CASE STUDY: LEARNER ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE CORRECTION OF MISTAKES

Galina Kavaliauskienė

Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania, gkaval@mruni.eu

Lilija Anusienė

Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania, lilija.anusiene@gmail.com

Abstract

The objective of the research is to explore learner attitudes to correction of mistakes or feedback as a language learning tool in oral, electronically- and paper-written work as well as peer correction of mistakes.

Feedback is a method used in the teaching of languages to improve performance by sharing observations, concerns and suggestions with regard to written work or oral presentation. It includes not only correcting learners, but also assessing them. Both correction and assessment depend on mistakes being made, reasons for mistakes, and class activities. Recently the value of feedback in language studies has been a matter of debate among language teaching practitioners. The research into the effects of feedback is far from conclusive. Teachers' and students' expectations toward feedback are found to be opposing, and the most frequent reason given is its negative impact on students' confidence and motivation. However, at the university level the issue of feedback has been examined in passing and there is insufficient research into learner attitudes to feedback in English for Specific Purposes.

The hypothesis for the present study is to find out whether criticism has a negative impact on student confidence and whether perceptions of feedback depend on professional specialization.

Socialinės technologijos/Social Technologies
© Mykolo Romerio universitetas, 2012
© Mykolas Romeris University, 2012

ISSN 2029-7564 (online)
https://www.mruni.eu/lt/mokslo_darbai/st/apie_leidini/
https://www.mruni.eu/en/mokslo_darbai/st/apie_leidini/index.php

__The research methods.__ A survey of students' perceptions of teachers' feedback in various class activities was administered to various groups of undergraduate students of psychology and penitentiary law. Statistical treatment of students' responses using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (SPSS) was carried out in order to establish the level of significance for the two small samples of participants.

__The respondents__ in this research participated students of two different specializations, penitentiary law and psychology, who study English for Specific Purposes at the Faculty of Social Policy, Mykolas Romeris University in Vilnius, Lithuania.

__The results obtained.__ The results indicated that feedback was considered helpful though correction of written work was more appreciated than correction of speech. Students believe that in order to improve their writing skills, it is necessary to receive teacher feedback on written work both on paper or submitted electronically. They prefer immediate correction of errors in spite of its impracticality and claim that individual correction of mistakes by teacher is useful. Differences between the responses of students who study two disciplines were slight. Attitudes to feedback do not differ significantly—specialization is not very relevant. Criticism isn't meant to undermine self-esteem, though some students were more confident than other students. Perceived merits of oral, handwritten, electronic, teacher and peer feedback as well as the value of statistical analysis in interpretation of data are discussed in this study. All the things considered might help learners be successful in improving language skills. It is generally believed that by making the students aware of the mistakes they make, and by getting them to act on those mistakes in some way, the students will assimilate the corrections and eventually not make those same mistakes in the future.

__Research limitations.__ A limited number of respondents might raise a question of the reliability of the findings and require a further study into the issue.

__Practical implications.__ The analysis of the responses by means of SPSS suggests that, in spite of the limited number of the respondents, the results may be extended beyond the studied samples.

__Originality.__ The value of this study encompasses the statistical approach to data analysis, which proves that the findings are reliable.

__Keywords:__ English for Specific Purposes, teacher's feedback to written work and oral production, peers feedback.

1. Introduction

Error correction, or feedback, has been used in language teaching/learning for a long time, but its benefits have been questioned by some language teachers. Lately teacher attitudes to feedback seem to undergo a revival stage as a useful teaching device in secondary schools (Allah, 2008; Brandt, 2008; Wang, 2008). It is argued in favour of delivering feedback which can help develop writing and speaking skills as well as learn grammar and vocabulary. However, at university level the issue of feedback has been

examined in passing and there is insufficient research into learner attitudes to feedback in English for Specific Purposes (ESP).

This paper aims to investigate student attitudes to feedback and drawing conclusions as to its suitability at the university level.

The objective of the research: to explore learner attitudes to feedback as a language learning tool in oral, electronically- and paper-written work as well as peer correction of mistakes.

The research methods used: a survey of student perceptions of teacher feedback in various class activities, statistical treatment of student responses using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software (SPSS) in order to establish the level of significance for the two small samples of participants, and analysis of various types of feedback provided by either teachers or peers.

The respondents in this research participated students of two different specializations, penitentiary law and psychology, who study English for Specific Purposes at the Faculty of Social Policy, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius, Lithuania.

2. Literature Review

In this section, previous research into positive and negative feedback in the English classroom, teacher and learner preferences for error correction and the latest technological developments that provide the learner with various levels of interactivity have been examined.

2.1. Three types of mistakes

Feedback may be defined as information supplied to learners concerning some aspect of their performance on a task, by a peer or a teacher, with a view to improving language skills. It includes not only correcting learners, but also assessing them. Both correction and assessment depend on mistakes being made, reasons for mistakes, and class activities. In linguistics, the definitions of "mistake" and "error" are rather diverse. According to Ancker (2000), a mistake is a performance error that is either a random guess or a slip, it is a failure to utilize a word correctly, and an error is a noticeable deviation from the language of a native speaker.

J. Edge (1989) suggests dividing mistakes into three types: slips, errors and attempts. "Slips" are mistakes that students can correct themselves; "errors" are mistakes which students cannot correct themselves; "attempts" are student's intentions of using the language without knowing the right way. In this article, either the most common linguistic term "error" or the students' preferred term "mistake" will be used interchangeably.

2.2. Types of feedback

It is thought that that not all student errors should be corrected because errors are normal and unavoidable during the learning process. The nature of teacher feedback

differs widely among teachers and classes and depends on such factors as course objectives, assignment objectives, marking criteria, individual student expectations, strengths, weaknesses, and attitude toward writing (Harmer, 2000). Current theories of how people learn languages suggest that habit formation is only one part of the process. There are many reasons for errors to occur: interference from the native language, an incomplete knowledge of the target language, or its complexity (Edge, 1989). Some researchers suggest that feedback to second language writing falls somewhere between two extremes—evaluative or formative feedback (McGarrell & Verbeem, 2007). Evaluative feedback typically passes judgement on the draft, reflects on sentence-level errors, and takes the form of directives for improvement on assignments. Formative feedback, which is sometimes referred to as facilitative, typically consists of feedback that takes an inquiring stance towards the text. Most of the research on feedback has dealt with the role of negative feedback in secondary education.

2.3. Different attitudes to error correction

Error correction or feedback remains one of the most misunderstood issues in foreign language teaching, and there is no consensus about it (Ancker, 2000). It is considered to be more effective when it is focused, contains relevant and meaningful data, it is descriptive rather than evaluative, and it contains a moderate amount of positive feedback with a selected and limited amount of negative feedback, it allows for response and interaction (Brandt, 2008).

The research into the effects of error correction is far from conclusive. Some authors suggest that error correction is ineffective and should be abandoned (Truscott, 1996). P. Wang (2008) describes the case study, entitled "Changing teachers," which shows that some students may emotionally respond in the face of threatening situations. Therefore, positive affective comments should be offered first to encourage learners and reduce the tension caused by error correction. It will avoid the hazards of demotivating students.

However, research has not explored the important aspects of teacher and student preferences for feedback in error correction. A survey of 100 students' preferences for error correction claims that students equate good writing in English with error-free writing; moreover, learners expect and want all errors in their papers to be corrected (Leki, 1991). Additionally, in a survey of 47 students' attitudes towards classroom feedback procedures, H. Enginarlar (1993) reports that students perceive surface-level error correction as effective teacher feedback. In the study investigating 824 students' and 92 teachers' beliefs about error correction and the benefit of a focus on form in language learning, R. Schulz (1996) reports some discrepancies among teachers as well as between teachers and students. Specifically, students are generally more receptive to receiving corrective feedback in both written and spoken language than teachers. A follow-up study (Schulz, 2001) that compares the 1996 data with responses elicited from 607 foreign language students and 122 teachers in Colombia reveals relatively high agreement between students as a group and teachers as a group across cultures on most questions. D. Nunan (1993) presents a study that examines the relationship

between the attitudes of students and teachers to the various activities. The data show a clear mismatch between learners' and teachers' views in all but one activity, namely, conversation practice. Error correction in Nunan's book receives a very high priority of 7 out of 10 points among students, and very low priority of 2 among teachers. The comparison of teacher and student preferences for error correction is analyzed by Rula L. Diab (2006), who reveals various discrepancies between instructor and student preferences to error correction, as well as differences in beliefs among instructors themselves. L. Diab recommends that teachers incorporate classroom discussions on error correction and feedback in order to help their students understand how feedback is intended to affect their writing.

Teachers' and students' expectations to error correction were examined by W. Ancker (2000). In his survey, 25% of 802 teachers and 76% of 143 students believed that all errors should be corrected. The most frequent reason given by teachers for not wanting correction is the negative impact of correction on students' confidence and motivation, and the most frequent reason given by students for wanting correction is the importance of learning to speak English correctly. The most important implication of these findings is to rectify the opposing expectations of teachers and students about how errors should be handled.

2.4. Peer and electronic feedback

The use of peer feedback in English writing classrooms has been generally supported as a potentially valuable aid for its social, cognitive, affective, and methodological benefits. The affective advantage of peer response over teacher response is that it is less threatening, less authoritarian, and more supportive, but students judge it as less helpful; however, 80% of peer comments were considered valid, and only 7% seen as potentially damaging (Rollinson, 2005).

Electronic feedback has drawn researcher interest for more than two decades (Allah, 2008). Incorporating e-feedback along with face-to-face modes has been shown to yield the best results in terms of quality of feedback and impact on revisions. This technique involves student learning preferences, which have positive influence on learning. According to Allah (2008), English teachers should deal with integrating electronic feedback with a balance of enthusiasm and caution because adopting new trends without careful planning can negatively influence student performance.

Research into feedback on oral production is not numerous. However, language instructors are aware that many learners fail to notice their own mistakes in impromptu speaking. Error feedback and its effect on noticing errors in verbal production are explored by H. Sakai (2004), who pays particular attention to recasts, i.e. feedback defined as a corrected reformulation of language learners' erroneous utterances by the teacher.

3. Rationale for the Study

This study has examined university student attitudes to feedback in various English class activities. Specifically the research addresses the questions of correction types and whether it is beneficial to learning. The above review of the relevant literature suggests that various types of feedback might benefit language learning. It is a matter of great relevance to teachers to find out what student beliefs and views on error correction are and what trends are dominant. It is also important to investigate if learners specializing in different subjects need the same types of feedback.

4. Respondents and Data Collection

The study was conducted at the Faculty of Social Policy, Mykolas Romeris University, Vilnius. The participants were students specializing in either penitentiary law or psychology and studying English for Specific Purposes. In this research, there were 24 students of psychology and 26 students of penitentiary law. They were predominantly females at the intermediate English levels. The amount of time spent by students in the second language classes was 4 hours per week for 2 semesters, which amounts to about 130 hours of English instruction. Data was collected through administering a specially designed survey in accordance with the accepted standards for surveys in Social Sciences (Dornyei, 2003). The questionnaire was administered to all respondents, and the analysis of responses was conducted. The obtained data was statistically processed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software, interpreted and described further on.

5. Results and Discussion

5.1. Results

The students' responses to the survey on their attitudes to feedback are summarised in Table 1. The columns show the percentages of responses to the statements. The students rated each statement according to the five-point Likert scale by circling the appropriate number: 1—strongly disagree, 2—disagree, 3—not sure, 4—agree, 5—strongly agree. For the sake of brevity, both positive responses "strongly agree" and "agree" and negative responses "strongly disagree" and "disagree" are added up. This approach does not distort the data. On the contrary, it allows displaying the findings in a compact way. The first column in Table 1 reproduces the survey statements. Three other columns show the percentage of psychology (PS) and penitentiary law (PL) students who disagreed, were not sure, or supported the statements.

Table 1. Student responses to the survey statements. The first percentage in the columns refers
to the responses of the students who study psychology, and the second percentage—to the responses
of the students who study penitentiary law.

Survey statements	Disagree (%)		Not sure (%)		Agree (%)	
	PS	PL	PS	PL	PS	PL
1. Mistakes are natural	9	5	24	9	67	86
2. Immediate correction by the teacher is preferable	13	11	13	41	74	48
3. Teacher correction is generally effective	1	4	2	5	97	91
4. Hard to notice my own mistakes	30	30	13	16	57	55
5. All mistakes is speaking must be corrected	30	14	40	22	30	64
6. All mistakes in writing must be corrected	4	4	8	2	88	94
7. Correction of oral errors in class undermines the learner's self-esteem	39	44	43	29	18	27
8. Individual correction of mistakes in writing is useful	2	2	4	–	94	98
9. Peer feedback is beneficial.	45	50	40	30	15	20

1ˢᵗ Statement. Making mistakes while learning English is natural.

The first row of Table 1 demonstrates the participants' opinions on making mistakes in language acquisition. The majority of participants, 67% of the psychology students versus 86% of the penitentiary law work students feel that mistakes in learning are unavoidable. Moreover, in the interviews they claim it is important to think about one's own mistakes in order to learn from them. The percentage of doubters is rather high—24% against 9%. Negative responses are very few: 9% versus 5%. However, the majority of learners emphasize in their interviews is that awareness of mistakes leads to linguistic development.

2ⁿᵈ Statement. Students prefer the teacher's immediate correction of errors.

As many as 74% of students in the first group support this statement contrary to 48% of the second group, while 41% of the second group are not sure. The number of negative responses is similar in both specializations: 13% and 11%. From the practical viewpoint, it is impossible for teachers to correct mistakes immediately, particularly in conversation classes. Any interruption of communication might ruin the activity. The misleading perception of usefulness of immediate correction probably lies in respondents' experience at school, where some teachers feel it is their duty to make corrections as soon as possible. As it has been mentioned in the literature review section, the idea of immediate correction seems to be evaluative rather than formative, which is preferable.

3rd Statement. The teacher's correction is generally effective.

Essentially, a great majority of 97% versus 91% of participants agree with the idea of effectiveness of correction. The number of uncertain responses varies from 2% against 5%, the number of negative responses is 1% against 4%. This clearly demonstrates learners' positive perception of correction.

4th Statement. Students find it hard to notice their mistakes.

The findings for this statement are quite straightforward: over half of respondents agree with the point (57% versus 55%), and almost a third (30% versus 30%) disagree. The percentage of neutral answers is rather small (2% versus 5%). Obviously, this statement refers to the personal perception of each respondent, so the differences of views are natural.

5th Statement. Teachers should correct the students' every mistake in speaking.

The attitudes to this statement differ significantly depending on specialization. About two-thirds of would-be psychologists either support or oppose the claim, and the rest 40% are not sure. The majority of students of another specialization (64%) agree, while 14% disagree, and 22% are not sure.

6th Statement. Teachers should correct the students' every mistake in writing.

Students' attitudes to developing writing skills are predominant among other language skills and are conditioned by the examination requirements, which include writing a summary of professional texts. Statistics of responses reflects that: 88% against 94% back this statement with a few learners either opposing (4% versus 4%) or uncertain (8% versus 2%). Learners are aware of writing difficulties and potential pitfalls they encounter in writing activities, so feedback seems extremely important. Students keep making the same common mistakes that have been repeatedly pointed out to them. It is widely accepted that there are two distinct causes for the errors: interference of mother tongue and developmental errors (Harmer, 2000). These errors are part of the students' interlanguage—the version a learner has at the current stage of development.

7th Statement. The teacher's correction of the student's oral errors in front of the class undermines the learner's self-esteem.

Students do not seem to worry about undermining their self-esteem: their responses are similar and either negative (39% versus 44%) or uncertain (43% versus 29%). This is good news for teachers—error correction is not expected to affect the learners' motivation or willingness to perfect language skills.

8th Statement. The teacher's individual correction of the students' written mistakes is useful for learning ESP.

The vast majority of students (94% against 98%) feel positive about usefulness of individual error correction as it facilitates personal learning. A personalized learning of the language and getting relevant feedback to one's performance are very important to develop language awareness.

9th Statement. Peer feedback is beneficial.

Students do not find peer feedback beneficial—only a minority of students support this statement. Almost half of the learners either disagree with the statement, or are not sure. The possible cause of this perception is unfounded fears of being criticized in public.

Summing up these findings, learners' responses are quite straightforward and unambiguous. To prove the point, however, the study must rely on statistical evaluation of the data as the number of respondents in this research is limited. Next section briefly describes the statistical procedure and the interpretation of the results.

4.2. Statistical processing of data

The obtained data have been processed statistically in order to determine how comparable and reliable the data are. Similarly as in our previous paper on alternative assessment of performance (Kavaliauskienė et al, 2007), Cronbach Alpha coefficient, which defines the reliability, was computed. It is found to be equal to 0.80, which is in a good agreement with the theory (Dornyei, 2003). The experimental findings have been processed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The Means and Standard Deviations for the responses of the students have been computed, and the t-test in data analysis has been applied. The *t*-test is most frequently used measure in second language research when comparing mean scores for two groups. It is important to emphasize that *t*-test can be used successfully with very large or very small groups. The adjustment for group size is made by evaluating the degrees of freedom, which are determined by subtracting one from the number of participants in each group and then adding the two resulting numbers together. Here the degree of freedom *df*=48. The critical values for *t* at different levels *p* of significance (one-tailed) are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Means, Standard Deviations (SD), One-tailed Significance Levels *p,* and data interpretation.

Survey statements	Means / SDs PS	Means / SDs PL	Computed t, critical t values	Significance level p, data interpre- tation
1. Mistakes are natural	3.89 0.72	3.91 0.72	$t = 0.289$ $t_{crit} = 1.684$	$p < 0.05$ NSD
2. Immediate correction by the teacher is preferable	3.72 0.84	3.43 0.49	$t = 2.071$ $t_{crit} = 2.021$	$p < 0.025$ SD
3. The teacher's correction is generally effective	4.33 0.68	4.73 0.69	$t = 2.52$ $t_{crit} = 2.423$	$p < 0.01$ SD
4. Hard to notice my own mistakes	3.35 0.74	3.32 0.74	$t = 0.187$ $t_{crit} = 1.684$	$p < 0.05$ NSD
5. All mistakes while speaking must be corrected	2.91 1.03	3.57 0.93	$t = 3.14$ $t_{crit} = 2.704$	$p < 0.01$ SD
6. All mistakes in writing must be corrected	4.41 0.60	4.32 0.68	$t = 0.67$ $t_{crit} = 1.684$	$p < 0.05$ NSD
7. The teacher's correction of the student's oral errors in front of the class undermines the learners' self-esteem	2.76 0.60	2.86 0.87	$t = 0.67$ $t_{crit} = 1.684$	$p < 0.05$ NSD
8. The teacher's individual correction of student's written mistakes is useful for learning ESP	4.30 0.72	4.25 0.68	$t = 0.69$ $t_{crit} = 1.684$	$p < 0.05$ NSD
9. Peer feedback is beneficial	2.75 0.65	2.85 0.85	$t = 0.625$ $t_{crit} = 1.684$	$p < 0.05$ NSD

The first column in Table 2 reproduces the survey statements. The second and third columns display the Means (first line) and the Standard Deviations (SDs, second line). The fourth column in Table 2 shows computed *t* values for each statement and critical *t* values. The data interpretations based on comparison of computed and critical *t* values are presented in the fifth column. If computed *t* values exceed critical *t* values, it means that there is a significant difference (SD) between PS and PL learners' responses. The Level of Significance *p* is found from Critical *t* Tables (Brown, Rodgers, 2002). The smaller *p* value is, the higher probability P is. If the Significance Level *p* is relatively high, i.e. *p* < 0.05 (P = 99.95%), it indicates that there is no significant difference (NSD) between the responses. In other words, the Means are statistically close. Therefore, according to the data in Table 2, it can be concluded that there is no significant difference (NSD) in responses to the statements 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9, but there is a significant difference (SD) in responses to the statements 2, 3 and 5. In other words, here the Means are not statistically very close. Thus, statistical processing of survey responses in the cases of the limited number of respondents ensures the right interpretation of the obtained data.

6. Classroom Feedback

6.1. Teacher/peer feedback

Peer and teacher feedback might be very helpful both in oral and written work. However, teachers should not interrupt the students' speech to point out their errors. Any intervention may raise stress levels and hinder communication. A good classroom practice is for teachers to keep recording students' mistakes during activities. Mistakes should be dealt with later, after the activity has ended. It is a good idea for teachers to focus on errors without indicating who made them and asking students to rectify the errors. However, peer correction works well only in classes with a friendly and cooperative atmosphere. Otherwise remedial work may lead to undermining the learners' self-esteem and cause more damage than gain. Feedback on written work depends on the specific tasks. In our classes, we practiced either paper correction or electronic feedback. Paper correction includes teacher responses to the learners' submitted written work. This kind of feedback is individualized: the teacher codes or corrects mistakes, writes comments on contents and errors. It is greatly appreciated by students who raise questions and ask for clarification.

6.2. Electronic feedback

Electronic peer feedback has been employed for writing comments in peer weblogs. All the learners have created their own weblogs which are used for written assignments and are incorporated in the teacher's weblogs. Peer comments may be viewed online. It should be noted that generally students avoid writing negative comments. As a rule, learners try to find positive aspects in each case and usually praise their peer's work. Unfortunately, teacher individual feedback, i.e. face to face, is not always followed by error correction: spelling and grammar errors online remain uncorrected, and the students' most common excuse for failing to do remedial work is a shortage of time.

Classroom practice allows to offer practical advice to other language practitioners. It is a good idea to evaluate student writing and provide feedback individually. It would be an unforgivable mistake to give any negative comments in front of the class or online. Similarly, it is better to provide feedback on observed speaking errors individually, for instance, during self-assessment interviews with each learner while discussing her/his success and achievements in language learning activities. The basic principle of teacher's feedback is to keep in mind that it is designed to teach and help learning, not to criticize.

7. Conclusions and Implications

The following conclusions have been drawn. First, students of penitentiary law and psychology believe that in order to improve writing skills, it is necessary to receive teacher feedback on written work both on paper or submitted electronically. Second, attitudes to feedback do not differ significantly—specialization is not very relevant.

Third, students prefer immediate correction of errors in spite of its impracticality and claim that individual correction of mistakes by teacher is useful.

The main implications of classroom practice for teachers are to monitor each student's performance in class activities closely, provide individual feedback on speaking and written errors, to encourage self- and peer-correction, to avoid negative feedback at all times, and to provide sandwich-type feedback individually—positive-negative-positive. Such an approach might help to avoid undermining a learner and preserve her/his self-esteem, as individual reactions towards error correction may be very strong, and criticism may be felt as an emotionally threatening act. Finally, it is important to find out what learner responses to teacher feedback on their written work or spoken production are. All the things considered might help learners to be successful in improving language skills.

References

Allah, L.F. 2008. "Electronic Feedback: Is It Beneficial for Second Language Writers?" *Teaching English with Technology, a Journal for Teachers of English*, 8(3). <http://www.iatefl.org.pl/call/callnl32.htm> [accessed 12/04/09].

Ancker, W. 2000. "Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice." *English Teaching Forum,* 38: 20-25.

Brandt, C. 2008. "Integrating Feedback and Reflection in Teacher Preparation." *ELT Journal.* 62: 37-46.

Brown, J.D. and T.S. Rodgers. (2002). *Doing Second Language Research*. Oxford University Press.

Dornyei, Z. 2003. *Questionnaires in Second Language Research.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers, New Jersey, USA.

Edge, J. 1989. *Mistakes and Correction*. Addison Wesley: Longman.

Enginarlar, H. 1993. "Student Response to Teacher Feedback in EFL Writing." *System.* 21:193–204.

Harmer, J. 2000. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. England: Longman.

Kavaliauskienė, G., Kaminskienė L., and Anusienė L. 2007. "Reflective Practice:

Assessment of Assignments in English for Specific Purposes." Journal of the European Association of Languages for Specific Purposes Iberica 14: 149-166.

Leki, I. 1991. "The Preferences of ESL Students for Error Correction in College-Level Writing Classes." *Foreign Language Annals.* 24: 203–218.

McGarrell, H. & J. Verbeem. 2007. "Motivating Revision of Drafts Through Formative Feedback." *ELT Journal*. 62: 37-46.

Nunan, D. 1991. *The Learner-Centred Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rula L.Diab. 2006. "Error Correction and Feedback in the EFL Writing Classroom." *English Teaching Forum*. 44: 2-13.

Sakai, H. 2004. "Roles of Output and Feedback for L2 Learners' Noticing." *JALT Journal*. 26(1). <http://www.jalt-publications.org/jj/articles/2004/05/index> [accessed 12-04-30].

Schulz, R. A. 1996. "Focus on Form in the Foreign Language Classroom: Students' and Teachers' Views on Error Correction and the Role of Grammar." *Foreign Language Annals*. 29: 343–64.

Schulz, R. A. 2001. "Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning

the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback." *Modern Language Journal*. 85: 244–58.

Truscott, J. 1996. "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes." *Language Learning*. 46: 327–69.

Rollinson, P. 2005. "Using Peer Feedback in the ESL Writing Class." *ELT Journal*. 59: 23-30.

Wang, P. 2008. "Exploring Errors in Target Language Learning and Use: Practice Meets Theory." *English Language Teaching*. 1(2): 182-187. <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal.html> [12/03/31].

STUDENTŲ POŽIŪRIS Į KLAIDŲ TAISYMĄ: ATVEJO ANALIZĖ

Galina Kavaliauskienė

Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva, gkaval@mruni.lt

Lilija Anužienė

Mykolo Romerio universitetas, Lietuva, lilija.anusiene@gmail.com

Santrauka. Klaidų taisymas, arba grįžtamasis ryšys, apibūdinamas kaip stebėjimo rezultatų ir siūlymų teikimas tarp asmenų norint geriau atlikti asmenines ir organizacines užduotis. Svarbu ne tik taisyti besimokančiuosius, bet ir vertinti juos. Tiek taisymas, tiek vertinimas priklauso nuo daromų klaidų, jų priežasčių ir darbo auditorijoje. Grįžtamasis ryšys yra vienas iš labiausiai ginčytinų klausimų mokant užsienio kalbų. Grįžtamojo ryšio svarba mokant kalbų nėra vienareikšmiškai vertinama dėstytojų, o jo tyrimai nėra galutiniai, tyrimų įrodymai nėra įtikinantys. Universitetinėse specialybės kalbos studijose grįžtamasis ryšys tyrinėtas paviršutiniškai. Dėstytojų ir studentų požiūriai į grįžtamąjį ryšį yra prieštaringi. Dažniausia dėstytojai neigiamai vertina grįžtamojo ryšio įtaką studentų motyvacijai ir pasitikėjimui savo gebėjimais.

Dėstytojo grįžtamasis ryšys taikomas, kai būtina taisyti rašybos ar kalbėjimo klaidas. Pastarųjų metų kalbų mokymosi teorijos teigia, kad ne visos klaidos taisytinos. Tai remiasi teiginiu, kad klaidos mokantis yra neišvengiamos – tai yra normalus reiškinys. Dabartinės teorijos apie kalbų mokymąsi teigia, kad įpročio formavimas yra tik viena proceso dalis. Klaidų atsiradimo priežastys būna įvairios: gimtosios kalbos interferencija, ribotas užsienio kalbos mokėjimas, kalbos sudėtingumas ar net fosilizacija pasiekus tam tikrą kompetencijos lygį. Tikėtina, kad išaiškinus studentams jų daromas klaidas, jie įsisavins duotus pataisymus ir pagaliau nedarys tų klaidų ateityje.

Straipsnyje nagrinėjami Mykolo Romerio universiteto Socialinės politikos fakulteto psichologijos ir penitencinės teisės studentų požiūriai į grįžtamąjį ryšį mokantis specialybės anglų kalbos ir nustatoma, kaip keičiasi jų nuomonės mokantis specialybės kalbos. Gauti rezultatai rodo, kad grįžtamasis ryšys yra veiksmingas būdas skatinti lingvistinį vystymąsi. Studentai labiausiai vertina rašto darbų klaidų taisymą, bet mažiau vertina klaidų taisymą pasisaky-

muose. Psichologijos ir penitencines teisės studentai mano, kad rašybos įgūdžiams pagerinti būtinas dėstytojo grįžtamasis ryšys. Studentai labiau vertina greitą klaidų taisymą nepaisant jo nepraktiškumo ir teigia, kad dėstytojų individualus klaidų taisymas yra naudingas. Dviejų disciplinų studentų atsakymų skirtumai labai nedideli. Požiūris į grįžtamąjį ryšį skiriasi nedaug – specializacija nėra labai svarbi. Priešingai negu dėstytojai, studentai mano, kad klaidų taisymas yra efektyvus ir nekenkia žmogaus savigarbai. Straipsnyje aptariamos dėstytojo grįžtamojo ryšio teikimo formos – popieriuje bei kurso draugų pastabos elektroninėje erdvėje. Visos tos aplinkybės gali padėti studentams sėkmingai tobulinti kalbos įgūdžius.

Pagrindinė šio tyrimo išvada skirta dėstytojams: stebėti kiekvieno studento pažangą ir teikti geranorišką rašto ir kalbėjimo klaidų taisymą. Dėstytojai privalo tobulinti savo klaidų taisymo metodikas taip, kad studentai nejaustų streso ar jaudulio.

Raktažodžiai: *specialybės kalba, dėstytojo grįžtamasis ryšys taisant rašybos ir kalbėjimo klaidas, kurso draugų pastabos.*