

Negative Feedback

Perceptions and Practices regarding the Correction of Oral English Errors in Norwegian Upper Secondary Schools

by Eldar Nordal



A Thesis presented to the
Department of Literature, Area Studies and European
Languages, Faculty of Humanities
In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the MA Degree in English

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Spring 2014

Negative Feedback

*Perceptions and Practices regarding the Correction of Oral English Errors in
Norwegian Upper Secondary Schools*

by Eldar Nordal

A Thesis presented to the Department of Literature, Area Studies and European
Languages, Faculty of Humanities
In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the MA Degree in English

Spring 2014

Supervisor: Hildegunn Dirdal

© Eldar Nordal

2014

Negative Feedback: Perceptions and Practices regarding the Correction of Oral English Errors
in Norwegian Upper Secondary Schools

Eldar Nordal

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Print: Representeren, University of Oslo

Abstract

This thesis provides an insight to perceptions and practices regarding oral negative feedback in Norwegian upper secondary education, through a triangulation of methods. The thesis confirms previous findings that there are major divergences between students' and teachers' views and opinions about oral negative feedback in the classroom. Whereas the majority of students are positive towards the facilitative effects of receiving negative feedback, the teachers are hesitant towards providing it. Classroom observations and teacher interviews confirm this reluctance. Furthermore, the study shows that the percentage of oral errors responded to in Norwegian classrooms is remarkably low compared to previous research, and the negative feedback that is provided almost unanimously consist of implicit recasts. This indicates that practices in Norwegian schools are not in accordance with what newer research has found to be effective for acquisition.

The findings highlight the importance of conducting research in Norway, as research on negative feedback in countries with different language proficiencies, education cultures, and curricula may differ considerably from the Norwegian classroom. Gathering knowledge about perceptions and practices in Norwegian schools is vital in order to give further suggestions for teaching practices and teacher training programs, and this thesis makes an important contribution in that respect.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor, Associate Professor Hildegunn Dirdal, whose support, constructive feedback, and wise guidance have been of the uttermost importance.

I am also in gratitude to the schools that accepted my requests and distributed my questionnaires, and to the teachers and students who were willing to participate. Without their help I would not have been able to write this thesis.

Special thanks should be handed to the two schools that let me conduct observations. I am especially grateful to the two teachers who were willing to let me observe in their classes, and to take the time to answer my questions. In addition, I would like to thank the students in those classes for their cooperation.

Last but not least I also wish to thank my family, friends and fellow students who have provided me with support and kept me sane during stressful times.

Table of content

1	Introduction	1
2	SLA in a historical perspective	3
2.1	From behaviorism to a natural approach and Communicative Language Teaching ...	3
2.2	The Interaction Hypothesis.....	4
2.3	Output and attention/noticing	5
3	Research on negative feedback	7
3.1	The overall effect of negative feedback.....	8
3.2	The extent to which errors are responded to in the classroom	9
3.3	Types of negative feedback	10
3.4	Differential effects of different types of negative feedback	11
3.4.1	Prompts vs. recasts	12
3.4.2	Implicit vs. explicit feedback	13
3.4.3	Recasts.....	13
3.4.4	Uptake	18
3.4.5	The Counterbalance Hypothesis.....	20
3.4.6	Generalizations.....	21
3.5	Learners' and teachers' perceptions of negative feedback	22
3.5.1	The illocutionary force of negative feedback.....	23
3.5.2	General perceptions about oral negative feedback.....	24
3.5.3	Schulz's study	24
3.5.4	Lasagabaster and Sierra's study	26
3.6	Summary.....	27
4	Research questions	29
5	Methods.....	31
5.1	The questionnaire study	32
5.1.1	Participants	32
5.1.2	Data collection instruments and procedure	34
5.1.3	Replication divergences	35
5.2	Classroom observations	36
5.2.1	Participants	37

5.2.2	Observation procedure	37
5.2.3	Coding	38
5.3	Teacher interviews.....	41
5.3.1	Participants	42
5.3.2	Data collection.....	42
6	The questionnaire	43
6.1	Results	43
6.2	Main findings.....	50
6.3	Discussion.....	50
6.3.1	Cultural differences in student perceptions	51
6.3.2	Discussing teachers' perceptions	53
6.3.3	Implications of the differences between teachers and students.....	56
7	Classroom observations of negative feedback	59
7.1	Overall feedback rates	59
7.2	Linguistic focus	62
7.3	Types of negative feedback provided	65
7.4	The explicitness of recasts	67
7.5	Uptake.....	71
7.6	Conclusion	73
8	Teacher interviews	75
8.1	The female teacher.....	75
8.2	The male teacher.....	79
8.3	Teacher comparison and discussion	81
8.4	Summary.....	83
9	Conclusion.....	84
	References	88
	Appendices	95
1.	Students' questionnaire.....	95
2.	Teachers' questionnaire.....	98
3.	Observation schemes	102
4.	Interview guide.....	112
5.	Interview transcription (female teacher)	114
6.	Interview transcription (male teacher)	120

1 Introduction

Having worked as a teacher for two years and planning to return to the profession after the submission of this thesis, my reasons for choosing to focus on error correction are founded upon my own experiences, both as a teacher and as a student in Norwegian schools. The English language has a strong position in the Norwegian society. Norwegians are exposed to English through media and the Internet as well as through travel and communication. The frequent exposure to English outside of school, in addition to the fact that pupils are taught English from the first year of primary school, has led to improved confidence and proficiency, and English students in upper secondary school will usually be able to communicate effectively using the target language. In addition, the English curriculum in Norway (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2006a) is very communication oriented, which opens up for much discussion and oral activities in the classroom. This will inevitably also lead to students committing language errors in class, which leaves the teacher with some important decisions to make regarding whether to respond, and if so, how to respond to those errors.

For decades researchers of second language acquisition (SLA) have tried to find answers to what are the most effective practices regarding the correction of oral language errors. As we will see, there are still disagreements about the role of error correction, otherwise referred to throughout this thesis as negative feedback¹, in language acquisition. The main focus of this thesis is a part of SLA research that has not been subject of much previous research, namely students' and teachers' perceptions regarding error correction in the classroom. Good practices in schools must build on accumulated knowledge of negative feedback and its effectiveness. However, the opinions and feelings of the agents involved will affect the process, which is why it is important to know what Norwegian teachers and students think about error correction. Additionally, although research on the topic has been conducted in other national contexts, we cannot necessarily assume that teachers and students in Norway will have the same perceptions and reactions as those in other countries. Thus, to give suggestions for teaching in Norwegian schools we first need to know what the reality is now, and what factors we have to contend with. This study aims to provide such a background.

¹ A definition of the term is given in chapter 3.

The thesis is organized as follows: Chapter 2 offers a brief, historical overview of approaches to SLA where some important terms and hypothesis are accounted for. In chapter 3, research on various aspects of negative feedback is discussed. This research will serve as important references and sources of comparison when presenting my own study. Further, the research questions of the thesis are presented in chapter 4. Chapter 5 is where the three methods used in this study will be accounted for. The results from my study are then presented and discussed in chapters 6, 7, and 8, one chapter for each of the different methods used. Finally, in chapter 9 the findings are summarized and conclusions drawn regarding the research aims of the thesis. Limitations of the study are also commented on, and suggestions for further research are given.

2 SLA in a historical perspective

This section offers a brief historical introduction to approaches to SLA. Some of the field's most influential hypotheses will be accounted for, as they form a basis for more recent research on SLA and my research on negative feedback in particular.

2.1 From behaviorism to a natural approach and Communicative Language Teaching

In the 1950s and 1960s, the audiolingual approach to teaching was the prevailing method, where immediate correction of errors was important (Griffiths & Parr, 2001; V. Russell, 2009). Learner errors should not be tolerated and efforts should be made to rid the learners of the errors as soon as possible. According to behaviorist views, learning could be achieved through repetitions of the desired actions. The following quote from Brooks (1960) explains the basics of the behaviorists' stimulus—response method: “Like sin, error is to be avoided and its influence overcome [...] the principal way of overcoming it is to shorten the time lapse between the incorrect response and a representation once more of the correct model” (p. 56).

However, in the 1970s theorists started to question the behavioristic methods, instead favoring a more naturalistic approach to learning. Terrell (1977) proposed a method which he called the Natural Approach, in which communicative activities in the classroom were important and where students' errors were largely ignored unless there was a breakdown in the communication. Stephen Krashen was also involved in the construction of the Natural Approach, and claimed that the behavioristic methods could have a damaging effect on the acquisition of a second language (1981, 1982). Instead he proposed the Monitor Model, which included five hypotheses about language learning: the Acquisition—Learning hypothesis, the Comprehensible Input Hypothesis, the Monitor Hypothesis, the Affective Filter, and the Natural Order Hypothesis (Krashen, 1982). The Comprehensible Input Hypothesis is arguably his most influential contribution to SLA research. According to Krashen, comprehensible input is both necessary and sufficient for successful L2 learning. Comprehensible input can be understood as language which is processed for meaning by the learners, while there is still

something to be learned. In other words, the input is one level above the level the learners are at. Krashen termed this *i+1* (1982).

Dell Hymes (1972) introduced the notion of communicative competence, which redefined what ‘knowing a language’ actually means. Mastering the structural aspects of a language was not enough. Now the most important thing was to be able to use the language appropriately in various social situations. This led to the rise of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which put a prime on interaction as both the means and the goal of language learning. CLT is still the dominant approach to English language teaching today (McKay, 2002), as is also evident in the Norwegian curriculum for English (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2006a).

2.2 The Interaction Hypothesis

Michael Long (1981; 1983) proposed an extension of Krashen’s Comprehensible Input Hypothesis. He agreed that learning takes place through comprehension, but claimed that the effectiveness of input increases when the learner has to negotiate for meaning. Long’s Interaction Hypothesis led to a series of interaction studies, and e.g. Pica, Young and Doughty’s study (1987) showed that more negotiation between interlocutors led to more comprehension. In addition, they found that opportunities to negotiate were indeed more effective than exposure to unmodified or premodified input. However, a problem in this study, as well as with similar studies, was that the interactionally modified input treatment the test groups received took longer than the premodified input treatment. Thus, as Ellis (2008, p. 253) points out, the advantage of interaction treatment could be due to the fact that the group was exposed to this type of input treatment over a longer time period.

The early version of the Interaction Hypothesis was subject to criticism, mainly because it failed to explain how the comprehensible input led to acquisition. In Long’s updated version of the Interaction Hypothesis (1996) he addressed this criticism:

... negotiation for meaning, and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional adjustments by the NS or more competent interlocutor, facilitates acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly selective attention, and output in productive ways. (pp. 451-2)

Long took into account Schmidt’s hypothesis about attention and Swain’s hypothesis regarding output, which are both accounted for in the next section. The interaction between

learner and interlocutor is important, since it will inform the learner about linguistic forms they have problems with. Through interaction and negotiation for meaning, the learner will receive both positive and negative evidence. The positive evidence may be provided through noticing linguistic forms in the input, while negative evidence is given by the interlocutor by indicating that something in the learner's output is inaccurate or difficult to understand. This may also lead to modified output, where the learner repairs the error. Long (1996) defines negative evidence as input that provides "[...] direct or indirect evidence of what is ungrammatical" (p. 413), which is very similar to the definition of negative feedback given in chapter 3.

2.3 Output and attention/noticing

Two above mentioned influential hypotheses in the field of SLA should also be accounted for. In his case study of Wes (1983), a young Japanese man who learned English without any instruction, Schmidt had shown that a positive attitude towards the target language and culture, plenty of comprehensible input, negotiated interaction and pushed output, was not sufficient to fully master the L2. What was lacking in Wes's case was attention to the language code, which stopped him from acquiring the grammar of the L2. In addition, Schmidt and Frota (1986) conducted a case study where they examined Schmidt's output in his learning of Portuguese. They found that the forms Schmidt produced in his output were the forms that he had noticed in his input. Conversely, the forms he had not noticed were not produced. These two studies led him to propose the Noticing Hypothesis (Schmidt, 1995), where he claimed that in order to acquire linguistic material, the learners need to notice it in the data provided by their linguistic surroundings.

Long's Interaction Hypothesis had stressed the importance of interaction between interlocutors, and where there is interaction there is also output. Swain (1985) had noticed that children in French immersion programs failed to develop an advanced level in speaking or writing the language. This was attributed to there being insufficient opportunities for the children to use the language in meaningful ways. On these grounds Swain (1985) formulated the Pushed Output Hypothesis, proposing that "producing the target language may be the trigger that forces the learner to pay attention to the means of expression needed in order to successfully convey his or her own intended meaning" (p. 249).

Alison Mackey's quasi-experimental study (1999) was the first to find a positive correlation between interaction and acquisition. The substantial number of studies investigating this topic have been synthesized in two meta-analyses that have pointed towards similar conclusions. Keck et al. (2006) combined the quantitative findings yielded by 14 task-based interaction studies published between 1994 and 2003, whereas Mackey and Goo (2007) incorporated an additional 14 studies published up to 2007. Both these meta-analyses found that acquisition does benefit from interaction. In addition, they found that these benefits may need some time to become noticeable, as the gains grew stronger for the studies that featured delayed post-tests.

This chapter has given a brief overview of the changes in pedagogical approaches in the past few decades. The principles of CLT will be an important factor in explaining practices and perceptions in Norwegian schools. In addition, hypotheses that provide a background for the interest in interaction and the effects of acquisition have been accounted for. We now turn to present and discuss research on negative feedback.

3 Research on negative feedback

The term *feedback* refers to an interlocutor's response to a speaker's utterance during interaction. The interlocutor provides *negative feedback* if the response contains information about an ungrammaticality in the speaker's utterance. In Iwashita's definition, "[n]egative feedback is an interlocutor's interactional move that indicates explicitly or implicitly any nontargetlike feature in the learner's speech" (2003, p. 2).

The terms *negative evidence*, *negative feedback*, *error correction*, and *corrective feedback* have essentially been used to describe the same phenomena by SLA researchers. However, the two latter terms imply a more pedagogical intention to correct. In many instances where an interlocutor provides information about the ungrammaticality of an utterance, it is not always clear whether the intention to correct is present (Ortega, 2009, p. 71). As will be demonstrated later in this thesis, this may sometimes be the case for teachers in a classroom context as well. Therefore, the term *negative feedback* will be used here.

This chapter aims to provide an overview of some important areas of research on negative feedback. Ever since the role of negative feedback in SLA was theoretically established, there has been a substantial amount of research on its effectiveness, and researchers have approached it from different perspectives. Some of this research will be mentioned in section 3.1, and we will see examples of both classroom studies, or studies on instructed SLA (ISLA), and laboratory studies in this chapter. According to Schachter (1991), the research on negative feedback prior to the 1980s was very limited, as "negative data for a long time meant nothing more than simple corrections of the learner's speech production" (Schachter, 1991, p. 90). Researchers such as Hendrickson (1978), had mentioned error correction earlier, but Long's Interaction Hypothesis, stating that providing learners with both positive and negative evidence facilitates language acquisition, led to a substantial amount of research on the topic. From an educational perspective on interaction studies, the topic has been of particular importance.

Long's Interaction Hypothesis has motivated a *focus on form* from a cognitive-interactionist perspective, which recommends that learners' attention should be drawn to the language as object when needed (Yilmaz, 2012). Long (1991) describes focus on form as drawing "[...]

students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication" (pp. 45-46). The use of negative feedback is a way of providing such attention.

The language learning classroom is a natural choice when investigating the topic, due to the fact that negative feedback provided by the teacher occurs frequently during the lessons. Negative feedback is common in a classroom setting, as we will see in chapter 3.2, whereas it normally occurs less frequently in a natural setting. Whether learners receive any negative feedback outside the classroom would for example depend on the relationship between the interlocutors, their personalities, their attitude and eagerness to learn and improve their language skills, and whether there are opportunities to communicate with native speakers or other language learners (Ortega, 2009, p. 73). Classroom studies can be used to test theories regarding language acquisition, and also, from a more pedagogical perspective, to find out which practices concerning negative feedback are the most effective when learning a language.

Below is an outline of some of the most important and thoroughly researched areas of negative feedback. First, research on the overall effect of negative feedback is discussed in an effort to shed light on just how efficient negative feedback has proven to be. Then the frequency of negative feedback in the classroom is accounted for, along with research on how the feedback is provided. Furthermore, the differential effects of different types of negative feedback are discussed in some detail, before the topics of students' and teachers' perceptions about negative feedback are examined.

3.1 The overall effect of negative feedback

As this chapter shows, there have been, and still are, divergent voices about the effect of negative feedback among SLA researchers. Schwartz (1993) maintained that language is fundamentally learned without the supply of negative feedback information, and Truscott (1999) claimed that the evidence that shows that negative feedback works is both insufficient and inconclusive. Krashen (1981) argued that negative feedback is unnecessary and might even be harmful. Therefore, according to Krashen, any attempt to draw the learner's attention to linguistic form should be avoided, and L2 educators should strive to maximize the learner's exposure to positive evidence. Ortega (2009, p. 72) argues that those who are critical towards

the positive effects of negative feedback dismiss the empirical evidence that is in favor of it, either because they maintain that it only reflects explicit, metalinguistic learning about the L2, or, because in order for it to be considered useful, negative feedback should work universally and across the board.

However, skeptics like the ones mentioned are in a minority among SLA researchers, at least within the cognitive-interactionist approach to SLA, as most argue that negative feedback is beneficial for learning (e.g. Li, 2010; Long, 1996 ; Lyster et al., 1999; Russel & Spada, 2006; White, 1989, 1991). Laboratory experiments involving adult learners have demonstrated that the use of corrective feedback is more effective than just providing them with input (Ayoum, 2001; Carroll & Swain, 1993; Mackey & Philp, 1998). Researchers conducting classroom studies have come to similar conclusions. Furthermore, in content-based and communicative language classes students show major improvements in accuracy if communication tasks are accompanied by negative feedback and other types of focus on form (e.g. Doughty & Varela, 1998; Lightbown & Spada, 1990; Spada & Lightbown, 1993; Williams, 2001; Williams & Evans, 1998).

Most of these classroom studies are comparable to experimental studies. With the exclusion of the studies by Lightbown and Spada (1990) and Williams (2001), their research include one or several treatment groups in addition to a control group, and treatment is limited to one or two structures. In all of these studies the learners receiving negative feedback achieve better results in the post-tests than the control groups. Thus, on the basis of studies like the ones mentioned, the evidence in favor of a positive effect of negative feedback in language acquisition is substantial.

3.2 The extent to which errors are responded to in the classroom

In an ESL or EFL classroom setting frequent uses of negative feedback are expected, as an important part of language instruction is improving the students' language speaking skills. Consequently, research shows that errors are generally responded to in the classroom. However, the extent to which errors are responded to differs, from a percentage of 48% of errors receiving negative feedback, reported by Panova and Lyster (2002), to 90% reported by Lochman (2002). The former study was based on ten hours of ESL lessons in Montreal,

whereas the latter reported feedback based on ten hours of German as a foreign language lessons in Belgium. A third example from classroom research is Lyster and Ranta's study (1997) of teacher—student interaction in four Grade 4/5 French immersion classrooms, which reported that teachers provided negative feedback on 62% of the erroneous utterances.

When it comes to laboratory studies using native speakers as interlocutors, between a half and a third of erroneous utterances produced by learners appears to receive negative feedback (Oliver (1995); Iwashita (2003); Mackey et al. (2003)). This lower rate of negative feedback may be due to the interlocutors having less of a didactic focus than teachers, focusing more on what they can understand, and less on correcting minor errors that do not obstruct communication to a large degree.

3.3 Types of negative feedback

Having established that providing students with negative feedback is an integral part of ESL/EFL teaching, we turn to examine which types of feedback that are used. There have been a number of different approaches to classifying negative feedback, which causes a few problems when attempting to compare different research. However, the taxonomy developed by Lyster and Ranta (1997, pp. 46-48), where they distinguish six types of feedback, has proven to be highly influential among negative feedback researchers. Therefore this coding system will be presented here.

1. In an *explicit correction* the interlocutor clearly indicates that the learner has said something incorrect, and provides the correct form.
2. A *recast* occurs when the interlocutor reformulates the learner's utterance, maintaining its meaning but offering a correct rendition of the form.
3. A *clarification request* is offered to indicate that the learner's utterance has low intelligibility and a reformulation is required.
4. *Metalinguistic feedback* is provided when the interlocutor offers comments, questions or information regarding the learner's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. *Metalinguistic comments* indicate that something the learner has said is incorrect. *Metalinguistic information* either provides grammatical metalanguage indicating the nature of the error or, in the case of lexical errors, provides a word definition.

Metalinguistic questions also refer to the nature of the error but are asked in order to elicit information from the learner, e.g. by asking “Is ‘girls’ singular?”.

5. *Elicitation* refers to techniques used by an interlocutor to directly elicit the correct form from the learner. This can be done by repeating part of the utterance, but pausing to allow the learner to complete the utterance correctly. It may also be done by asking questions to elicit correct forms, e.g. by asking “How do we say X in English?”. A final form of elicitation is directly asking the learner to try again.

6. In the case of *repetition*, the interlocutor repeats the erroneous utterance, adjusting the intonation so as to highlight the error.

In Lyster and Ranta’s study (1997), recasting was by a considerable margin the most widely used technique, being the preferred feedback move in 55% of the cases, while the remaining 45% were divided as follows: elicitation (14%), clarification requests (11%), metalinguistic feedback (8%), explicit correction (7%), and repetition of error (5%).

Similarly, Panova and Lyster’s study (2002) found that almost half (48%) of the student turns with error or use of L1 received corrective feedback. Recasting and translation of learner errors were the most frequent types of feedback, and recasts occurred in more than half of the feedback turns. Recasts and translation together accounted for 77% of the feedback moves, leaving only small percentages of other corrective techniques (clarification request, 11%; metalinguistic feedback, 5%; elicitation, 4%; explicit correction, 2%; repetition, 1%). It is worth noting that while translations were coded as recasts in Lyster and Ranta (1997), they were coded as a separate feedback category in Panova and Lyster (2002) due to the large number of translations observed. Studies by e.g. Oliver and Mackey (2003) and Sheen (2004) further confirm that recasts are the most common form of error correction used by language teachers.

3.4 Differential effects of different types of negative feedback

The above mentioned divergences when it comes to classifying types of negative feedback has also made the task of finding out which type of negative feedback is the most efficient in SLA a challenging one, since studies using different classifications and methods may not be easily compared. To illustrate this, a short description of two different approaches to

classifying and measuring differential effects of negative feedback is included below. Moreover, since we have seen that recasts are the most widely used feedback type in the classroom, it is the feedback type that attracts the most attention here. The interest in recasts is also connected to one of the research aims of this thesis. Then, the notion of uptake as an outcome measure of SLA acquisition is briefly accounted for, before looking at which feedback type is more likely to lead to uptake. Further, the Counterbalance Hypothesis is outlined, since it contains some interesting ideas about when different types of negative feedback are more effective. The principles of the hypothesis are also connected to my own study. Finally, some generalizations about differential effects will be made, with the aid of some of the more recent meta-analyses on the topic.

3.4.1 Prompts vs. recasts

Ammar & Spada's quasi-experimental study (2006) investigated the effects of recasts and prompts on 64 students of English as a second language in Canada. Prompts are described as feedback techniques that "[...] push learners to self-correct or peer-correct" (Ammar & Spada, 2006, p. 549). The techniques referred to as prompts in the study were elicitation, repetition and metalinguistic feedback. It should be noted that these techniques are quite different in nature, and the study did not investigate which of these techniques was the most effective. Clarification requests were not included because they may be mistaken for feedback on meaning, and also because Lyster and Ranta (1997) had found this to be the least successful negotiation-of-form technique in leading to learner repair (Ammar & Spada, 2006, p. 553). One of the groups received negative feedback in the form of recasts and the other in the form of prompts, while the control group did not receive any form of negative feedback. The third person possessive determiners *his* and *her* were the targeted structure. The study showed that the two groups receiving negative feedback achieved better results than the control group on the posttests, but those receiving prompts benefitted more from the negative feedback than those receiving recasts. In addition, the efficiency of recasts depended on the learners' proficiency. The learners with high proficiency benefitted equally from both prompts and recasts, but the low-proficiency learners benefitted more from prompts than recasts.

3.4.2 Implicit vs. explicit feedback

Ellis, Loewen & Erlam (2006) chose to divide the negative feedback types into either implicit or explicit feedback. “In the case of implicit feedback, there is no overt indicator that an error has been committed, whereas in explicit feedback types, there is” (Ellis et al., 2006, pp. 540-541). Recasts are generally regarded as implicit, whereas explicit correction or metalinguistic feedback is explicit. The targeted structure in this study was the regular past tense *-ed*, and results from various tests showed a significant advantage for explicit feedback.

The two examples above demonstrate how researchers have used different classifications of negative feedback with somewhat dissimilar foci, and tested different target structures. It is also worth noting that the research on negative feedback differs in other ways, e.g. when it comes to the type of study (laboratory/classroom, experimental/quasi-experimental etc.) the number of participants, age and proficiency of the learners, type of school, treatment activities and testing procedures².

3.4.3 Recasts

Since research shows that recasts are by far the most frequently used type of feedback in the classroom, the amount of research on the topic has been increasing rapidly. However, there are also other reasons why recasts have been given so much attention. For example, recasts have generally been viewed as an implicit type of negative feedback, and have thus often been studied when comparing the effects of implicit versus explicit feedback. Research has led to mixed results on whether or not recasts are beneficial to learners. Several studies have found positive evidence that recasts facilitate language learning (Ayoun, 2001; Braidı, 2002; Doughty & Varela, 1998; Han, 2002; Havranek, 2002; Iwashita, 2003; Leeman, 2003; Mackey & Philp, 1998; Oliver & Mackey, 2003). The studies above were only able to establish a positive effect on short-term learning, but Li’s meta-analysis (2010) discovered that the effects of implicit feedback did not fade or even increased over time.

Lyster and Ranta (1997) found that recasts are the least effective type of negative feedback, and, as seen above, the studies by Ellis et al. (2006) and Ammar & Spada (2006) point in the same direction. This is in accordance with most other research where two or more uses of

² A detailed overview of relevant studies on negative feedback and how they differ will not be given here. E.g. Ellis et al.’s table 1 (2006, pp. 344-346) offers an insight to other research on negative feedback and divergences in participants, target structure, design, tests and results.

negative feedback are compared. Meta-analyses by Norris & Ortega (2000) and Lyster & Saito (2010) show that the more explicit types of negative feedback tend to lead to larger gains. On the other hand, there have also been studies that have showed no significant difference between implicit feedback (in the form of recasts) and explicit feedback (Loewen & Erlam, 2006; Sauro, 2009).

As mentioned, recasts have generally been regarded as implicit, but as e.g. Nicholas et al. (2001), Ellis & Sheen (2006) and Ellis (2008) point out they can vary significantly in how implicit they actually are. “Arguably, recasts should not be viewed as necessarily implicit but rather, depending on the linguistic signals that encode them and the discursual context, as *more or less* implicit/explicit” (Ellis, 2008, p. 229). In much of the previous research, recasts have been treated as a homogenous entity. However, as Ellis & Sheen (2006) point out, recasts may differ both in form and function. Firstly, recasts are not always didactic; they can also serve communicative functions and negotiate meaning. In the example below it is likely that the interlocutor’s focus is on negotiating meaning rather than being strictly didactic³:

Example 1:

L: My granny is retarded. He plays a lot of golf.

I: Your grandfather is retired? He doesn’t work anymore?

L: Yeah, that’s right.

However, distinguishing recasts that negotiate meaning from those that negotiate form is often a difficult task. In addition, recasts may be used as a ‘conversational lubricant’ (Ortega, 2009, pp. 73-74), which means that a recast is used to keep the conversation going. The intent of the interlocutor may also be multifaceted, for example when the interlocutor’s intention is both to correct an error and to continue the conversation (Gass & Mackey, 2006, p. 12). In the examples below the interlocutor does provide a better rendition of the learner’s utterance, but the focus seems to be on the meaning and continuing the conversation rather than correcting the learner’s error. It may also be a way of clarifying what is being said.

³ All of the examples of negative feedback in this chapter are my own inventions.

Example 2:

L: This perfume has stink.

I: You think the perfume stinks? I think it smells rather good.

Example 3:

L: The people in the text is sad.

I: Yes, I think the people are sad too, but why?

In his research of negative feedback in immersion classrooms, Lyster (1998a) found that recasts are “[...] less successful at drawing learners’ attention to their non-target output – at least in content-based classrooms where recasts risk being perceived by young learners as alternative or identical forms” (p. 207). In a different publication the same year, Lyster expands on why he thinks the ambiguity of recasts is a problem:

Because ill-formed and well-formed sentences are equally likely to be followed by a variety of confirming and approving moves initiated by teachers, it remains difficult, if not impossible for young learners, with some degree of reliability, to (a) test hypotheses about the target language and (b) detect input-output mismatches with respect to form (Lyster, 1998b, p. 75).

This claim has been supported by Panova and Lyster (2002), who suggested that the reason why prompts led to more learning than recasts was that the learners failed to notice their own errors and were not sure about how to interpret recasts.

Even the recasts that are meant to be corrective may differ, both in explicitness and in terms of providing positive or negative evidence. All recasts provide positive evidence, but whether recasts provide negative evidence depends on the learner’s interpretation of their illocutionary force. In other words, recasts only provide negative evidence if the learner understands the interlocutor’s intention to correct. Doughty (2001) and Long (2007) are in support of recasts as the ideal negative feedback type exactly because of their implicitness. As recasts can provide both positive and negative evidence without interrupting the communicative flow,

learners can make cognitive comparisons between their incorrect utterances and the reformulations during meaningful discourse. On the other hand, if the learner is not aware that the recast is meant to be corrective, then the recast solely provides positive evidence.

So what are the deciding factors of how learners interpret recasts? The degree of explicitness is one important factor, and as we will see below, Loewen and Philp (2006) suggest that there are certain linguistic signals that indicate implicitness and others that indicate explicitness of recasts. The fact that recasts may vary significantly in explicitness is illustrated in the examples below. In example 1 and 2 the teacher uses recasts, but it is evident that the recast in example 1 is more explicit than in example 2. In example 2 the teacher starts with a show of approval before quickly moving on with the conversation. Even though example 1 and 3 are almost identical, only example 3 would be coded as explicit feedback in e.g. Lyster and Ranta's (1997) research, while example 1 and 2 would be treated as the same feedback type.

Example 4:

L: He come into the room.

T: He **came**.

L. He came into the room.

Example 5:

L: He come into the room.

T: Yes, he came into the room. What happened next?

Example 6:

L: He come into the room.

T: No, he **came**.

L: He came into the room.

Philp (2003) investigated which factors that facilitate learners' noticing of recasts in interactions between native-speakers and nonnative-speakers. The study showed that whether the learners noticed recasts were related to their proficiency. The learners with low proficiency were significantly less accurate when recalling recasts than the more proficient learners. In addition, shorter recasts were recalled with greater accuracy than longer ones. Another finding was that the number of changes within the recasts also affected the recall, which was less accurate for the learners when there were more than three changes. Philp (2003) also suggested other factors that may have encumbered the noticing of recasts: limited working memory, multiple corrections and complicated changes in the recast, new and unfamiliar input, processing biases of the learner, and grammatical forms that exceeded the learner's interlanguage grammar. Thus, to what extent learners notice recasts may be down to a selection of variables.

Some of the results of this study were followed up by Loewen and Philp (2006), who focused on the provision and effectiveness of recasts. The study was based on classroom observations in adult ESL classes in Auckland, New Zealand. A total of 12 classrooms were observed during 17 hours of meaning-based interaction, with 12 teachers and 118 student participants. The observations showed, as so many other studies have, that recasting was the preferred type of negative feedback. Almost 50% of the feedback consisted of recasts, followed by inform (providing information about the error) 37%, and elicitation (eliciting a response from the students) 14%. Furthermore, the researchers used posttests to determine whether the use of the different feedback types was beneficial to the learners.

Like the other feedback types, recasts were beneficial at least 50% of the time. However, the researchers found that there were specific characteristics regarding the recasts that determined

their degree of implicitness. These characteristics both affected whether the recasts led to successful uptake and the accuracy on the posttests. Factors like intonation, number of changes, stress and number of feedback moves were found to have an influence on the accuracy of the posttest scores. In addition, they found that the ambiguity of recasts was reduced by certain cues provided by teachers and that the degree of difference between the recast and the corrected utterance also had an impact on its effectiveness.

Ellis & Sheen (2006) point out that an important factor of how recasts are interpreted is connected to the learners' orientation to the interaction. If they act as learners, treating language as an object to be studied, they are more likely to acknowledge the corrective function of recasts. On the other hand, if they act as language users, treating language as a tool for communication, they are less likely to detect the negative evidence in recasts. A further theory in connection with the learner's orientation and the instructional context will be discussed in section 3.4.5.

3.4.4 Uptake

In addition to the debate regarding how beneficial recasts are for learning, there is also disagreement about the validity of using uptake as an outcome measure in SLA, as several studies have. Lyster and Ranta (1997, p. 49) refer to uptake as different types of student responses immediately following negative feedback. This includes responses with repair of the non-target items as well as utterances still in need of repair. Havranek (2002) claims that negative feedback is most likely to be successful if the learner is able to provide the correct form when alerted to the error. This implies that for it to be successful the learner must be ready for the correction in the development of his learner language. If the correction is provided by the teacher or a peer, the success rate is likely to increase if the learner repeats the correct version. Havranek's study (2002) shows that recasts without learner contribution are the least effective for all learners.

Learners who witness a correction as auditors profit more from it if they have time and opportunity to formulate a silent response similar to the one being corrected to match it with the correction. In the data, this condition corresponds to form-focused exercises rather than to more spontaneous utterances focusing on content (Havranek, 2002, pp. 268-269).

Recasts have been criticized both for being ambiguous and the fact that they are the negative feedback type least likely to lead to uptake. Long (2007) argues that foreign and second language teachers should not reject the use of recasts in their classrooms simply because they have been found to be ambiguous in some classroom settings. Furthermore, he points out that the immediate uptake of recasts cannot be equaled with L2 learning. Mackey and Philp (1998) share Long's view and argue that immediate uptake is not an appropriate outcome measure. The researchers found that intensive recasting had a positive facilitative effect on the development of morphosyntactic forms among advanced L2 learners. They were able to establish the positive effect of recasts on short-term L2 development despite the fact that recasts rarely elicited any type of modification or uptake immediately following the recast in their study. Even though recasts do not usually result in immediate uptake and repair, they concluded that "[...] the immediate response of the learner to recasts may not be a predictor of whether that learner will subsequently make use of the recast" (Mackey & Philp, 1998, p. 352). Instead they suggested that the content of the recast and the developmental level of the learner would be more accurate predictors of subsequent production of the TL form than immediate uptake. Thus, contrary to Havranek's (2002) view, uptake may be a signal that the learner is ready, but that does not mean that absence of uptake shows unreadiness.

As Panova and Lyster (2002) point out, recasts do not promote immediate learner repair, which, in the case of recasts, involves repetition. However, recasts that reduce the learner's utterance and add stress to emphasize the corrective modification are more effective at eliciting repetition of the recast and are more likely to be identified by learners as negative feedback. The feedback types clarification request, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition of error have a more positive correlation with learner uptake and immediate repair than recasts. Furthermore, in these cases the repair is generated by the learner.

What is the distribution of uptake following different types of corrective feedback? According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), the feedback types least likely to lead to uptake were recasts, which resulted in uptake 31% of the time, followed by explicit correction, which led to uptake 50% of the time. Elicitations led to 100% of uptake from the learners. Clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, and repetition also led to uptake in most cases, with 88%, 86%, and 78%, respectively.

Oliver and Mackey (2003) and Sheen (2004) found that the discourse context of the foreign language classroom plays an important role in whether or not a recast results in the learner's uptake of the correction. Oliver and Mackey (2003) found that in explicit language-focused contexts, learners demonstrated uptake of 85% of recasts. Sheen (2004) claimed that the instructional setting is also a factor that contributes to whether or not recasts result in learner uptake. The rates for uptake and repair were greater in some contexts than others. For example, she found that learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in Korea and English as a Second Language (ESL) in New Zealand demonstrated greater uptake of recasts than French immersion and ESL learners in Canada, even though all four settings ascribed to communicative approaches. These findings may be connected to the Counterbalance Hypotheses, accounted for below.

3.4.5 The Counterbalance Hypothesis

The researchers in the previous paragraph pointed out the importance of the role of the instructional context in which the correction takes place. Even though research has taken place in ESL or EFL classrooms, factors like the instructional emphasis or culture, and the distance between a student's mother tongue and the target language may have an impact on how students respond to negative feedback. Lyster and Mori (2006) conducted a comparative analysis of teacher—student interaction in two different instructional settings: French immersion classrooms in Quebec, Canada and Japanese immersion classrooms in the United States. The study examined recasts, prompts, and explicit feedback, and the goal was to determine whether learner uptake and repair patterns differ with regards to their instructional settings. They found, not surprisingly, that recasts were the most common type of negative feedback used in both settings, followed by prompts and explicit feedback.

However, when they observed how the students responded to the recasts, the differences between the two settings were significant. In the Canadian French immersion classrooms, uptake and repair following recasts was rare (38%), while being considerably more frequent following prompts (53%). These findings are in line with most other research on negative feedback and uptake as accounted for above. In contrast, the pattern was reversed in the Japanese immersion classrooms, where uptake following recasts (68%) was much more likely than after prompts (23%).

Lyster and Mori pointed out that the two instructional settings differed in emphasis on accurate oral production and repetition, which was more prominent in the Japanese immersion classroom. Another differing factor was the distance of the students' first and second languages, where French and English are more similar than Japanese and English. In addition, French was a second language for the students in the Canadian immersion classroom, and the second language was available outside the classroom. Japanese was a foreign language for the students in the US. To account for the differences, Lyster and Mori proposed the Counterbalance Hypothesis (2006, p. 294):

Instructional activities and interactional feedback that act as a counterbalance to the predominant communicative orientation of a given classroom setting will be more facilitative of interlanguage restructuring than instructional activities and interactional feedback that are congruent with the predominant communicative orientation.

In other words, in contexts where accuracy and learning the language as an object is the dominant classroom culture, implicit negative feedback may be more effective, since the shift from form to meaning adds saliency and allows for noticing and awareness to occur. In section 2.3 the importance of attention and noticing was mentioned, and as we see it is an important part of the Interaction Hypothesis as well. Correspondingly, in contexts where the classroom culture is more oriented towards meaning and content, more explicit types of feedback are more effective since the attention is then shifted from meaning to form. Following Lyster and Mori's hypothesis, the instructional setting and discourse context of the classroom will be decisive when it comes to which type of negative feedback teachers should use.

3.4.6 Generalizations

The considerable differences in the research methods on negative feedback make generalizing the findings problematic. Nevertheless, the majority of studies have concluded with an advantage of explicit over implicit negative feedback. In recent years meta-analyses have emerged. These studies collect and evaluate "[...] available evidence offered by results from all primary studies addressing a common research problem" (Norris & Ortega, 2000, p. 423). A relatively recent meta-analysis was conducted by Lyster and Saito (2010), investigating 15 quasi-experimental negative feedback studies involving student—teacher interaction in classroom settings. A brief review of their results follows.

All three feedback types (recasts, prompts, and explicit correction) proved to be much more effective than no use of negative feedback. However whereas all types of negative feedback were positive influences on the learners' interlanguage development, prompts were more effective than recasts. The researchers claim that "[...] CF in classroom settings may be more effective when its delivery is more pedagogically oriented (i.e., prompts) than conversationally oriented (i.e., recasts)" (Lyster & Saito, 2010, p. 290). Furthermore, the effects of explicit correction could not be distinguished from the effects of recasts and those of prompts. The researchers attribute this to the fact that explicit correction both conveys positive evidence, as similar to recasts, and negative evidence, as similar to prompts. Thus, the types of linguistic evidence in explicit correction overlap with recasts and prompts.

Lyster and Saito (2010) point out that their findings do not coincide with Mackey and Goo's meta-analysis (2007), which showed much larger effects for recasts. They attribute the differences to Mackey and Goo including both classroom and laboratory studies, inferring that recasts will prove more effective in laboratory settings.

Even though Lyster and Saito (2010) were unable to distinguish explicit correction from the other types of feedback, it is important to distinguish between explicit correction as a type of feedback and explicit feedback in general. Prompts are also regarded as a type of explicit feedback, since they convey negative evidence by indicating that the learner's utterance is incorrect. However, as discussed in section 3.4.3, recasts may also differ considerably in degree of explicitness.

3.5 Learners' and teachers' perceptions of negative feedback

There are two approaches to investigating perceptions of negative feedback. One way is to examine whether students perceive the negative feedback provided in the classroom as error correction, and for example whether teachers perceive their own use of recasts as a means of error correction or more as a conversational lubricant. The other approach is to examine people's views and opinions regarding negative feedback in general. Negative feedback may be investigated from the students' point of view to shed light on their views and opinions on receiving negative feedback. It may also be investigated from the teachers' point of view to shed light on their views and opinions regarding the provision of negative feedback.

As one of the main goals of this study is to investigate both students' and teachers' views on negative feedback, the latter approach is the main focus of this study. However, the former approach also plays an important role in trying to determine the best practices regarding negative feedback. As mentioned in section 3.4.3, a problem with recasts is that they may be ambiguous, with the student not perceiving the teacher's intention behind the recast. This becomes evident in studies exploring learners' response to negative feedback. Therefore, we start by shedding some light on issues and research regarding the former approach before turning our attention to the latter.

3.5.1 The illocutionary force of negative feedback

Roberts (1995) examined the ability of students in a Japanese L2 class to notice error correction, and found that the learners were largely unaware of the negative feedback provided by the teacher. Of 92 instances of error correction, the students could only identify 35% of them, and only understood 21%. Similarly, Slimani's study (1992) showed that students failed to claim 36% of the language items that were focused on in class. The majority of the items were focused on as error correction, where the teachers used recasts without any use of metalanguage or involvement from students. Again it seems that using recasts as error correction is not the best way to facilitate learner noticing. This is also supported by Panova and Lyster (2002) concluding that "[l]earners claim to notice forms that they are pushed to self-repair more than forms that are implicitly provided by teachers" (pp. 577-578).

A problem in negative feedback research is that there is no easy way to ascertain either the teacher's illocutionary force when providing negative feedback, or whether or not the students understand the teacher's intention. Mackey et al. (2007) attempted to solve this problem by using a stimulated recall method, where both teacher and students were shown video clips of instances of negative feedback that had occurred in the classroom, and provided comments about their intentions and perceptions. However, Ellis and Sheen (2006, p. 582) are critical towards this method, claiming that establishing intentionality in retrospect is not a reliable method.

As Russel (2009) points out, there is a lack of research regarding the dynamic between students and teachers, and how it may affect the interactional patterns in the classroom. She especially calls for more research on the learners' perceptions of their teachers' intent when providing negative feedback, and suggests that paralinguistic cues as well as the teacher's

tone and demeanor may have an effect on the perception of error correction. This is, however, an area that needs to be investigated further.

3.5.2 General perceptions about oral negative feedback

We turn to another area that may not have received the attention it deserves. Although there have been some research on students' and teachers' beliefs about language learning in general (Bell, 2005; Horwitz, 1988), a limited number of studies have investigated the students' views on receiving negative feedback in the classroom. Schulz (2001) points out some early studies by Cathcart and Olsen (1976), and Cohen and Robbins (1976). These studies found that the students are generally in favor of negative feedback in their language learning. Cathcart and Olsen's study (1976) showed that the students desired more error correction than the teachers generally felt was necessary. Similarly, Cohen & Robbins's study (1976) showed that the learners in the classroom generally expect that their errors will be corrected.

Chaudron (1988, p. 133) states that students "[...] derive information about their behavior from the teacher's reaction, or lack of one, to their behavior", while Horner (1988) asserts that lack of correction may lead to confusion among the other students, and that they should receive confirmation of their suspicions when they sense that an error has occurred.

Lyster (1998a) found that teachers in French immersion classrooms preferred to use negotiation of form (i.e. elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests or repetition) to correct lexical errors. When correcting phonological and grammatical errors, recasts was the preferred feedback type. The study also revealed a generally low tolerance among teachers for lexical and phonological errors. Grammatical errors were not corrected that often, but when it happened, recasts were used more often than other feedback types.

3.5.3 Schulz's study

One of relatively few studies on how teachers and students differ in perceptions about negative feedback was conducted by Schulz (2001). She investigated the divergences in teacher and students beliefs when it comes to oral negative feedback, and also whether there are any cross-cultural differences between teachers and students in Colombia and the USA⁴.

⁴ The study also investigates perceptions about grammar instruction and written negative feedback, but this will not be elaborated on here.

In a previous study (Schulz, 1996), the beliefs of U.S. post-secondary foreign language (FL) students and teachers were examined. A multiple choice questionnaire was distributed to 824 American FL students of various languages (German, Arabic, Chinese, French, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish) and 213 FL teachers. Her 2001 study used a replication of the same questionnaire, but to 607 Colombian FL students and 122 Colombian FL teachers.

The study yielded some interesting findings about the perceptions of teachers versus those of students. In short, Schulz found that American and Colombian perceptions about oral negative feedback were largely similar, with students from both cultures expressing that their teachers should correct their errors. Respectively, 94% of American students and 95% of Colombian students expressed a desire for correction of oral language errors. In addition, only 4% of both the U.S. and Colombian students expressed that they disliked having their oral errors corrected during class. However, there were minor discrepancies regarding who should do the correcting, with 61% of U.S. students and 54% of Colombian students preferring teacher correction to peer correction. One significant discrepancy became evident when the two groups responded to whether they learned from the correction of peers. 90% of the Colombians vs. 70% of the Americans indicated that they learned a lot from it.

Regarding teachers' perceptions, the U.S. and Colombian teachers were also similar in their views on oral language correction. A total of 48% of the teachers from both countries disagreed with the statement that teachers should not correct students when they make errors in class, and on the other statements the discrepancy was relatively small. The biggest difference was regarding the importance of correcting language errors in class, in which 39% of the Colombian teachers vs. 30% of the U.S. teachers agreed that in general students' errors should be corrected.

However, while the discrepancies between students from the USA and Colombia and between teachers from the two countries were relatively small, the differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about oral negative feedback were substantial. The discrepancy rates between American students and teachers and Colombian students and teachers were largely similar, so as to avoid too many numbers only the U.S. students and teachers discrepancy rates will be presented here.

- 4 % of the students indicated a dislike towards being corrected in class, whereas 22% of the teachers thought that students disliked being corrected in class, thus yielding a discrepancy rate of 18%.
- 2% vs. 33% agreed that teachers should not correct students when they made errors in class.
- 90% of the students vs. 30% of the teachers agreed that students should be corrected when they make oral errors.

Thus, in all three cases where teachers and students were asked to reflect on statements regarding oral error corrections the discrepancy rates are large, ranging from 18% to 60%. The implications of these discrepancies will be discussed when comparing my own research to Schulz's in chapter 6.1.

3.5.4 Lasagabaster and Sierra's study

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) also conducted a study which investigated teachers' and students' perceptions about oral negative feedback, however in a different manner than Schulz (1996, 2001). In this study, eleven undergraduate students and ten teachers of English as a foreign language watched video clips of classroom interaction between teachers and students. The participants were asked to detect when the teacher corrected students, in addition to classifying the feedback types, judge their efficiency and voice their opinions both individually and in groups. Out of the 12 negative feedback moves that were shown, the teachers only detected 48%, and the students detected 28%.

The low percentage of negative feedback moves detected by both teachers and students is interesting, as are their thoughts on what is useful error correction. On one hand, the students deemed constant correction unhelpful, since it would inhibit language production.

Nevertheless, they would like to be corrected, but with teachers focusing explicitly on a smaller number of errors. In addition, the students felt that the teachers should spend more time on each correction, using more strategies and resources in their correction of errors. The teachers feared that too much correction could lead to language anxiety among students, also expressing that correcting every error is neither practical nor beneficial. Instead they emphasized the importance of achieving a balance between priority of correction based on the severity of the error committed and the importance of allowing students time to talk.

Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005) argue that “[...] the exploration of students’ opinions constitutes an essential source of information to improve the process of learning in general and correction strategies in particular” (p. 125). This does not mean that the students are always right, but that it is useful for the teachers to understand the learners’ perceptions. They conclude that the greatest challenge for teachers is to provide learners with corrections that they both notice and understand, thus implying a need for more explicit and direct error correction.

3.6 Summary

This chapter has given an insight to research on various aspects of negative feedback. Researchers still disagree when it comes to the extent to which negative feedback should be given, which types of feedback are more effective, the importance of uptake, and how to classify and measure their effects. However, some conclusions may be drawn. Perhaps most importantly, there is a great amount of research showing that providing negative feedback in some form or another is more effective for acquisition than not providing any negative feedback. Furthermore, classroom research shows that negative feedback is generally provided in ESL/EFL classrooms, although the extent of errors responded to differs. Thirdly, study after study shows that teachers have a preference for using recasts. Recasts are now viewed as considerably more diverse in their degree of explicitness compared to earlier research. With recent studies suggesting that the degree of explicitness in connection with the instructional context determines the facilitative effects of negative feedback, recasts should not simply be dismissed as being implicit.

Regarding uptake, we have seen that several researchers contest the method of using the degree of uptake as a measure of acquisition. Loewen and Philp (2006) found a relationship between successful uptake and subsequent test performance for other feedback types than recasts, which suggests that a low rate of uptake following recasts does not have to mean that recasts are less facilitative for acquisition than other feedback types.

Finally, research on learners’ and teachers’ perceptions about negative feedback has been presented. Much emphasis has been put on Schulz’s study (2001), not only because the study will be replicated here, but also because there is very limited research on the topic in general.

The reason for including this chapter is both to sum up what has been found out about negative feedback so far, and of course also to connect the various findings with my own research. I will shed light on how I will do this when presenting my research questions in the next chapter.

4 Research questions

As research and hypotheses that form a foundation for my own study have been accounted for, it is time to present the research questions. We have seen that research on perceptions about negative feedback is limited. However, the findings indicate that there are divergences between students and teachers, and that these divergences are likely to have an impact on language acquisition. As mentioned in the introduction chapter, teachers' and students' views and feelings about negative feedback will affect its effectiveness. In addition, we cannot assume that Norwegian teachers' and students' have the same opinions and reactions as those from other countries. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate Norwegian teachers' and students' perceptions about oral negative feedback, and whether there are major discrepancies between teachers' and students' perceptions.

Schulz (2001) compares American and Columbian students' and teacher's perceptions about error correction. This study will replicate Schulz's research on oral error correction in an effort to compare Norwegian students' and teachers' perceptions with those from the US and Columbia. Possible reasons and implications for the divergences between cultures will also be discussed.

English teaching in Norway is very communication oriented, both because of the pedagogical perspective, but also because Norwegian upper secondary students are relatively proficient in English compared with many English students from other cultures. On these grounds I hypothesize that many oral errors in the classroom are ignored, and that much of the negative feedback that is given is implicit (using relatively implicit recasts), thus not in line with Lyster and Mori's Counterbalance Hypothesis (2006).

In the previous chapter, we have seen that classroom research generally shows that recasts are the most frequently used type of negative feedback, and researchers have tended to view this feedback type as implicit. However, newer research (Ellis, 2008; Ellis & Sheen, 2006; Loewen & Philp, 2006) suggests that recasts vary to a large degree in explicitness. This study will adopt Loewen and Philp's (2006) recast characteristics to shed light on the explicitness of the negative feedback provided in Norwegian classrooms.

It is important to investigate what the reality of negative feedback is in Norwegian schools, as effects of and practices regarding negative feedback in countries with different language proficiencies, education cultures, and curricula may differ considerably from the Norwegian classroom. This study contributes to gathering knowledge about perceptions and practices in Norwegian schools, which is vital in order to give further suggestions for teaching practices and teacher education.

The research questions are as follows:

1. What are Norwegian students' and teachers' perceptions regarding correction of oral English errors in the classroom?
2. To what extent do Norwegian students' and teachers' perceptions about negative feedback differ from those of students and teachers in other cultures?
3. To what extent does the English teaching in Norwegian schools correspond with the principles of the Counterbalance Hypothesis?
4. What is the degree of explicitness of the negative feedback provided in Norwegian schools, and how do the general practices regarding negative feedback correspond with previous research on the topic?

5 Methods

In this chapter the methods used in my study will be accounted for. First, I will shed light on the rationale behind using three different methods in my research. Then these methods – questionnaires, observations and interviews – will be described in more detail, along with a presentation of the participants and the various data collection procedures.

The questionnaire study makes up the basis of this thesis, and is arguably the most important and comprehensive part of the research. However, the type of questionnaire used in this study has its limitations when it comes to exploring certain issues more in depth. As Sealey (2010) and Dörniy (2008) state, each research method has its limitations and disadvantages.

Whereas questionnaires are useful for collecting large amounts of information about the respondents efficiently, Dörniy (2008, pp. 10-14) mentions possible problem sources using this type of quantitative research: the simplicity and superficiality of answers, unreliable and unmotivated respondents, the lack of opportunity to correct the respondents' mistakes, social desirability bias, self-deception, acquiescence bias, the halo effect, and effects of fatigue. All of these problem areas may to various extents have influenced the outcome of the questionnaires used in the study. However, fatigue and motivation problems should not be major problems in this case, since the questionnaire is quite short and participation is voluntary.

One way of mitigating some of the problems is by using triangulation, where more than one method is used, and the different types of data can be compared or used to add more saliency to the research. This is supported by Cohen et al, who claim that triangulation of methods increases the validity of any research (2004, p. 195). Even though triangulation may be time-consuming, it provides the researcher with a more in-depth understanding of the topic. For the purpose of this study, the use of three different methods will not only contribute to investigating various topics within the field of error correction. The different approaches will also help examining different sides of the same topic, thus providing a more thorough insight than one approach would offer alone. As perceptions are not easily observed, it is useful to use questionnaires to get some insight to students' and teachers' views and opinions. In addition, practices may not be reported accurately in questionnaires or interviews, so therefore observation is used. This will also give the researcher the opportunity to compare whether there is congruence between what participants claim that they do and what they actually do.

5.1 The questionnaire study

One of the main goals of this thesis is to shed light on Norwegian teachers' and students' perceptions about oral negative feedback. We have seen that Schulz (1996, 2001) is one of the relatively few researchers who have focused on the topic. In order to be able to compare perceptions about negative feedback across different cultures, my questionnaire is a partial replication of Schulz's. As Abbuhl (2011, p. 297) states, replication studies are essential in order to have greater confidence that the results of the original study were not due to chance or sampling error. In addition, this replication will help evaluate the external validity of the findings in Schulz's study. In other words, it will evaluate whether the findings can be generalized to a wider population (*ibid.*). As mentioned, the type of replication used here is *partial*, as a different population in a different setting than in the original study is investigated. Below the questionnaire study is presented, and some important divergences between my own and Schulz's questionnaire are accounted for.

5.1.1 Participants

The focus group in my study consists of teachers and students of English in Norwegian schools at upper secondary level. The main reason for choosing this education level is that even though there are major differences in aptitude, most students of English at this level will have gained enough language proficiency to be able to express themselves orally in the TL, although not without committing language errors. Focusing on teachers and students of English at university level would be another option, but the education on this level is less likely to have much 'traditional' language teaching, instead using lectures and more student-driven education. Also, at this level I suspect that there is generally very little focus on correcting students' errors. Nevertheless, it might have been interesting to study an English year course class at university level to examine if these assumptions are true. Another option would be to focus on lower secondary classes, but students at that level may not have developed the same maturity level when it comes to expressing their opinions and perceptions about language learning. Ultimately, all these levels of English education in Norway would have been interesting to investigate, but for the scope of this study choosing all three education levels would not be feasible. The fact that I have worked, and will return to working as a teacher in upper secondary education also contributes to my interest in conducting research on this educational level.

In order to ensure geographical diversity, two schools from each of the 19 counties in Norway were asked to participate, but apart from that, the sampling of schools was done randomly. The schools were asked to respond to my e-mail if they did not want to participate, so that another school in the county could be chosen instead. Most of the schools who did not want to participate responded, but in a few cases no response was given. Thus, by the time the questionnaires were closed down for analysis, schools from four counties had still not responded. Nevertheless, schools from 15 out of the 19 counties in Norway did respond to the questionnaires, ensuring a satisfactory geographical variation among the participants.

The teachers in my study were 33 ESL instructors⁵ from 15 different counties. The majority of the participants were female (59%), and their ages ranged from 26 to 67 with an average age of 44. Their teaching experience varied from 2 to 35 years, with an average of 17 years. All of the participants were educated within pedagogy and English, but their education varied from a 1 year of higher education in English to a Master's degree.

Altogether, 151 students from 11 different counties⁶ answered the students' questionnaire. 61.5% of the participants were in their first year at upper secondary school, 18.5 % were in their second year, while 20.5% were in their last year. The majority of the participants (70.2%) were students in the general studies program, while the remaining participants were enrolled in various vocational studies (29.8%).

Participation in the questionnaire study was voluntary, both for teachers and students. One could suspect that the students that decided to participate in the study might be more motivated, or like English more as a subject. This could possibly make them more positive to error correction than the average student. However, it was noticeable that many of the teachers have decided to let the students answer the questionnaire during the lessons, as larger amounts of student responses had been recorded within a few minutes. Thus, the students' participation may not have been entirely voluntary after all.

⁵ Due to unfortunate technical problems, 8 of the teacher participant's answers from statement 2 and onward have disappeared. Thus, only 25 answers have been recorded for statement 2 – 11.

⁶ As with the teacher questionnaire, 8 participant's answers are missing from statement 2 and onwards. Thus, only 143 answers have been recorded for statements 2 – 8.

5.1.2 Data collection instruments and procedure

As this is a partial replication of Schulz's study, the same types of questionnaires were made: multiple-choice-type questionnaires with closed-ended questions. Such items provide the respondents with ready-made options to choose from, and they are not required to produce any free writing themselves. According to Dörnyei (2008), the biggest advantage of this method is that their coding and tabulation "[...] leaves no room for rater subjectivity" (p. 35). Additionally, the questionnaires were organized in a 5-point Likert scale, with the same values as Schulz used. However, as done by Schulz in her studies, the data has been simplified by collapsing the scale into a 3-point scale when discussing the results (agree, undecided, disagree). Cases where there is a notable divergence between e.g. agree slightly and agree strongly are mentioned in the discussion.

The questionnaires were made using Google Docs, and distributed to the schools via e-mail. The teachers and students answered the questionnaire anonymously, and they were only asked to state which county they lived in, not the name of their school. This was also made clear to the schools and participants in the questionnaires, so that they would not be afraid of their answers being traceable back to them in any way. However, this also means that the number of teachers and students from each school and class is unknown.

Dörnyei (2008) stresses the importance of pilot-testing questionnaires. Thus, a pilot test was carried out on beforehand. This was done to ensure that there were no technical problems with the administration of the questionnaire and the scoring and processing of the answers, and also to uncover potential misinterpretations or other pitfalls concerning the content of the questionnaire. At the end of the questionnaire, there was a text box with room for comments from the participants. The pilot test was conducted in an upper secondary school, where four teachers and twelve students answered the respective questionnaires. A technical error was discovered as a result of the pilot test: the participants were able to tick off several alternatives, thus being able to agree and disagree with the same statement. Subsequently, this was corrected before distributing the questionnaires to the participants in the study. No other errors or problems were found or commented upon during the pilot testing.

5.1.3 Replication divergences

Even though the questionnaires used in this study closely resemble the ones used by Schulz (1996, 2001), a few significant divergences between Schulz's and this study should be addressed. Some of these divergences may contribute to explaining the differences in perceptions between the participants from Norway and the participants from the other countries.

Firstly, the participants in Schulz's studies are not directly comparable with those in my study. One reason for this is that her participants were either students or worked as educators at a post-secondary level, while my study focuses on teachers and students at upper secondary schools. Thus, the student participants differ in age. Another important divergence is that while my study focuses on teachers and students of English only, Schulz's study included teachers and students of a number of different foreign languages.

Moreover, many of the students in Schulz's 1996 study were taking language courses at elementary level (Schulz, 1996, p. 350). This means that there will be large differences in aptitude between the Norwegian students who have been learning English from an early age, and the students who are at beginner's level when learning a foreign language. It should also be noted that while Schulz's questionnaires had a broader emphasis, focusing on the role of grammar instruction, written negative feedback and oral negative feedback, the focus in my questionnaire was solely on the latter. Thus, only the statements regarding oral negative feedback were replicated in my study.

In addition, I included some statements of my own in an effort to shed some light on the teachers' preferred negative feedback methods and their views on uptake. Whereas Schulz omitted making statements for the teachers for statement 5 and 6 (see chapter 5.1), I chose to make similar statements for the teachers. The rest of the statements (7-9) are my own. Statements 7 and 8 are made for both students and teachers, while statement 9 is for teachers only. The rationale behind including 7 and 8 was to have the students and teacher indicate whether they had a preference for receiving (students) and giving (teachers) implicit or explicit feedback. Statement 9 was made for the teachers to investigate their perceptions on uptake following negative feedback.

Moreover, it should be noted that there are some important and some minor divergences between the students' questionnaire and the teachers' questionnaire, but this will be addressed

when the results are presented in chapter 6.1. As an important aspect of the questionnaire is to compare the results to Schulz's, I have chosen not to change the wordings of any of the statements. This could have helped reducing some of the divergences between the teachers' and students' questionnaire, but at the same time it would make comparisons with Schulz's findings less reliable.

Although there are important divergences between the studies, this also makes the findings interesting as we get the chance to compare different education cultures. As will become evident when the results have been reviewed and discussed, the cultural differences that are found highlight the importance of conducting research in cultures with more relevance to our own context in terms of classroom culture. Research that has been carried out in other educational cultures may not be transferable to Norwegian schools. Another reason for replicating Schulz is that to my knowledge there are not any other studies with the same emphasis that uses more comparable participants from similar cultures. As mentioned, this is an area that needs more research, not just in Norway, but in various other cultures as well.

5.2 Classroom observations

There are several reasons why I have chosen to conduct classroom observations. Firstly, it will help to shed light on the extent to which language errors are responded to in the classroom, which is one of the aims of the study. Secondly, by observing English lessons I will be able to account for both the content of the lessons and the nature of the negative feedback provided. Thus, it will be possible to make some generalizations regarding whether the principles of the Counterbalance Hypothesis (Lyster & Mori, 2006) are followed, and the explicitness and effects of the recasts provided. Thirdly, the classroom observations will function as a foundation for the teacher interviews, where some of the questions will be directly related to what was observed during the lessons.

According to Cohen et al., the strength of observation as a research method is the researcher's immediate awareness to the situation (2004, p. 456). The researcher can see with his or her own eyes what happens in a situation, without relying on second-hand accounts. While this is a positive aspect, researchers must be aware of their own bias and ensure that they do not see only what they would like to see, or read things into the events that take place.

During a teacher interview, a teacher might claim that she or he for example always uses explicit correction in the classroom. With the use of classroom observation, the researcher can see whether this is the case or not. Some teachers might either believe that they do something, or they might even try to answer according to what they think they ought to do, but when they are observed it may turn out that they actually do something else. This is one of the strengths of observation and makes interviews and observation a good combination.

5.2.1 Participants

The classroom observations were conducted in two upper secondary schools in different parts of Norway, with one English teacher from each school. One of the schools offered both general studies and vocational study programs, while the other school offered vocational study programs only. In total, nine school lessons were observed in five different classes. Each lesson lasted 45 minutes, and three of the classes had combined lessons lasting 90 minutes. Classes from the following study programs were observed: Healthcare, Childhood and Youth Development (2 lessons); General Studies (1 lesson); Technical and Industrial Production (one class from each school, 2 lessons each); and Electricity and Electronics (2 lessons). Four of the classes were observed in the combined upper secondary school, while the two other classes were observed in the vocational school. The students in the Electricity and Electronics class were in their second year at upper secondary education, while the other students were in their first year. As will be described in more detail when accounting for the teacher interviews, the two teachers differed considerably in age, educational background and vocational experience. They also differed in gender.

5.2.2 Observation procedure

The classroom observations were descriptive and non-interventionist, meaning that there were no attempts to change or manipulate what was happening in the classroom from the researcher. The strength of such studies is that they provide an authentic representation of what is occurring in the classroom (Loewen & Philp, 2012, p. 58). However, in order to make sure that there would be some oral interaction in the classes, I asked the teacher on beforehand whether there would be any oral activity during the lessons I planned to observe. It should be noted that the teachers always mentioned that they planned to have some class discussion or other oral interaction, so it was not necessary to postpone any observation lessons. Apart from

that, neither the teachers nor the students knew anything about the focus of my observations. This was important in order to maintain as authentic lessons as possible. If the participants knew what I was there to observe, chances are that they would behave in a different manner than they normally would.

At the beginning of each lesson, I presented myself and informed the students that I was there to observe as part of my Master's degree. They were also informed that they would remain anonymous, and that the lesson would be recorded on tape. There were never any questions or comments regarding the observation. I then found a seat in the back of the classroom, and the students generally did not seem to pay much attention to me nor to the fact that the lesson was recorded. The small, wireless recorder was put on the teacher's desk, and the recordings were always loud and clear except during pair - or group work. These sessions were short, and no instances of student-teacher interaction were missed. Even though I noted down what happened during the lessons in addition to plotting in the instances of language errors and error correction, it was very useful to have recorded the lessons. This enabled me to listen through the lessons again to make sure I had not missed anything. In addition, it helped with coding the instances of error correction with more accuracy. Finally, as will be discussed in the interview chapter, I used the recordings to play short audio clips from the observations to one of the teachers during the interviews.

5.2.3 Coding

When it comes to the coding of feedback, we have seen examples of different approaches in earlier research. Whereas Lyster and Ranta (1997) divide negative feedback into six different types, much of the newer research has narrowed down the selection into recasts, explicit correction and prompts (see e.g. Lyster & Saito, 2010). The main difference here is that prompts cover four of Lyster and Ranta's feedback types, namely elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, and repetition. The common feature for prompts is that the correct form is not given, but instead clues are provided to prompt the students to come up with the correct form. Since the focus of the observation is first and foremost on the nature of recasts, I did not find it necessary to divide prompts into further subcategories. Indeed, as the results from the observations will show, prompts were actually not used in these classes at all.

However, there is one more feedback type to account for. *Translations*, where the learner's use of the L1 is being translated by the teacher in the TL, have been treated differently by

researchers. We have seen that Lyster and Ranta (1997) found few instances of translation in their research, and subsequently coded them as recasts, whereas Panova and Lyster (2002) chose to code translations as a separate category. They point out that there is “[...] a relevant difference between a recast (a response to an ill-formed utterance in the L2) and a translation (a response to a well-formed utterance in the L1)” (p. 583).

In the classes observed in this study, several students used their L1 consistently when speaking in the classroom. To code all of these instances as errors would be the same as assuming that each time the student used the L1 it was because the student was unable to convey his or her message in English. This may of course be the case in some instances, but there are a few other possible reasons as well. For example, it could be down to an unwillingness to speak English (which may again be down to different reasons), forgetfulness or laziness. Thus, it is not possible to determine the students’ reasons for using the L1, and the instances where use of L1 have not been corrected have therefore not been coded as errors. Consequently, even though the instances where the teacher has translated students’ utterances are included in the appendix, the use of translations will not be included in the tables showing the percentage of errors responded to or the types of negative feedback used.

As mentioned, the nature and explicitness of recasts may vary to a large degree. Ellis and Sheen describe recasts as “chameleonlike” (2006, p. 579) because of their various features. Therefore, coding all reformulations of an incorrect utterance simply as recasts will not tell us the whole truth about how negative feedback is provided. This also suggests that much of the earlier research on the acquisitional effects of recasts may have its shortcomings. Loewen and Philp (2006) stress the variation in salience and implicitness of recasts, and suggest certain features that can affect the degree of explicitness. These features have been adopted in my own coding of recasts, and will thus be accounted for below.

Prosodic emphasis refers to whether the teacher provides any cues in terms of giving atypical stress to the linguistic item that is recast. This could for example be a particular word or morpheme that was erroneous in the learner’s utterance, and the stress may be added through pitch, emphasis or deliberate pausing. In the coding scheme the prosodic emphasis is coded as either stressed or unstressed. If prosodic emphasis is given, the recast will be more explicit than if it is not given.

The *length of the recast* and the *number of changes* are two features that impact the relationship of the recast to the original utterance. As mentioned in the research chapter, Philp (2003) found that the length of the recast has an effect on whether the learner will notice the correction. Shorter recasts of fewer than five morphemes were recalled with greater accuracy than longer ones. The same applies to the number of changes in the recast, where few changes to the learner's utterance are more likely to lead to noticing. In the coding scheme the length of the recasts has thus been divided into five or more morphemes and fewer than five morphemes, whereas the number of changes has been divided into either one change or two or more changes.

Segmentation of a recast means that only the problematic form of the learner's utterance is recast instead of the whole utterance, thus pinpointing the problem for the learner. This is not to be confused with the previously mentioned short recasts, since they are not always segmented. The coding for this feature is divided into either segmented or whole.

The teacher's *intonation* when providing a recast may also have an impact on the degree of explicitness. The potential ambiguity of recasts has been accounted for earlier. This often happens if the intonation is interrogative, since it then can be perceived as a confirmation check rather than as a correction. On the other hand, if the recast is given with a declarative intonation, it is less ambiguous and thus arguably more explicit.

While the other features have an impact on explicitness and saliency, the *linguistic focus* of the negative feedback provided is interesting because it tells us what types of language errors that are responded to. In addition, it may tell us whether a particular type of language error tends to receive the same type of negative feedback. The linguistic focus is coded into four different categories. Where the student has chosen the wrong word for the stylistic context, the error is coded as *lexical*. In Lyster's words (1998a), lexical errors are "[...] inaccurate, imprecise, or inappropriate choices of lexical items in open classes—namely, nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives" (p. 195). In addition, "nontarget derivations of nouns, verbs, adverbs and adjectives, involving incorrect use of prefixes and suffixes" (Lyster, 1998a, p. 196) will be coded as lexical errors. The following is an example of a lexical error observed in the study: "I buy it at the store, the daily store" (meaning grocery store).

Phonological errors are obviously connected to the learner's pronunciation. However, the definition of what may be viewed as such an error is not as straightforward as e.g. the lexical

errors. For the purpose of this study, pronunciation that clearly differs from the TL has been coded as phonological errors. If for example sounds have been added to or omitted from a word, it is a phonological error. Another type of phonological error may be using a phonetic accent or stress at the wrong syllable in a word. However, a nonnative accent does not qualify as an error in this study. An example from the observations follows: /'appriʃeit/ (appreciate). In this example, the stress is put on the wrong syllable, and a phoneme is omitted.

Morphological and *syntactic* errors are put in the same category for the purpose of this study. All types of grammatical errors are included here: grammatical gender, tense, subject/verb agreement, determiners, prepositions, pronouns, word order etc. In the following example from the observations the wrong preposition is used: “The planes crashed on the Twin Towers”.

Combination is the last category, and is used for turns where more than one type of error is committed, and the negative feedback covers more than one of the linguistic categories. As will become evident when viewing the results of the observations, the coding is important to determine the explicitness of the recasts observed. In addition, it will tell us which types of errors are corrected.

Finally, regarding the coding of uptake, the plan was to use Lyster and Ranta’s (1997) definition, as described in chapter 3.4.4. The uptake would be coded as *repair* if the student successfully repairs the erroneous utterance after receiving feedback, or *needs repair* if the student fails to repair. However, these definitions were not necessary in my study, as no uptake, either successful or unsuccessful, was observed.

5.3 Teacher interviews

The teacher interviews will contribute to provide an insight to the teachers’ perceptions regarding negative feedback. In addition, their views will be compared with the teachers’ indications in the questionnaire. Whereas the teachers in the questionnaire can only indicate their degree of agreement with a selection of statements, using interviews as a method gives the participants a chance to express their views and thoughts in detail. Thirdly, we will be able to investigate whether there is congruence between what the teacher say that they do and what they actually do, by comparing their answers in the interviews with their actions observed during the classroom observations.

5.3.1 Participants

The female teacher is 33 years old. She has 1 year of higher education in English, and was in the last semester of her pedagogical education at the time of the classroom observations. She was working as a substitute teacher while finishing her pedagogy studies, and had just started at the upper secondary school when the observations took place. Naturally, her work experience as a teacher was limited, having worked five weeks at a lower secondary school and three weeks at upper secondary.

The male teacher is 68 years old. He has 1.5 years of higher education in English, in addition to pedagogical education, and he has worked as a teacher for 19 years.

5.3.2 Data collection

Prior to the interviews, an interview guide was made. This is found in appendix 4. The goal of the interviews was to have the teachers talk as freely as possible about their views on oral error correction. Therefore, they did not know the topic of my research at the start of the interview. Question 6 – “Kva tankar gjer du deg når det gjeld munnlege språkfeil i klasserommet”, was useful in getting the teachers to express their opinions, and they answered several of my next questions without me having to ask them.

The interviews were conducted after the last lesson was observed. As with the classroom observations, I recorded the interviews using a tape recorder. The interviews were later transcribed, and the transcriptions are included in appendices 5 and 6. As the focus of the interviews was on content rather than language, the transcriptions do not include pauses, false starts and such. In order to avoid very long sentences and too many incomplete sentences, I have sometimes rephrased or restructured utterances in the transcriptions to become more readable. However, I have made sure that the content of the utterances is contained.

6 The questionnaire

In this chapter the results from the questionnaires will be presented and discussed. Section 6.1 contains tables showing the percentages for each statement from the questionnaires, along with brief presentations of the numbers. In section 6.2 the main findings will be summed up, before the results and implications of the questionnaires will be discussed in section 6.3.

6.1 Results

First, the results from my own questionnaire will be accounted for, with a focus on comparing the teachers' and students' answers. Where the students and teachers have been given similar statements to consider, the students' statement comes first. Then the responses will be compared with Schulz's studies (1996, 2001).

Table 6.1: Jeg misliker å bli rettet på i klasserommet. / De fleste elever misliker å bli rettet på i undervisningen.

Schulz: I dislike it when I am corrected in class / Most students dislike it when they are corrected in class.

	Agree %			Undecided %			Disagree %		
	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.
Students	4	4	37	6	9	22	90	87	40
Teachers	28	22	30	21	24	27	51	48	42

As the table shows, 30% of the teachers in Norway agreed that most students dislike being corrected, while 42% disagreed with the statement. If we compare it with the students' answers, 37% agreed that they disliked being corrected, while 40% disagreed. Thus, even though a higher percentage of students agree with the statement, the teachers and students had fairly similar perceptions here.

In Schulz’s questionnaires, only 4% of both Columbian and American students indicated that they disliked being corrected, while 90% (Col.) and 87% (U.S.) disagreed with the statement. The discrepancy rates between Norwegian students and the students from the two other cultures are high: 33% when it comes to agreeing with the statement, and 47-50% for disagreeing. Moreover, fewer of the American and Columbian teachers agreed with the statement and more disagreed, compared to the teachers in Norway. However, the divergences here are minor. To sum up, the discrepancy between teachers and students in the two other cultures is far bigger than in Norway, and the Norwegian students clearly show a different preference than students from the two other cultures.

It should be noted that in both statement 1 here and in statement 4 below the students are asked to state their own opinions, while the teachers are asked to indicate what they think the students’ views are. The different emphasis is obviously important in order to examine whether the teachers are familiar with the students’ views. In addition, the teacher statement reads “most students”, so in order to agree with the statement, the teachers must think that the majority of students dislike being corrected. Although minor, the differences in wording between the students’ and teachers’ statements may have an impact on the results.

Table 6.2: Lærere bør ikke rette på elevenes språkfeil i klasserommet. / Lærere bør ikke rette på elevers uttale eller grammatiske feil i klasserommet unntatt dersom disse feilene forstyrrer kommunikasjonen.

Schulz: Teachers should not correct students when they make errors in class / Teachers should not correct students' pronunciation or grammatical errors in class unless these errors interfere with comprehensibility.

	Agree %			Undecided %			Disagree %		
	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.
Students	3	2	21	3	4	22	95	94	56
Teachers	35	33	68	17	18	8	48	48	24

21% of the Norwegian students agreed with the statement, while 56% disagreed. On the other hand, 68 % of the teachers agreed (40% strongly agreed) with the statement presented to them, and only 24% disagreed. Thus, there is a substantial gap between students' and teachers' perceptions. Furthermore, as with the previous statement, there is a noteworthy discrepancy between the cultures. Compared to Columbian and U.S. teachers, the Norwegian teachers are more inclined to agree with the statement. The same pattern occurs when comparing the students' replies. Whereas the students from Columbia and the U.S. are all but unanimous, the Norwegian students' opinions are divided. Even though a small majority disagrees with the statement, as many as 22% are undecided on the matter, and almost as many agree.

If we compare the statements, we see that the phrasing of the statement offered to the students is more general than that offered to the teachers. It does not specify which types of errors that should or should not be corrected, whereas in the teachers' statement the types of errors are specified, in addition to specifying when error correction could be used. It may be argued that these specifications make the statement more leading or easier to agree with. At any rate, it is impossible to say whether more similar statements would have led to more or less similar results, but it is nevertheless useful to keep this in mind when comparing the results.

Table 6.3: Når jeg snakker engelsk vil jeg at læreren skal rette på feilene mine / Generelt sett bør feil som begås av elever når de snakker engelsk i klasserommet rettes på.

Schulz: When I make errors in speaking this language, I would like my teacher to correct them. / Generally, when students make errors in speaking the TL, they should be corrected.

	Agree %			Undecided %			Disagree %		
	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.
Students	97	90	64	2	9	16	1	2	19
Teachers	39	30	20	21	28	28	40	41	52

64% of the Norwegian students agree with the statement, with 19% disagreeing. Among the teachers, only 20% agree that oral English errors should generally be corrected. More than half of the teachers (52%) disagree with the statement. The discrepancies between students and teachers are notable; 44% (agree) and 33% (disagree). On this matter, the discrepancies between the teachers from different countries are not as large as with the previous statement, but the difference between Norwegian and especially Columbian teachers is notable, with a discrepancy of 19% for those agreeing. Among the students, the cultural differences are more evident, with the discrepancy between Norwegian and Columbian students ranging from 18% (disagreeing) to 33% (agreeing).

Again, there is a small divergence between the students' and the teachers' statement. The students are asked to reflect on what they would prefer personally, while the teachers should reflect on what they think is best for learning on more general terms. The differences here are not as striking as in table 2, but nevertheless worth noting. Furthermore, the fact that the teacher is specified as a source of correction in the student statement opens up for questioning whether the students who disagree do so because they do not want to be corrected by their teacher specifically (e.g. they would rather be corrected by a peer), or because they are generally opposed to being corrected.

Table 6.4: Jeg foretrekker å bli rettet av medelever i små grupper fremfor å bli rettet av læreren foran klassen. / Elever foretrekker å bli rettet av medelever i små grupper heller enn å bli rettet av læreren foran hele klassen.

Schulz: I prefer to be corrected by my fellow students in small group work rather than by my teacher in front of the entire class.

	Agree %			Undecided %			Disagree %		
	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.
Students	15	13	26	31	26	36	54	61	38
Teachers	N/A	N/A	48	N/A	N/A	24	N/A	N/A	28

Here, the students have indicated their own perceptions, and the teachers have indicated what they think the students perceptions are. As shown in tables 4 – 6, teachers’ statements are not included in Schulz’s questionnaires. I chose to include the teachers, in order to investigate any discrepancies. The majority of the Norwegian students either disagree (38%) with the statement or are undecided (36%), while almost half of the teachers (48%) agree. Thus, the discrepancy between students and teachers is notable. So are the differences between the student cultures, where Norwegian students to a larger degree are inclined to prefer peer correction.

Table 6.5: Jeg lærer mye av at læreren retter mine medelevers språkfeil i klasserommet / Elever lærer mye av at læreren retter andre elevers språkfeil i klasserommet.

Schulz: I learn a lot when the teacher corrects the errors made by my fellow students in class.

	Agree %			Undecided %			Disagree %		
	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.
Students	90	70	52	6	23	22	4	7	26
Teachers	N/A	N/A	24	N/A	N/A	28	N/A	N/A	48

The discrepancy between Columbian and American students has been commented on in section 3.5.3. We see that the Norwegian students are not as inclined as the others to think that the correction of peers contributes to their own learning. Just over half of the students (52%) agree, while roughly a fourth of them disagree with the statement. The Norwegian teachers are less positive, with almost half of them indicating that the correction of peers does not aid the language acquisition of their fellow students to a large degree.

Table 6.6. Jeg lærer mye av at læreren retter mine språkfeil i klasserommet. / Elever lærer mye av at læreren retter deres egne språkfeil i klasserommet.

Schulz: I learn a lot when the teacher corrects the errors I make in class.

	Agree %			Undecided %			Disagree %		
	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.	Col.	U.S.	Nor.
Students	94	86	63	4	12	15	2	2	22
Teachers	N/A	N/A	28	N/A	N/A	44	N/A	N/A	28

Another significant discrepancy between Norwegian students' and teachers' perceptions is found here, with 63% of the students agreeing with the statement against only 28% of the teachers. As many as 44% of the teachers are undecided on this statement. Again, the Columbian (94%) and American students (86%) are very positive concerning the effect of error correction. While the majority of Norwegian students are also in favor of this view, there is a discrepancy of 31% compared to the Columbians.

The last three tables contain the statements I chose to add to the questionnaire. As mentioned in the methods chapter, these were added to learn more about perceptions regarding the explicitness of negative feedback and the teachers' thoughts about the importance of uptake.

Table 6.7: Jeg foretrekker at læreren forteller meg direkte hva jeg har sagt feil og retter på det. / Jeg foretrekker å direkte fortelle eleven hva som er feil og rette på det.

	Agree %	Undecided %	Disagree %
Students	72	19	10
Teachers	52	32	16

72% of the students agree that they prefer explicit correction from the teacher, and just over half of the teachers indicate that they prefer to provide the students with explicit feedback. However, 32% of the teachers are undecided on the issue.

Table 6.8: Jeg foretrekker at læreren forteller meg indirekte at jeg har sagt noe feil. / Jeg foretrekker å indirekte indikere at noe eleven har sagt er feil.

	Agree %	Undecided %	Disagree %
Students	42	27	44
Teachers	44	20	36

42% of the students and 44% of the teachers agree with this statement, with a slightly bigger discrepancy if we look at the ‘disagree’ numbers. This statement is the direct opposite of the previous, and may thus seem surplus as one might think that those who disagreed with the previous statement would agree with this one and vice versa. However, the percentages show that this is not always the case.

Table 6.9: Uansett om eleven har fått direkte eller indirekte tilbakemelding på feil er det viktig at eleven selv gjentar det som har blitt sagt på en korrekt måte.

	Agree %	Undecided %	Disagree %
Teachers	48	20	32

This statement was given to teachers only, with no equivalent to the students. 48% of the teachers indicate that correct uptake from the student is important, while 52% are either undecided or disagree.

6.2 Main findings

One of the aims of this thesis was to account for Norwegian students' and teachers' perceptions regarding negative feedback of oral errors in the classroom. To summarize the findings, the results from the questionnaire show that there are significant discrepancies between Norwegian teachers' and students' perceptions about oral negative feedback in the English classroom. The student majority indicate that they would like their oral English errors to be corrected, whereas the teacher majority are not very positive towards error correction in general. The teachers indicate skepticism towards significant facilitative effects of negative feedback, while the majority of the students believe that they do learn a lot from being corrected.

Another aim was to compare the Norwegian participants with teachers and students from other cultures, more specifically from the U.S. and Columbia. The results from the questionnaires show that even though the Norwegian students are generally favorable towards negative feedback, the students from the two other cultures are almost unanimously positive. Among the teachers the divergences are not as large, but again the Norwegians are less positive towards negative feedback than their American and Columbian colleagues. Thus, while the divergences between teachers and students in Norway are indeed notable, they are not quite as large as between students and teachers in the two other countries. In the following chapter, possible reasons for and implications of these findings will be discussed.

6.3 Discussion

Having found that there is a mismatch between students' and teachers' views on the importance of error correction, an important question is whether this may have any effects on the students' learning. This is an issue that does not easily lend itself to empirical testing, but should nevertheless not be ignored as a result. It is also interesting to discuss possible reasons why there is such a divergence, in addition to discussing the cultural differences that have been found.

6.3.1 Cultural differences in student perceptions

When questioning why Norwegian students are not quite as positive towards error correction as those from the other cultures, the divergences accounted for in the methods chapter may at least be part of the reason. Firstly, the fact that the Norwegian students differ from the others in age and education level may have an impact. Those who have chosen to learn a language at university level may be more motivated than those who study English because it is a mandatory subject at upper secondary level, and they may therefore have a stronger desire to be corrected. Older students may also be more mature and motivated for learning.

Additionally, aptitude will arguably have an impact on the classroom discourse and both the learners' and teachers' attitudes towards what are important focus areas in the classroom. As mentioned earlier, many of the students at university level study a language at beginner's level. Compared to Norwegian students, who have had English education in school from an early age, the classroom discourse will be significantly different. The Norwegian students may have the impression that they are getting quite skilled at speaking English, and thus do not need much error correction. On the other hand, those who have just started to learn to speak a language will arguably be less confident, and to a considerably larger degree dependent on the teacher's guidance when speaking the FL.

The degree to which the L1 and SL/FL differ may also affect the methods used in the classroom, and possibly also the students' views on negative feedback. For example, a FL with a grammatical structure that differs significantly from the L1 may lead to more focus on form in the classroom than a language with more familiar grammar, and a FL with substantial phonological challenges may lead to a greater need amongst students for oral correction than a language with more familiar pronunciation. It might be argued that Norwegian differs less from English than e.g. English does from Japanese, and for that reason the Japanese language students may prefer more negative feedback to help their pronunciation.

In an effort to account for possible explanations to why students are favorable towards negative feedback, Schulz (1996, p. 348) regards the curriculum and testing methods as strong influences on students' opinions. He argues that the curriculum is to a large degree grammar-based, and both teaching and testing has a strong focus on form. Therefore, students may believe that an explicit focus on getting rid of language errors is the most important step to learning a language. As described in the methods chapter, the divergences between the

Norwegian participants and those from the two other cultures are large, and it would be interesting to compare both testing methods, curricula and the prevalent instructional practices in the three cultures as there is likely to be major differences.

If we look at the English subject curriculum and the competence aims at upper secondary level in Norway (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2006b), there is little evidence of a dominant focus on form. Still, two of the competence aims may lead to such a focus:

- express oneself fluently and coherently in a detailed and precise manner suited to the purpose and situation
- use patterns for pronunciation, intonation, word inflection and various types of sentences in communication

Schulz's (1996) also argues that the students base their views on error correction on their own positive experiences when receiving negative feedback. If they feel that they learn something from the negative feedback they receive, it is a natural catalyst to favoring more correction. We also see from statement 6 in the questionnaire above that the majority of students feel that they learn a lot from being corrected.

Another factor that should not be ignored is the expectations students have to how language learning in the classroom takes place. As Schulz (2001) states, students "[...] see the teacher as an expert knower whose role is to explain and provide feedback" (p. 255). This also shows in the questionnaire, where the students indicate that they would rather be corrected by the teacher than their peers in smaller groups. Does this mean that the students are more anxious of peer correction than teacher correction, or simply that they trust the teacher to correct their errors, not their fellow students? This is a question that must be left open, but whatever the answer is the teacher's influence on the students' perceptions should not be underestimated. If the students are used to teachers giving negative feedback frequently, they might think that this is the best way of learning and are thus more positive towards receiving it. We have seen that the US and Columbian teachers are more positive towards negative feedback than the Norwegian teachers, which most likely means that they provide it more frequently in the classroom as well. This may of course have a reverse effect if the students feel that the teacher constantly disrupts the classroom conversation to focus on minor language errors. Thus, either

positively or negatively, the teacher's views and actions are likely to have an influence on the students when it comes to their views on negative feedback.

As mentioned, research on students' perceptions about oral negative feedback has yielded similar results; namely that most students generally want to be corrected when they make an erroneous utterance in the target language. Ultimately, the students' overall desire to be corrected is not very surprising. They are in the classroom to learn a language, and as long as they believe that error correction is an important means to achieving their goal, they will be positive towards receiving it.

6.3.2 Discussing teachers' perceptions

We have seen that when the Norwegian teachers were fairly accurate regarding whether students would indicate a dislike towards being corrected (statement 1 and 4). There were larger discrepancies on statement 4, where almost half of the teacher participants expected the students to favor peer correction to teacher correction. As discussed, the students seem to have a rather traditional view on learning, with the teacher as the main source for teaching and correction. The indications that some teachers think otherwise may be one possible reason why they are reluctant of being the source of error correction in the classroom.

Schulz (2001, p. 255) mentions three important sources to which the teachers attribute their beliefs: their preparation program and in-service development, their professional experience, and their own language learning experience. Whether they have received any instruction regarding negative feedback during their teacher training, and if so the content of that instruction, may have a strong impact on the teachers' perceptions about which practices are best. This may be especially influential on newly educated teachers, still having the teacher training fresh in their memory and lacking much experience of their own. It would be interesting to investigate the content of the teacher training in Norway to see to what extent, if any, negative feedback is touched upon. If there is a focus on negative feedback in teacher education programs, the nature of that instruction is very important, especially in light of the research on the topic yielding mixed results. Further research should investigate what information is being given to students in teacher education programs regarding error correction and whether that information is based on current research. One of the teachers will shed some light on this issue in the interview chapter, being in the middle of her teacher

training. It would also be useful to compare teacher training in Norway with the teacher training in the US and Columbia to see if there are any striking differences.

Once the teachers get more teaching experience, it is more likely that they will rely on the knowledge they have acquired from their own practices. They might for example have observed that particular forms of instruction and uses of error correction have led to successful learning, or on the contrary found that error correction have had a detrimental effect on student participation. In addition, some teachers may be more engaged in being up to date on research on the topic than others. Some of today's teachers may have ended their teacher education 40 years ago, and there is no doubt that research on negative feedback has come a long way since then. Moreover, as with the students, the teachers' experiences as language learners may be influential. If this is indeed the case, then established teacher practices may be handed down through generations. Lastly, the teachers' perceptions about corrective feedback may to some degree depend on what they feel comfortable with, and their own language speaking abilities. For example, a teacher with a distinct nonnative-like accent may not be confident about correcting students' phonological errors.

However, while the factors mentioned may influence teacher perceptions, it does not mean that they will always lead to negative views on error correction. Are there any other influences that more clearly point towards negative perceptions on error correction? As mentioned when discussing the students' perceptions, Schulz (1996) points to the curriculum as a strong influence, and claims that it is typically grammar-based in FL courses. The curriculum is undoubtedly of major importance to the teachers, and as we have seen the Norwegian upper secondary curriculum for English does not have a strong focus on grammar or language errors in particular. The guide to FL curricula states that the purpose of the competence aims is to give the student training in intercultural and communicative competence:

Dette innebærer at det er ferdigheter i språket, ikke kunnskaper om det, som skal være det sentrale i språkopplæringen. Kunnskap om språkstrukturer betraktes ikke som mål i seg selv, men som hjelpemiddel for å kunne bruke språket aktivt
(Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2006c)

The Norwegian curriculum is closely connected to the principles of Communicative Language Teaching, which was accounted for in chapter 2. This does not by any means entail that error correction should not take place in the English classroom. However, it may be

argued that a curriculum based on more behavioristic values, with e.g. more focus on speaking correctly and avoiding language errors, would influence the teachers into putting more emphasis on error correction in the classroom. Thus, different emphasizes in the curricula may be one of the main reasons for the divergences between the Norwegians and the participants from Columbia and the US.

Moreover, Norway is in an interesting position when it comes to the status of English. While English has traditionally been viewed and taught as a FL, increased exposure to English through media and the Internet as well as through more travel and communication using English as a Lingua Franca, has led to improved confidence and proficiency among Norwegians. Kachru (1990) divides the role of English in different countries in the world into three circles: the *Inner Circle*, where English is the L1; the *Outer Circle*, where English is used as a SL in a multilingual country (e.g. India); and the *Expanding Circle*, where English is studied as a foreign language. Norway would traditionally be put in the Expanding Circle. However, as McKay (2002) points out, this categorization is problematic because today a lot of the countries in the Expanding Circle (like Norway) have a higher number of English-speaking bilinguals than countries in the so-called Outer Circle. Because of the reasons stated above, Graddol (1997) views such countries as Norway as in transition from an EFL context to an L2 context.

In this lies a notion of Norwegians being in a sense bilinguals. McKay (2002) defines bilingual users of English as “[...] individuals who use English as a second language alongside one or more other languages they speak” (p.27). In addition, her definition covers “a wide range of English proficiency” (Ibid.). This means that most Norwegian students are eligible to call themselves bilingual users of English, because the level of proficiency does neither include nor exclude people with native-like proficiency or people with English skills that only meet certain communicative needs. Therefore, provided that Norwegian students and the teacher share the same L1, the English classroom in Norwegian schools may resemble a bilingual society. This may have an impact on perceptions on the need for negative feedback, both among students and teachers. As mentioned, if Norwegian students think of themselves as proficient English speakers, they may not feel a strong need to be corrected. Likewise, the teachers may think that the students’ proficiencies are at a high level already, and will therefore not be too concerned with correcting their language errors.

6.3.3 Implications of the differences between teachers and students

We have seen that earlier research has found a mismatch between students' and teachers' perceptions about oral negative feedback. The questionnaires administered to teachers and students of English in Norway confirm the findings, even though the divergences are not as large as between the teachers and students in Schulz's studies. Schulz (1996, 2001) claims that differences in perceptions may be detrimental to language learning. This view is based on the notion that if certain expectations are not met, it may have a negative impact on motivation.

To illustrate this point, it may be compared with taking piano lessons. If you choose to start taking piano lessons, you expect to receive guidance and correction from the piano teacher when playing wrongly in order to improve your piano skills. If no such correction is given, you will most likely feel cheated and your motivation will decrease. This notion is transferrable to the language classroom, albeit with an important distinction: Taking piano lessons is optional, whereas attending English courses is often mandatory. For the majority of the student participants in my study, English is a mandatory subject in the language program they are in, so the inner motivation for improving their language skills may not always be strong. Nevertheless, the fact that the majority of Norwegian students in the questionnaire would like their errors to be corrected shows that they do have a motivation for improving their English skills.

On the other hand, the 37% that indicate a dislike of being corrected in the classroom should not be ignored. Many students are anxious of taking the word in the classroom, and fear of committing a language error and being corrected for it may lead to passivity and reluctance of speaking English, not just in the classroom, but also in authentic situations outside of the classroom.

Table 7 and 8 showed that the students and teachers differed less in their views regarding implicit and explicit feedback types than what might be expected. For example, the fact that only 16% of the teachers disagree with statement 7 is a bit surprising, as studies have almost unanimously shown that teachers are more likely to use implicit feedback types than explicit feedback. Indeed, 52% of the teachers in the questionnaire agree that they prefer providing the students with explicit feedback. The students are not quite as divided on the topics, with 72% preferring explicit feedback. However, on the opposite statement the percentage of students

(42%) and teachers (44%) agreeing is almost identical. The fact that many participants are undecided on the two statements may indicate that they do not think the explicit versus implicit negative feedback is a case ‘either, or’, but rather that they see both forms as useful depending on the situation. This may also explain the uneven percentages on the opposite statements, as some participants might have agreed or disagreed on both of them. We will return to this part of the questionnaire results in the classroom observation chapter.

What can be done to meet students’ expectations while at the same time avoid increasing student anxiety? Schulz claims that the teacher is responsible for discovering students’ beliefs and expectations. Only by doing that, the teacher can either help modify their beliefs, or adjust his or her methods to better meet the students’ expectations. “If teacher behaviors do not mesh with student expectations, learner motivation and a teacher’s credibility may be diminished” (Schulz, 2001, p. 256).

Lasagabaster and Sierra’s study (2005), accounted for in chapter 3.5.4, found that teachers feared that too much negative feedback in the classroom would lead to language anxiety among students. They also expressed that correcting every error is neither practical nor beneficial. The students in the same study indicated that constant correction would be unhelpful, constraining the students’ willingness to speak in the classroom. Nevertheless, they wanted negative feedback, but with a more explicit focus on a smaller number of errors. The students also thought that the teacher should use more strategies in their correction, and spend more time on each correction. Whether these views correspond with the Norwegian students’ views cannot be answered by examining the questionnaires, but when we come to the teachers’ interviews we will see that the Norwegian teachers indicated the same fear of inducing language anxiety as those described above.

Gregersen (2003) conducted an interview study examining the reactions of anxious and nonanxious FL learners to their own errors. The researcher found that the two ‘types’ of students differed in their ability to recognize their errors and also in their reactions to making errors. Anxious students both made more language errors, corrected themselves and code switched more frequently than the nonanxious students. “As errors are made, learners become more anxious, and the more anxious they are, the more errors they make” (Gregersen, 2003, p. 29). The researcher calls for teachers to be more aware of their important role in reducing anxiety among students. This can be achieved by creating a classroom atmosphere which is

friendly and cooperative. She also warns that what may be perceived by the teacher as lack of motivation and poor attitude towards the subject may be a sign that the student is anxious.

If the teacher explained his/her methods regarding error correction, the students would at least be more informed which might help to avoid disillusionment. It might be even better to discuss the use of error correction with the students, thus increasing their commitment and involvement in the learning process. However, a one-size-fits-all approach to error correction is not likely to work well on all students. Therefore, it might be useful to make individual agreements with the students based on their perceptions, motivation, language level, and language anxiety.

There is a need for more research on both students' and teachers' perceptions of negative feedback. The small amount of research there is on the topic tend to point to important divergences between students' and teachers' opinions. As this study has shown, students are generally in favor of being corrected, while teachers are more reluctant towards providing negative feedback. Possible reasons for the divergences have been discussed, as well as possible implications. Especially the implications of the divergences should be the focus of further research. It would be interesting to investigate if there is a connection between student – teacher divergences in views on negative feedback and the effectiveness of the instruction given.

7 Classroom observations of negative feedback

All of the lessons observed included some type of oral activity and/or class discussion. (Details about these can be found in appendix 3). The teachers were asked on beforehand whether there would be any oral interaction during their classes, and both of them confirmed that this was already planned for the classes I asked to observe. Thus, it is not likely that the content of the classroom activities was changed because I was there to observe, but it cannot be ruled out either.

The main goals when conducting the observations were to find out to what extent teachers in Norwegian schools correct oral English errors in the classroom, investigate which errors were corrected and which negative feedback types were used to correct them, and to examine the degree of explicitness of the recasts that were provided. We now turn to a presentation and discussion of the results.

7.1 Overall feedback rates

All of the lessons had very similar beginnings: the teacher introduced a topic which led to class discussion. The topics discussed in the various classes were food culture, American politics, political advertisements, and 9/11. All of these topics can be said to belong in the Culture and Society part of the curriculum, where one of the aims is to “discuss and elaborate on culture and social conditions in several English-speaking countries” (Kunnskapsdepartementet, 2006a). There was a general focus on the content and communication about the topics, and very little focus on form and language as an object. Apart from instances where the teachers asked questions like “do you know what prejudice means?”, thus turning the focus to the language itself, the general focus was on using English as a means of communicating about the content. In other words, the classroom activities observed in these lessons were in line with the Communicative Language Teaching approach to language teaching as was described in chapter 2.1.

Table 7.1

Percentage of errors responded to

Number of errors observed	38
Number of errors responded to	15
Percentage of errors responded to	39.5 %

As the table shows, a total of 38 language errors were found during 6 hours and 45 minutes of classroom observations. However, only 15 of the 38 errors received any type of negative feedback, yielding a percentage of 39.5% of errors responded to. In chapter 3.2 we saw that Panova and Lyster (2002) reported 48% of error correction, while Lyster and Ranta (1997) reported 62%, and Lochman (2002) 90%. According to Ortega (2009, p. 73), generally “[...] a good proportion of errors appear to be responded to” in instructional settings. Furthermore, Ortega (ibid.) reports that Panova and Lyster’s study (2002) has attested the lowest percentage of errors responded to in SLA research. With that in mind, the percentage of errors responded to in this study is remarkably low.

What may be the causes of the low amount of negative feedback given in Norwegian classrooms? If we look back at the results from the teachers’ questionnaire, there was a general reluctance among Norwegian teachers to giving feedback, and also skepticism towards any positive effects negative feedback may have on language learning. We saw that the percentage of Norwegian teachers agreeing to the statement that errors should not be corrected was considerably larger than Columbian and US teachers. Whether negative feedback is used or not depends to a large degree on the individual teacher. If the teacher believes that negative feedback is imperative to language acquisition, (s)he would arguably be more inclined to provide it more frequently than teachers who do not share that belief. The different factors that may contribute to the teachers’ views on negative feedback were discussed in the questionnaire chapter. In addition, the interviews with the two teachers in the next chapter will give a deeper insight into their perceptions and choices.

It should also be noted that the above mentioned research differs from this study in terms of L1, type and level of education, and whether the classes were studying EFL, ESL or another FL. Panova and Lyster's study (2002) was based in an adult ESL classroom in Montreal, Lyster and Ranta's study (1997) was conducted in French immersion classrooms, while Lochtmann's study (2002) was based on German as an FL lessons in Belgium. The level of proficiency, the target language, and the educational culture may all have an impact on the frequency of negative feedback. This is also part of the reason why it is useful to conduct such a study in Norwegian schools. One cannot merely rely on the notion that research and findings from other cultures can automatically be applied to Norway.

The type of classroom activity will undoubtedly also play an important role in the frequency of negative feedback given. All of the oral activities observed in this study were, as mentioned, largely focused on content-based communication, not on any specific linguistic features. However, it must be stressed that the number of lessons, classes and teachers observed in this study is very limited, and any conclusions and generalizations should be viewed as tentative. Nevertheless, it is interesting to investigate whether there is a pattern between the findings in the questionnaire, the observations and the teacher interviews.

In chapter 3.1 we saw that most SLA researchers agree that negative feedback is indeed beneficial for learning, although there is disagreement with regard to when and how it should be given. We also saw that several classroom studies pointed out major gains for students in communicative language classes, if the communication tasks and activities were accompanied by negative feedback. With this in mind, it would seem that the students observed in my study would benefit from more error correction. However, whereas SLA research is for the most part conducted with a strictly scientific focus, examining which methods lead to the best results, the teacher's role is more diverse and complicated. The teachers will of course also be interested in choosing the methods and practices that are the most efficient for language acquisition, and at the same time they play a very important role in facilitating motivation and eagerness to learn. In addition, they are vital in preventing and reducing anxiety among students when it comes to speaking English in the classroom. Of course, increased anxiety does not have a positive effect on language acquisition either, and as seen in the results from the questionnaires, these considerations may be part of the reason why teachers are reluctant to provide more negative feedback in the classroom. The teachers also shed more light on this issue in the interviews in the next chapter.

In the lessons observed, the extent to which students contributed orally, at least the degree to which they spoke English, varied from class to class. The same applies for the number of students contributing in the various classes. In some classes two or three students did the most of the talking, while other classes had a more even division where several students took part in the discussions. If more negative feedback would lead to fewer students being willing to participate orally, the implications of the low percentage of error correction may not be as negative as the previous research indicates. The teachers may be afraid of this being the case, as is also indicated in the interviews in the next chapter.

7.2 Linguistic focus

The table below shows the frequency of different error types observed, the frequency of which the different error types were responded to, and the preferred type of negative feedback provided for each error type.

Table 7.2

Linguistic focus

Type of error	Number of errors	Error frequency percentage	Number of errors responded to	Percentage of errors responded to	Preferred type of feedback
Lexical	11	28.9 %	6	54.5 %	Recast (5/6)
Morphological / Syntactic	16	42.1 %	5	31.3 %	Recast (5/5)
Phonological	10	26.3 %	3	30 %	Recast (3/3)
Combined	1	2.6 %	1	100%	Recast (1/1)
Total	38	100%	15		

For lexical errors we see that 11 such errors were observed out of a total of 38 errors. Thus, a percentage of 28.9 of the observed errors were lexical. Furthermore, 6 of the 11 errors were responded to in terms of negative feedback provided by the teacher, yielding a percentage of 54.5. Finally, the preferred feedback type for lexical errors was recasts, which was used in 5 of the 6 instances.

The most frequent error type observed was morphological or syntactic errors. 42.1 % of the errors observed belonged in this category. However, only 5 of the 16 instances were responded to, yielding a percentage of 31.3. Furthermore, the teacher chose to use recasts in all of the 5 instances where the errors were responded to.

10 of the errors were coded as phonological, with a percentage of 26.3. 30.0% of the errors received negative feedback, all in the form of recasts. Lastly, 1 instance of combined errors was recorded, and also these errors were responded to using a recast.

When compared with Lyster's study (1998a) of French immersion classrooms, we see that grammatical errors were most common with 50%, followed by lexical errors (18%), phonological errors (16%) and unsolicited use of L1 (16%) (p. 199). Since Lyster chose to include the latter category, the numbers are not fully comparable with this study.

Nevertheless, we see that there are similarities regarding the most frequent error type and the relationship between the other error types as well.

Furthermore, in Lyster's study the rate of feedback per error type was 80% for lexical errors, 70% for phonological errors, 56% for grammatical errors, and 43% following the use of L1. When it comes to the types of feedback following the different errors, recasts were used the most following phonological and grammatical errors (64% and 72%, respectively). However, following lexical errors, negotiation of form was the preferred feedback type (55%).

Compared to my own study, Lyster's numbers differ considerably, with a higher feedback rate on all types of errors. Almost 40% more of the lexical and grammatical errors were responded to in Lyster's study, while 26% more of the phonological errors were responded to. This is of course connected to the low general feedback rate observed in my study, and again it is important to note that there are major differences when it comes to type of school,

language, language level, and age in the two studies. Lyster's study is obviously also substantially more comprehensive, with observations of 921 error sequences.

Nevertheless, there are similar tendencies as well. Notably, lexical errors receive the highest feedback rate, and phonological errors receive the lowest feedback rate in both studies. This contributes to strengthening the notion that teachers generally consider lexical errors to be more important to react to than errors concerning grammar and pronunciation. The findings are not very surprising, as lexical errors more often than other error types may lead to a breakdown in communication. In addition, the reason why the teachers have responded more to lexical errors may not always be in order to correct the student, but rather in order to negotiate for meaning so that the conversation may continue. Errors regarding pronunciation and grammar are less likely to disrupt a discussion, as long as the illocutionary force behind the learner's utterance is still understood.

An implication of the low percentage of negative feedback on phonological and grammatical errors is that the students will not receive any evidence that the grammaticality of their utterance, or the pronunciation of a certain word, is flawed. On the contrary, they may get positive reinforcement from the teacher that what they just said was good, interesting or correct. Thus, they do not get any chance to correct themselves, or any corrective input that may either consciously or unconsciously lead to acquisition. Phonological errors can arguably be dealt with in a fairly straightforward manner. The word that is mispronounced can be highlighted by the teacher by means of negative feedback. Depending on the feedback type used, the student will either get a correct rendition of the word by the teacher by terms of a recast or explicit correct, or be informed that the utterance is non-target-like and be prompted to repeat the word. Such errors are rarely time consuming or difficult to understand for the students, and in many cases the students are aware that they may be mispronouncing a word.

However, as always the teacher will have to make some decisions. Whether the teacher chooses to give feedback to phonological errors may depend on the severity of the error, the instructional setting, whether the correction will lead to student anxiety or causes an unwanted change in focus from communication to form, the individual students' language level and correction needs, and whether the error is recurring or not. The teacher interviews will shed more light on this.

Errors regarding morphology or syntax may be more complicated for the student to understand. More so than with phonological errors, the teacher must consider whether the student is developmentally ready to understand the nature of the error, and thus has increased chances of internalizing the grammatical item. Some errors may also require much time and explanation from the teacher depending on how complicated it is and whether the teacher chooses to simply provide negative feedback on the error and move on, or use the error as an example when explaining a grammatical rule, e.g. the third person singular –s ending. This leads us into a discussion of what is correct grammar teaching, e.g. whether grammatical items should be focus on individually and deductive, or inductive and as they appear naturally through authentic use of the language. This is however a large topic of its own, and will not be discussed in more detail here.

7.3 Types of negative feedback provided

As the table below shows, the use of recasts was overwhelming. Recasts were used in all but one instance where negative feedback was provided.

Table 7.3

Types of negative feedback

Feedback type	n	Percent
Prompt	0	0
Explicit feedback	1	6,7
Recast	14	93,3
Total	15	100

It is no surprise that recasts is the most used type of negative feedback in the classroom, as this has been reported in several classroom studies. In chapter 3.3 we saw that both Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Panova and Lyster (2002) reported that recasts was the most popular feedback type among teachers, used in more than 50% of the instances. The preference for recasts is also strong in Lyster's study (1998a), but the use of feedback types is not quite as one-sided as in my study. For example, in Lyster (1998a, p. 200) the majority of feedback moves involved negotiation of form after lexical errors.

One of the reasons for the high percentage of recasts in this study is the omission of translation as a feedback type. As mentioned, Panova and Lyster (2002) put translations as a separate category. If translations were treated in this manner in my study, the percentage of recasts would decrease. On the other hand, Lyster and Ranta (1997) chose to include translations in their coding of recasts, thus increasing the percentage of recasts compared to this study and Panova and Lyster's. Thus, the problem with translations is not just whether or not to include them, but also in what category they are included. In addition, more classes and lessons observed with different teachers and a greater variation in pedagogical focus would likely have led to more variation in the use of negative feedback. Nevertheless, as we will see in the next chapter, the teachers were quite clear that they preferred to use recasts when accounting for their negative feedback methods.

Why are recasts generally so widely used in the classroom? Loewen and Philp (2006) mention some important reasons why the use of recasts is so popular:

A recast is time-saving, less threatening to student confidence, and less disruptive of the flow of interaction than, for example, elicitation of self-repair. Unlike explicit correction, recasts maintain the focus on meaning. Recasts also allow the teacher to maintain control (p. 537).

As the classroom activities were generally oriented towards content rather than form, it is thus not surprising that recasts were favored by the two teachers. It allowed them to continue the conversation without spending time on more explicit types of correction and risk losing focus on the content. The teachers also seemed to have clear ideas about what they wanted to achieve during the lessons, and by using recasts they were always in control of the conversations, guiding the students in the right direction.

If we compare the use of recasts reported in the observations with the teachers' questionnaires, we see that the teachers answering the questionnaires were generally not as

biased towards implicit correction as the teachers observed. When confronted with the statement “Jeg foretrekker å direkte fortelle eleven hva som er feil og rette på det”, 52% of the teachers agreed with it, and only 16% disagreed. When the statement was reversed; “Jeg foretrekker å indirekte indikere at noe eleven har sagt er feil”, 44% agreed and 36% disagreed. A considerable percentage was undecided on the statements as well. If the majority of the teachers have the same perceptions about negative feedback as the two teachers observed in the classroom, more teachers should have disagreed with the former statement and agreed with the latter. However, it is certainly possible that the notions of especially ‘indirect’ and perhaps also ‘direct’ correction of errors were too abstract, and that the teachers were not quite able to connect indirect correction to recasting. Perhaps including examples of indirect and direct feedback would have made it clearer. The word “omformulere” could also have been used instead of “indirekte indikere”.

On the other hand, it may be the case that the two teachers observed in this study are ‘exceptions’, and that the majority of Norwegian teachers have a more balanced view on what is the correct use of negative feedback. More research is required in order to draw any clear conclusions. The students generally had stronger opinions on the topic, with 72% agreeing that they preferred explicit correction from the teacher. The implications of the differing views on negative feedback have been discussed in the previous chapter.

7.4 The explicitness of recasts

Instead we turn our attention to the recasts that were observed in the classrooms in an effort to account for their explicitness. The coding was accounted for in chapter 4.2.3, and the results will be discussed and compared to Loewen and Philp’s (2006) findings, which were accounted for in chapter 3.4.4.

Table 7.4**Recast characteristics**

Characteristic	n	Percent
Length of recast		
Fewer than five morphemes	7	50
Five or more morphemes	7	50
Prosodic emphasis		
Unstressed	11	78.6
Stressed	3	21.4
Segmentation		
Segmented	4	28.6
Whole	10	71.4
Number of changes		
One change	8	57.1
Two or more changes	6	42.9
Intonation		
Declarative	10	71.4
Interrogative	4	28.6

From the total number of 14 recasts, 7 of them (50%) had fewer than five morphemes. Compared with Loewen and Philp's study (2006), as many as 86.8% of the recasts had fewer than five morphemes. Although segmentations of recasts is not quite the same as a short recast, since a short recast is not necessarily segmented, the concept is similar in that a

segmented recast highlights the error and excludes the rest of the utterance. In my study, only 28.6 of the recasts were segmented, while Loewen and Philp's study found a percentage of 69.3 for segmented recasts. According to the researchers, short recasts proved to be the most beneficial for the students' posttest scores. This implies that instances where the teacher only reformulates the wrong part of the student's utterance (provided it is short) will be more likely to lead to acquisition than recasting e.g. the whole utterance. The 'limit' of 5 morphemes set by Loewen and Philp (2006) does not mean that there is a big difference between a recast consisting of five morphemes and a recast consisting of six morphemes. Rather, they suggest, the shorter the better. However, the length of the recast may arguably also depend on the type of error committed. Sometimes the teacher may feel the need to reformulate larger parts of an utterance in order for it to make sense or sound more native-like, thus also requiring more morphemes in order to do so.

Next, examining the prosodic emphasis, we see that 78.6% of the recasts were unstressed by the teachers, meaning that the teachers did not provide any cues in terms of changes in pitch, emphasis or deliberate pausing to highlight the recast item. This is another area where Loewen and Philp (2006) found a divergence in the effectiveness of recasts. Generally, stressed recasts were found to be more effective than unstressed recasts, so the low percentage of stressed recasts reported in my observations is not positive in that respect. Again, in Loewen and Philp' study the recasts provided were more in line with what is deemed to be effective, with 85.1 of the recasts being stressed.

The number of changes in the recast may also have an impact on the learner's ability to notice the corrected item or items. According to the researchers, few changes between the initial utterance and the recast will be more effective. 57.1% of the recasts in my study had one change, thus being more likely to be noticed, while the other recasts had two or more changes. While the majority of recasts had the desired number of changes here, the percentage was higher in Loewen and Philp's study (2006), which reported that 73.7% of recasts had only one change.

Lastly, the teachers' intonation when providing a recast may also have an impact on the degree of explicitness, as a recast with a declarative intonation is less likely to be ambiguous to the students and therefore more explicit in nature. On the other hand, recasts with

interrogative intonation could be perceived as confirmation checks, leading the student to continue focusing on the content rather than noticing the correction in the recast. 71.4% of the recasts in my study were declarative, thus in line with what Loewen and Philp (2006) found to be more efficient. Once again they reported an even higher percentage of 83.3 declarative recasts.

To sum up Loewen and Philp's (2006) findings, short and stressed recasts with few changes and declarative intonation are likely to be beneficial for students as shown in posttests. These characteristics may also be claimed to make the recasts more explicit and less ambiguous. We have seen that the recasts observed in this study were largely unstressed, the majority was not segmented, and half of them were coded as longer recasts. In addition, just under half of the recasts contained more than one change. All these characteristics contribute in making the recasts more implicit, and as claimed by Loewen and Philp (2006), not as effective for learning as they could be.

How does the classroom discourse and negative feedback explicitness fit in with Lyster and Mori's Counterbalance Hypothesis (2006)? The hypothesis was accounted for in chapter 3.4.5, but in a nutshell they hypothesized that in instructional settings that focus on content and communication, the type of feedback should be made explicit. This will effectively shift the learners' attention from meaning to form, which will again raise their awareness regarding the corrected item. In all of the lessons observed, the focus was unequivocally on meaning and communication rather on the language itself. Following the Counterbalance Hypothesis, the feedback provided should have been made explicit. Except for one instance of explicit correction, the chosen feedback type in the other occasions was recasts. We have seen that although recasts have generally been viewed as quite implicit in nature, they actually may vary considerably in implicitness. However, using the characteristics described by Loewen and Philp (2006), the recasts observed generally proved not to be particularly explicit. On this basis, the occurrences of negative feedback observed in this study, combined with the classroom focus on meaning, did not correspond well with the principles of the Counterbalance Hypothesis.

7.5 Uptake

The table below shows the amount of uptake following negative feedback. Successful uptake means that the student corrected his or her non-target-like utterance successfully after having received negative feedback from the teacher. This only happened once during the observation. A phonological error was observed when a student read a text out loud. The teacher recast the wrongly pronounced word, and the student repeated the teacher's correction. There were no reports of unsuccessful uptake – a wrong repetition from a student after having received negative feedback. The two other categories, none and no chance, depend on whether the student was given the chance to correct the non-target-like utterance (none), or if the teacher for example chose to continue the conversation straight after providing the feedback (no chance). It should also be noted that the instances where teachers translated unsolicited used of L1 have been included here, thus raising the total number of negative feedback moves to 25.

Table 7.5

Uptake

	n	Percentage
Successful	1	4%
Unsuccessful	-	-
None	19	76%
No chance	5	20%
Total	25	100%

Except for the one instance of student uptake, the other 24 negative feedback turns did not lead to uptake. Five of the feedback turns did not leave any room for uptake, as the focus was immediately turned elsewhere by the teacher, or more rarely by other students. However, in most cases there was time for the student to repeat the utterance. This does not mean that the teacher was waiting for it to happen, expecting uptake from the student. Body language is a feature that has not been covered in the observation scheme. The teacher may use facial

expressions, eye contact or other gestures to signal for example approval, disapproval, or expectancy to the students. There were no instances where I got the impression that uptake was anticipated by the teacher, neither through body language nor through the feedback that was given. Thus, the instances of pauses after the teacher's recast were most likely short, natural breaks in the classroom conversation.

Loewen and Philp (2006) report very high rates of learner uptake. For example, 59.6% of the recasts, 45.9% of the inform feedback, and 83.1% of the elicitations were followed by successful uptake. This reflects that the adult language classrooms observed in their study were highly interactive, and the differences in classroom cultures become very clear.

What are possible implications for the lack of uptake? In chapter 3.4.4 the importance of uptake was discussed. We saw that several studies have used the extent of successful uptake as a measurement of how effective negative feedback is in general, and also how effective the different types of negative feedback are. As mentioned, this way of measuring negative feedback have been questioned and criticized by some researchers, and especially recasts have been found to be less efficient since they are less likely than other feedback types to lead to uptake. Even though Loewen and Philp's (2006) study showed a rather high percentage of uptake following negative feedback, this was uncommonly high compared with other studies. The discourse context has been found to play an essential role in whether student uptake will take place (Oliver & Mackey, 2003; Sheen, 2004). When it comes to the importance of uptake, Loewen and Philp (2006) are also among those who suggest that learner repetition of a recast is not a good indication of learning. Their posttests showed that there was a relationship for other types of feedback between successful uptake and successful recall, but for recasts this was not an important factor.

In the teacher's questionnaire, the teachers were presented with a statement regarding uptake: "Uansett om eleven har fått direkte eller indirekte tilbakemelding på feil er det viktig at eleven selv gjentar det som har blitt sagt på en korrekt måte". 48% agreed with the statement, 32% disagreed, and 20% were undecided on the issue. Based on the observations, the two teachers would be likely to disagree with the statement, and they may thus not represent the majority of the teachers' opinions and practices regarding uptake. However, the fact that almost 50 percent of the teachers have indicated that uptake is important in the questionnaire does not

necessarily mean that they all facilitate and encourage student uptake in the classroom. It would have been interesting to let the two teachers in my observations answer the questionnaire prior to the observations, but then they would know the purpose of the classroom observations and possibly change their behavior accordingly.

7.6 Conclusion

To sum up the main findings of the classroom observations, what stands out the most is the low rate of negative feedback provided. Given that most current SLA researchers agree that the provision of negative feedback is important, or at least that giving negative feedback in one way or another is generally more effective than ignoring oral language errors, the findings may be the source of some concern. Furthermore, the negative feedback that was given has almost unanimously consisted of recasts. Contrary to what some of the previous studies have indicated this is not necessarily negative, as the nature and explicitness of recasts may vary considerably.

In addition, there are obvious didactic advantages with the use of recasts which makes it compelling for teachers. However, by investigating the characteristics of the recasts given, they were generally more implicit than what Loewen and Philp (2006) have found to be effective. Moreover, the relatively implicit nature of the negative feedback provided in exclusively communication oriented classrooms is not in line with Lyster and Mori's (2006) hypothesis on instructional counterbalance. Lastly, although the importance of uptake is debated, the lack of uptake following the recasts is also worth noting.

The classroom observations have given interesting insight into the practices of two teachers at upper secondary schools in Norway. In order to make any valid and reliable generalization about practices in the English classroom in Norwegian schools, much more observation in different schools and with different teachers would be necessary. Nevertheless, the observations and teacher interviews have an important function in adding context to the more comprehensive questionnaires. As mentioned in the methods chapter, questionnaires have their limitations, which triangulation through the use of observations and interviews can contribute in making up for. It is only through observation that we see whether the participants actually do what they have indicated in questionnaires and interviews. It is also

interesting to see that the two teachers, who differ in age and educational and occupational background, have quite similar methods and perceptions regarding negative feedback. With the results from the questionnaires in mind, it is likely that several other teachers choose similar methods as well.

8 Teacher interviews

The two teacher participants and the interview procedures have been presented in the methods chapter. As mentioned, an interview guide was made in advance and used during the interviews. The guide is found in appendix 4, while the transcriptions of the interviews are found in appendices 5 and 6. As seen in the transcriptions, the questions asked were not always in the same succession or using the exact same formulations as in the interview guide. The aim was to get the teachers to speak as freely as possible about their methods, views and choices, without too much interruption or leading questions, and sometimes it was natural to ask follow-up questions that were not planned on beforehand. In some cases the teachers answered several of my questions without me having to ask them specifically.

The main content of the interviews will be presented and discussed below. The two interviews will be presented separately, but the two teachers' answers will be compared subsequently. In addition, the teacher interviews will be compared and connected to what was observed during their lessons.

8.1 The female teacher

When asked about the importance of students communicating in the target language in the classroom, the teacher answered that practicing speaking English in the classroom is very important. She highlighted the importance of overcoming the obstacle of speaking a foreign language, and claimed that if this is difficult to do in the classroom it will also be difficult to do outside of the classroom. She was aware that not everybody likes to speak English in the classroom, but was of the opinion that parts of the English lessons in school should be used to help them overcome that fear.

According to the teacher, a problem during a regular, teacher controlled lesson is that it is difficult to get everybody to contribute orally. Therefore, they may be given tasks where they communicate together in pairs. In this way they get to practice a bit before going through the content in class. The teacher also indicated that there should be a period in each lesson where the students get to speak English. This may not always fit in depending on the content of the lesson, but she then suggested that they start off by speaking about this and that just to get used to speaking English during the lessons.

Asked about her thoughts on oral language errors in the classroom, she said that it is important to know the students really well before correcting them. She maintained that the most important thing is that they actually speak in the classroom. She also mentioned there being several phases in language learning, and that she often experiences committing language errors herself, even though she is aware of them being wrong. However, if she sees that a student commits a systematic error that recurs often, she is open to finding a suitable time and manner of correcting it.

The teacher claimed that direct correction of errors in the classroom may have an impeding effect on oral production among students. Therefore, she tries to correct errors without making the students feel like they are being corrected. She does this by giving them confirmatory answers while reformulating the students' utterances. This method is compared to explicit correction; "no sa du det og det, det heiter sånn og sånn", and metalinguistic correction: "hugs 's'en der". The teacher was skeptical towards using such negative feedback types. In her opinion, if such feedback is used it is vital to know that the student is eager to learn and is willing to 'soak up' these types of corrections.

I asked her if she consciously uses the feedback method of reformulating students' non-target-like utterances in the classroom. She answered that she thinks she tries to do it, and that in every classroom there will be strong students that will be able to understand that a correction has taken place. Whether the students are conscious about the correction or not, they will benefit from hearing the correct reformulation. Furthermore, she emphasized that when a student is trying to say something in the classroom there will be an element of stress, because the teacher and fellow students are listening. In addition, trying to express the idea that is in your head, and thinking about which words you should use and the manner in which the message should be conveyed, are challenging factors. Thus, if something does not come out correctly, it is not necessarily due to a systematic error in the student's language knowledge.

When asked whether there are occasions where she thinks it is best to raise the student's awareness that an error has been made, she said that it depends. If the class has been working with specific vocabulary, and errors are committed in connection to that, the teacher might raise awareness about the error. She also added that she tends to translate students' utterances in Norwegian to English. However, again she stressed the importance of letting the students speak freely, without being 'arrested' when making a language error. According to the teacher

the students should always be rewarded for taking the word in class, regardless of the content of their utterances.

The teacher also added that, while not being entirely sure regarding her own actions regarding oral error correction, she does not react to grammatical errors. She does not think that the students will understand the correction, and that it is thus not likely to lead to acquisition. In her opinion, correction of such errors are better to do in written work, where the student has time to analyze his or her own text and work on certain aspects of the language.

In answer to what she thought the students' views on error correction in the classroom are, the teacher believed that students' views on the topic will vary considerably. In short, she indicated that there will be strong students who will probably appreciate all input that will help them improve their English skills, while there are also students who will refuse to speak the rest of the term if they get corrected. She admitted that this makes it challenging to find the correct balance in the classroom, but mentioned individual conversations or group work as more suitable occasions for giving feedback. In the teacher's opinion, class discussions are not suited for error correction.

The teacher was presented with two audio clips from the classroom observations. The clips are transcribed below:

Sound clip 1:

VG1 Healthcare, Childhood and Youth Development: (About moussaka)

Teacher: Do you make it?

Student: My mum **do**.

Teacher: Your mum makes it?

Sound clip 2:

VG1 General Studies: (About advertisements)

Teacher: Why shouldn't we have political advertisements?

Student: Because the big parties have more money, and they could advertise for **themselves**, and people **that** don't know what to **elect** they just "ah, I saw him on television, he seems like... it seems like a good party, I think I'll pick them.

Teacher: Yes, exactly!

The teacher was then asked to comment on the audio clips. She remembered both of the situations. Regarding the first clip, the teacher claimed that she was intending to correct the error by reformulating, but then chose a different verb. If she could do the correction again, she would do it differently, because she does not think that the student will recognize that the reformulation is in the third person singular. The teacher described the episode as a golden opportunity that was lost.

Commenting on the second clip, the teacher here commented that she was busy writing on the blackboard, and did not hear that the students said "what to elect". She would not want to correct the other two errors in the student's utterance because of the risk of losing focus on the main point of the activity, which was to discuss political advertisements. When asked about whether she would react to "what to elect" if she had heard it, she admitted that she would probably have reformulated the utterance and not just have said "yes, exactly".

Furthermore, when asked about whether she could remember any focus on error correction and negative feedback during her teacher training, she mentioned some focus on word associations. The teacher can provide synonyms or a broader vocabulary when speaking with the students, without interrupting them. The aim is to let the students talk, and add words that they could have used without stopping the conversation to make the students repeat them. She confirmed that the method described is very similar to her use of recasts in the classroom.

Lastly, the teacher emphasized that she was new to the classes, and had been told by colleagues that there were certain students that were very shy and did not want to contribute orally in class. Her goal was to create a climate in the classroom where there could be oral contribution from the students, and where she could help the students improve their language without giving them a feeling of being corrected.

8.2 The male teacher

As his colleague, the male teacher thinks it is important to practice communicating in English in the classroom. He reasoned that while not everybody will need to be able to write in English later in life, knowing how to speak English is vital. In addition, he emphasized the importance of overcoming the fear of speaking English.

The teacher claimed that there is a great deal of oral activities in his classes. He has a year plan with longer periods of oral work, and is constantly searching for new ways to get the students to speak in the classroom. Some of his methods include games of various types and jigsaw interviews, and he is careful to always speak English in the classroom himself. However, he added a basis for assessing the students is required, so there needs to be written work as well. Asked whether he thought it is a problem that students speak Norwegian during the lesson, he answered that it varied from class to class. Two of his classes required some use of Norwegian due to having some problems understanding, but generally he thought that the students were quite adept at speaking English.

His thoughts on oral errors were that everybody commits errors sometimes, and he very rarely uses what he calls direct correction. In fact he claimed to rarely correct errors at all. During teacher—student conversations the teacher sometimes asks the students whether they would like to have their oral errors corrected. Often the students indicate that they would like the teacher to correct them, but the teacher maintained that there is great individual variation.

Nevertheless, the teacher was reluctant to correct, and justified this with his fear of students getting anxious about speaking English or unsure about their own abilities to communicate orally in the TL. In addition, he thought that most errors will disappear on their own as the students increase their proficiency. He also compared oral error correction with his correction of written errors, where the students seem to have fossilized errors. For example, the word

‘with’ is often spelled ‘whit’ by students, even though the error has been corrected several times.

He did, however, admit that he sometimes repeats a student’s utterance, correcting the part of the utterance that is incorrect. This is more often done when the students read than when they speak freely. When he senses that the students are unsure about the pronunciation of a word when reading, it is OK to provide them with the correct pronunciation, but in a conversation the focus should be on communication, not on error correction. I point out that some researchers have found recasts to be ambiguous, so the students will not always understand that they are corrected. The teacher agreed that this probably happens quite often, but suggested that hearing the recasts may nevertheless have a positive effect on learning.

Asked whether some errors are more important to correct than others, the teacher stated that he tries to focus on errors that interfere with communication, and so-called ‘Norwegian errors’, meaning direct translations from Norwegian to English. He provided an example of such an error: “I have it good”.

The teacher brought up what he viewed as a problem with correction in the classroom, namely that of peer correction. He has had to ask students to stop correcting others, as they tend to do it too often, and not in a manner which the teacher will tolerate. Often the students are rude saying things like “Oh, you don’t know English”, and the teacher viewed this as a serious problem. Another problem is that some students have already decided on which attitude they will have to learning and speaking English, and a negative attitude is not always easy to change.

As mentioned in the methods chapter, the teacher finished his pedagogical education in 1997. This being 17 years ago, he did not remember details about his education. However, he believed that the instruction regarding error correction was to avoid constant and direct correction of language errors. He was not familiar with any research on the topic since he finished his teacher training, but added that his classroom teaching is a way of doing research, trying out new methods and seeing how they work. One thing he had noticed is how good the students’ pronunciation often is, sometimes even better than the teacher’s. He suggested that increasing input will give the students better pronunciation, and maintained that there are generally few serious oral errors that require correction. In general, he was more concerned with the students’ problems regarding written English than the correction of oral errors.

8.3 Teacher comparison and discussion

The classroom observations showed that both teachers included some oral activities in their lessons. Therefore, the fact that both teachers agree that oral practice is important in the classroom is no surprise. Whereas the female teacher generally tries to include some conversation in every lesson, the male teacher chooses to have longer periods of oral activities and written activities. They both emphasize the importance of overcoming fear and anxiety when it comes to speaking English, and state this as one of the main reasons why there is a great deal of focus on oral English in class.

Furthermore, both of the teachers seem to be conscious about their choices regarding negative feedback. They are reluctant to provide students with negative feedback, but both state that they sometimes use recasts to correct their students. The female teacher uses this type of feedback because the students will not feel like they are being corrected. The male teacher says that he usually uses recasts during reading, when he senses that the students need help in pronouncing a word. Thus, the male teacher's use of recasts is even more limited than the female teacher's. If we examine the observation reports, we see that only one instance of negative feedback was observed in the male teacher's lessons, and this was precisely a recast of a phonological error during reading. Also the female teacher's reluctance to provide negative feedback and explicit types of feedback in particular correlates with what was observed during her lessons. Both teachers acknowledge that recasts may not always be perceived as corrections, but they believe that they nevertheless may have facilitative effects on acquisition. The male teacher's recast of a single word during reading will most likely be understood by the students, as this has quite explicit characteristics. On the other hand, many of the female teacher's recasts were long, declarative, and unstressed, thus having quite implicit characteristics.

The female teacher's thoughts about the use of implicit recasts are similar to those of Doughty (2001) and Long (2007), who claim that recasts are useful because of their implicitness. However, an important difference is that the teacher's main reason for providing such recasts is to avoid anxiety, while the researchers believe that they are more likely to facilitate acquisition. In addition, we have seen that the views of these researchers do not correlate with most of the newer research on the effectiveness of negative feedback.

The teachers state very similar reasons why they are reluctant to correct oral errors. They fear that error correction will have an impeding effect on students' willingness to communicate orally. In addition, the male teacher does not find it necessary to correct most oral errors, as most of them are minor errors and likely to disappear by themselves. However, he does concede that there are instances of 'Norwegian errors' that require some focus. The female teacher is open to finding a suitable time and manner to correct recurring errors. Also, if the class has been working with specific vocabulary, focusing on form, she is more inclined to raise awareness about language errors committed in relation to that.

The teachers' reluctance to use negative feedback in the classroom correlates well with the teachers' indications in the questionnaire. The teachers taking the questionnaire did not have the chance to express why they have this reluctance, but the teachers' answers regarding this in the interviews are likely to be representative for many other teachers as well. However, as few as 24 percent of the teachers agreed with the statement that students learn a lot from having their oral errors corrected, and 48 percent disagreed. This tells us that many of the teachers in the questionnaire do not believe that negative feedback facilitates acquisition to a large degree, and the two teachers interviewed indicate the same perceptions. The teachers' views also correlate well with the opinions of the teachers in Lasagabaster and Sierra's study (2005).

Both teachers believe that there are major individual variations regarding students' desire to be corrected. However, the male teacher sometimes asks his students about it, and they more often than not tell him that they would like to be corrected. The female teacher thinks that there will always be strong students that desire and will benefit from negative feedback, while there are also students that will react negatively and refuse to speak again if corrected. The teacher admits that this makes it difficult to find the right balance in the classroom regarding error correction. This is also why she thinks that it is important to know the individual students well before providing any negative feedback.

As shown in the student questionnaire, 37 percent of the students indicated a dislike to being corrected in the classroom. Thus, the teachers' belief that some students are anxious about error correction may be warranted. Even though the majority of students in the questionnaire are positive towards the learning effects of negative feedback and generally show a desire to be corrected, the student minority indicating otherwise should not be ignored.

8.4 Summary

The teacher interviews have shown that the two teachers have similar views on most aspects of oral error correction. They both value and encourage oral English participation by the students in the classroom, but are reluctant to correct oral errors due to a fear of causing or increasing student anxiety. Their views and methods regarding negative feedback do not correspond well with research on negative feedback and how it facilitates language acquisition. On the other hand, they have to take into account that students have different views and reactions to receiving error correction.

What can be done to meet students' expectations, avoid increasing students' anxiety of speaking English in the classroom, while at the same time use practices of negative feedback that facilitate acquisition? As mentioned in the questionnaire chapter, explaining methods and how negative feedback may help students improve their English, in addition to speaking with the students about their perceptions regarding negative feedback, may be of some help. The female teacher mentioned that it is important to know the students well before correcting them, and the male teacher stated that he sometimes asked them whether they would like to be corrected. Getting to know your students' perceptions, and trying to make individual agreements and use practices that work well with each student, might be important contributions to facilitate language acquisition.

9 Conclusion

This study has used three different methods to answer four research questions regarding oral negative feedback. A summary of the findings, along with comments on limitations of the study and suggestions for further research follows.

What are Norwegian students' and teachers' perceptions regarding correction of oral English errors in the classroom? In answer to this research question, the questionnaires show that the majority of students would prefer their oral English errors to be corrected, whereas the majority of teachers are generally less positive towards error correction. Furthermore, the teachers indicate skepticism towards substantial facilitative effects of negative feedback, while the majority of the students believe that they learn a great deal being corrected. Thus, there are considerable differences in perception between students and teachers regarding the distribution and effects of negative feedback. Students' expectations about how their language skills can improve, in addition to their own experiences in receiving negative feedback, may help explain their overall affinity towards error correction. The study suggests that the differing perceptions may have negative effects on students' motivation and lead to disillusionment. However, it must be stressed that there is a need for further research on this area, and that the sample size was relatively small, especially for the teacher's questionnaire.

The thesis offers further insight into teachers' perceptions through the teacher interviews. There will undeniably be large individual differences in teachers' perceptions, and it cannot be claimed that these two teachers represent the majority of Norwegian teachers' views on error correction. Nevertheless, the interviews show that the two teachers, differing considerably in age and educational and vocational background, had similar views regarding error correction. They were both reluctant towards the use of negative feedback, and their main concern was that it may lead to increased language anxiety among students. The teachers' comments correlated well with what was observed during their lessons, and their skepticism towards error correction fit well with the results from the questionnaires.

However, while the two teachers mentioned recasts as the only type of feedback that they sometimes use, again correlating with what was observed, the teachers in the questionnaires did not indicate such a preference. As for most studies, this study being no exception, there

are limitations that restrict generalizations and interpretability. The use of questionnaires, where participants are forced to respond only to a specific set of items, has its disadvantages. The statements regarding the explicitness of negative feedback may have been too vague, or they may have been misinterpreted by participants, as is often the case with questionnaires (Dörnyei, 2008). In addition, some problems regarding the items in Schulz's (2001) study have previously been discussed.

To what extent do Norwegian students' and teachers' perceptions about negative feedback differ from those of students and teachers in other cultures? In order to answer the second research question, the results from my questionnaire, being a partial replication of Schulz's (2001), were compared with her research on students and teachers from Columbia and the US. Whereas Schulz only found minor cultural differences between the students from Columbia and the US, and the teachers from Columbia and the US respectively, her results showed that there were major divergences between students' and teachers' perceptions about negative feedback. The students from Columbia and the US were almost unanimously positive towards error correction. Compared with these cultures, Norwegian students are considerably less favorable towards negative feedback. The Norwegian teachers are also less positive towards negative feedback than their colleagues from the two other cultures, but even though the differences between students and teachers in Norway are large, they are generally not as large as between teachers and students in the two other cultures.

Important divergences between the participants in the two studies have been addressed, for example regarding proficiency and education level. This may account for some of the cultural differences. Nevertheless, the divergences highlight the importance of conducting more research in general, but it also justifies conducting research in Norway, as research in other cultures may not be transferable to Norwegian schools.

The classroom observations were useful in providing a basis for the teacher interviews, and as mentioned, questionnaires have their limitations which triangulation through the use of observations and interviews can contribute in making up for. It is through observation that we see whether the participants actually do what they have indicated in questionnaires and interviews. In addition, the observations are vital in order to answer research question 3 and 4.

To what extent does the English teaching in Norwegian schools correspond with the principles of the Counterbalance Hypothesis? The principles of the Counterbalance

Hypothesis (Lyster & Mori, 2006) are both interesting and relatively simple to implement, as the instructional setting and discourse context of the classroom will determine the explicitness of the negative feedback provided. The classroom discourse observed in this study, with highly meaning-based lessons, would require quite explicit correction. However, this was not the case, as the negative feedback provided largely consisted of recasts with implicit characteristics. It should be stressed that the Counterbalance Hypothesis is still a merely a hypothesis, and more research will need to be conducted in order to test its principles before making any conclusions.

What is the degree of explicitness of the negative feedback provided in Norwegian schools, and how do the general practices regarding negative feedback correspond with previous research on the topic? Having mentioned that the negative feedback provided by the teachers during the observations largely consisted of relatively implicit recasts, I have already answered part of research question 4. Much of the previous research on negative feedback has simply regarded all uses of recasts as implicit in nature, but newer research has shown that recasts may vary substantially in explicitness. Thus, much of the research deeming recasts as less effective than other feedback types may have to be revisited. In accordance with Loewen and Philp's (2006) characteristics of recasts, those who were observed in this study were nevertheless largely implicit. Indeed, one of the teachers stated in the interview that she preferred correcting errors without giving the students a feeling of being corrected, and this explains the use of implicit feedback.

In response to how the general practices regarding negative feedback correspond with previous research on the topic, we have seen that the percentage of errors being responded to in this study was remarkably low. The same can be said about the rate of uptake, which was almost nonexistent. In addition, the percentage of recasts was remarkably high compared to other research, even though recasts are normally the most used type of feedback. Lexical errors were responded to the most, which is in correspondence with previous research. It should, however, be stressed that the relatively low number of lessons observed, with a limited number of teachers and classes, is likely to have contributed to the large differences in comparison with more comprehensive research.

In addition to the need for more research on students' and teachers' perceptions in general, further research should attempt to investigate how attitudes to oral correction influence the effectiveness of negative feedback, and in which ways practices in the classroom can

influence the students' perceptions of error correction. Additionally, it would be interesting to investigate the focus of error correction in teacher education programs in Norway to see whether there is congruence between research and instruction on the topic, as well as to shed more light on which factors that determine a teacher's practices.

To sum up, this thesis has given an insight to Norwegian teachers' and students' perceptions, in addition to teachers' practices, regarding oral English error correction in the upper secondary classroom. The teachers' reluctance towards negative feedback, as indicated in the questionnaire, observed during the lessons, and expressed through the interviews, does not correlate well with what research on the topic has found to be effective for acquisition, nor does it correspond with the students' perceptions. These findings are important, as they are likely to negatively affect the quality and effectiveness of English instruction in Norwegian schools. However, in order to make any valid and reliable generalizations about practices in the English classroom in Norwegian schools, more research in a larger number of classrooms with a larger number of teachers is necessary. Nevertheless, this study has contributed to gathering knowledge about perceptions and practices in Norwegian schools, which is vital in order to give further suggestions for teaching practices and the content of the teacher education programs.

References

- Abbuhl, R. (2011). Why, when, and how to replicate research. *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide*, 296-312.
- Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 28, 543-574.
- Ayoun, D. (2001). The role of negative and positive feedback in the second language acquisition of the passé composé and imparfait. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 226-243.
- Bell, T. R. (2005). Behaviors and attitudes of effective foreign language teachers: Results of a questionnaire study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 38(2), 259-270.
- Braidi, S. M. (2002). Reexamining the Role of Recasts in Native-Speaker/Nonnative-Speaker Interactions. *Language Learning*, 52(1), 1-42.
- Brooks, N. (1960). *Language and language learning: Theory and practice*. . New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 15(03), 357-386.
- Cathcart, R., & Olsen, J. (1976). Teachers' and students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors. *TESOL*, 76, 41-53.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. D., & Robbins, M. (1976). Toward assessing interlanguage performance: the relationship between selected errors, learners' characteristics, and learners' explanations. *Language Learning*, 26(1), 45-66.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2004). *A guide to teaching practice*: Psychology Press.
- Doughty, C. (2001). Cognitive underpinnings of focus on form. *Cognition and second language instruction*, 206-257.
- Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, 1, 114-138.

- Dörnyei, Z. (2008). *Questionnaires in second language research: construction, administration, and processing*. New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 28(02), 339-368. doi:10.1017/S0272263106060141
- Ellis, R., & Sheen, Y. (2006). Reexamining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 28(4), 575.
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2006). Input, interaction and output: An overview. *AILA review*, 19(1), 3-17.
- Graddol, D. (1997). *The future of English*. London: The British Council.
- Gregersen, T. S. (2003). To Err Is Human: A Reminder to Teachers of Language-Anxious Students. *Foreign Language Annals*, 36(1), 25-32.
- Griffiths, C., & Parr, J. M. (2001). Language-learning strategies: theory and perception. *ELT Journal*, 55(3), 247-254.
- Han, Z. (2002). A study of the impact of recasts on tense consistency in L2 output. *Tesol Quarterly*, 36(4), 543-572.
- Havranek, G. (2002). When is corrective feedback most likely to succeed? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3-4), 255-270. doi: 10.1016/s0883-0355(03)00004-1
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398.
- Horner, D. (1988). Classroom correction: Is it correct? *System*, 16(2), 213-220.
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283-294.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. *Sociolinguistics*, 269-293.
- Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 25(01), 1-36.
- Kachru, B. B. (1990). World Englishes and applied linguistics. *World Englishes*, 9(1), 3-20. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-971X.1990.tb00683.x
- Keck, C., Iberri-Shea, G., Tracy-Ventura, N., & Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2006). Investigating the empirical link between task-based interaction and acquisition. *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 13, 91.

- Krashen, S. (1981). Second language acquisition. *Second Language Learning*.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*: Oxford Pergamon.
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2006a). National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training. Retrieved 24.03.2014, from <http://www.udir.no/Stottemeny/English/Curriculum-in-English/>
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2006b). National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training. Retrieved 12.04.2014, from <http://www.udir.no/kl06/ENG1-03/Hele/Kompetansemaal/Kompetansemal-etter-Vg1--studieforberedende-utdanningsprogram-og-Vg2---yrkesfaglige-utdanningsprogram/?lplang=eng>
- Kunnskapsdepartementet. (2006c). National Curriculum for Knowledge Promotion in Primary and Secondary Education and Training. Retrieved 12.04.2014, from <http://www.udir.no/Lareplaner/Veiledninger-til-LK06/Veileder-fremmedsprak-cont/Undervisningsveiledning-til-lareplan-i-Fremmedsprak/Artikler-niva-1/Introduksjon-til-eksempelbasert-veiledning-i-grunnleggende-norsk/>
- Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2005). Error correction: Students' versus teachers' perceptions. *Language Awareness, 14*(2-3), 112-127.
- Leeman, J. (2003). Recasts and second language development. *Studies in second language acquisition, 25*(01), 37-63.
- Li, S. (2010). The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback in SLA: A Meta-Analysis. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 309-365. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus on form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching. *Studies in second language acquisition, 12*(4), 429-448.
- Lochtman, K. (2002). Oral corrective feedback in the foreign language classroom: How it affects interaction in analytic foreign language teaching. *International Journal of Educational Research, 37*(3), 271-283.
- Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Corrective feedback in the chatroom: An experimental study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 19*(1), 1-14.
- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2006). Recasts in the Adult English L2 Classroom: Characteristics, Explicitness, and Effectiveness. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(4), 536-556. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.2006.00465.x

- Loewen, S., & Philp, J. (2012). Instructed Second Language Acquisition. *Research methods in second language acquisition: A practical guide*, 53-73.
- Long, M. H. (1981). Input, interaction, and second-language acquisition. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 379(1), 259-278. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.1981.tb42014.x
- Long, M. H. (1983). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2), 126-141.
- Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective*, 2, 39-52.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of second language acquisition*, 2, 413-468.
- Long, M. H. (2007). *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lyster, R. (1998a). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48(2), 183-218.
- Lyster, R. (1998b). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 20(01), 51-81.
- Lyster, R., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). A response to Truscott's 'What's wrong with oral grammar correction?'. *Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, 55(4), 457-467.
- Lyster, R., & Mori, H. (2006). Interactional feedback and instructional counterbalance. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 28(2), 269.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 19(01), 37-66.
- Lyster, R., & Saito, K. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 32(2), 265-302.
- Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 21(4), 557-587.
- Mackey, A., Al-Khalil, M., Atanassova, G., Hama, M., Logan-Terry, A., & Nakatsukasa, K. (2007). Teachers' Intentions and Learners' Perceptions about Corrective Feedback in the L2 Classroom. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 1(1), 129-152. doi: 10.2167/illt047.0
- Mackey, A., & Goo, J. (2007). Interaction research in SLA: A meta-analysis and research synthesis.

- Mackey, A., Oliver, R., & Leeman, J. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS–NNS and NNS–NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning*, 53(1), 35-66.
- Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(3), 338-356.
- McKay, S. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: rethinking goals and approaches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as Feedback to Language Learners. *Language Learning*, 51(4), 719-758. doi: 10.1111/0023-8333.00172
- Norris, J. M., & Ortega, L. (2000). Effectiveness of L2 instruction: A research synthesis and quantitative meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 50(3), 417-528.
- Oliver, R. (1995). Negative feedback in child NS-NNS conversation. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 17, 459-482.
- Oliver, R., & Mackey, A. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(4), 519-533.
- Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding second language acquisition*. London: Hodder Education.
- Panova, I., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *Tesol Quarterly*, 36(4), 573-595.
- Philp, J. (2003). Constraints on “noticing the gap”. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 25(01), 99-126.
- Pica, T., Young, R., & Doughty, C. (1987). The impact of interaction on comprehension. *Tesol Quarterly*, 21(4), 737-758.
- Roberts, M. (1995). Awareness and the efficacy of error correction. *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*, 163-182.
- Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 133-164.
- Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 6(1), 21-31.
- Sauro, S. (2009). Computer-mediated corrective feedback and the development of L2 grammar. *Language Learning & Technology*, 13(1), 96-120.
- Schachter, J. (1991). Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 89-102. doi: 10.1177/026765839100700202

- Schmidt, R. (1983). Interaction, acculturation, and the acquisition of communicative competence: A case study of an adult. *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*, 137, 174.
- Schmidt, R. (1995). Consciousness and foreign language learning: A tutorial on the role of attention and awareness in learning. *Attention and awareness in foreign language learning*, 1-63.
- Schmidt, R., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition*, 237-326.
- Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 343-364.
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244-258.
- Schwartz, B. D. (1993). On explicit and negative data effecting and affecting competence and linguistic behavior. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 15, 147-147.
- Sealey, A. (2010). *Researching English language: a resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- Sheen, Y. (2004). Corrective feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8(3), 263-300.
- Slimani, A. (1992). Evaluation of classroom interaction. *Evaluating second language education*, 197-221.
- Spada, N., & Lightbown, P. M. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in second language acquisition*, 15, 205-205.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. *Input in second language acquisition*, 15, 165-179.
- Terrell, T. D. (1977). A Natural Approach to Second Language Acquisition and Learning1. *The Modern Language Journal*, 61(7), 325-337.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: A response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.

- White, L. (1989). *Universal grammar and second language acquisition* (Vol. 1): John Benjamins Publishing.
- White, L. (1991). Adverb placement in second language acquisition: Some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research*, 7(2), 133-161.
- Williams, J. (2001). The effectiveness of spontaneous attention to form. *System*, 29(3), 325-340.
- Williams, J., & Evans, J. (1998). What kind of focus and on which forms? *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*, 139.
- Yilmaz, Y. (2012). The Relative Effects of Explicit Correction and Recasts on Two Target Structures via Two Communication Modes. *Language Learning*, 62(4), 1134-1169. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9922.2012.00726.x

Appendices

1. Students' questionnaire

Retting av muntlige feil i klasserommet

SPØRREUNDERSØKELSE FOR ELEVER SOM TAR ENGELSK PÅ VIDEREGÅENDE SKOLE

Formålet med denne spørreundersøkelsen er å få innsikt i dine tanker og holdninger til retting av muntlige språkfeil i engelsktimene.

Spørreundersøkelsen vil bli brukt som en del av Masteroppgaven min ved Universitetet i Oslo. Innholdet vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Jeg vil også minne om at dette ikke er en test med 'rette' eller 'gale' svar, så svar så oppriktig som mulig.

Tusen takk for din deltakelse.

Kjønn: _____

Fylke: _____

Utdanningsprogram: _____

Klassetrinn (VG1, VG2, VG3): _____

Ta stilling til følgende påstander og kryss av i hvilken grad du er enig/uenig.

1. Jeg misliker å bli rettet på i klasserommet.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

2. Lærere bør **ikke** rette på elevenes språkfeil i klasserommet.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

3. Når jeg snakker engelsk vil jeg at læreren skal rette på feilene mine.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

4. Jeg foretrekker å bli rettet av medelever i små grupper fremfor å bli rettet av læreren foran klassen.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

5. Jeg lærer mye av at læreren retter mine medelevers språkfeil i klasserommet.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

6. Jeg lærer mye av at læreren retter mine språkfeil i klasserommet.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

7. Jeg foretrekker at læreren forteller meg direkte hva jeg har sagt feil og retter på det.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

8. Jeg foretrekker at læreren forteller meg indirekte at jeg har sagt noe feil.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

2. Teachers' questionnaire

Retting av muntlige feil i klasserommet

SPØRREUNDERSØKELSE FOR ENGELSKLÆRERE PÅ VIDEREGÅENDE SKOLE

Formålet med denne spørreundersøkelsen er å få innsikt i læreres holdninger til retting av elevers muntlige språkfeil i engelsk i klasserommet. I tillegg vil den gi en indikasjon på hvorvidt lærere har kjennskap til elevenes holdninger til samme tema.

Spørreundersøkelsen vil bli brukt som en del av Masteroppgaven min ved Universitetet i Oslo. Innholdet vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Jeg vil også minne om at dette ikke er en test med 'rette' eller 'gale' svar, så svar så oppriktig som mulig.

Tusen takk for din deltakelse.

Kjønn: _____ Alder: _____ Fylke: _____

Hvor mange år har du undervist i engelsk? _____

Hvilken språkutdanning og pedagogisk utdanning har du?

Hvilket år avsluttet du din utdanning? _____

Ta stilling til følgende påstander og kryss av i hvilken grad du er enig/uenig.

1. De fleste elever misliker å bli rettet på i undervisningen.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

*2. Lærere bør **ikke** rette på elevers uttale eller grammatiske feil i klasserommet unntatt dersom disse feilene forstyrrer kommunikasjonen.*

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

3. Elever foretrekker å bli rettet av medelever i små grupper heller enn å bli rettet av læreren foran hele klassen.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

4. Elever lærer mye av at læreren retter andre elevers språkfeil i klasserommet.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

5. Elever lærer mye av at læreren retter deres egne språkfeil i klasserommet.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

6. Generelt sett bør feil som begås av elever når de snakker engelsk i klasserommet rettes på.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

7. Jeg er bevisst på når og hvordan jeg retter på elever som begår språkfeil.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

8. Jeg er kjent med forskning på retting av elevenes feil i klasserommet.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

9. Jeg foretrekker å direkte fortelle eleven hva som er feil og rette på det.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

10. Jeg foretrekker å indirekte indikere at noe eleven har sagt er feil.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

11. Uansett om eleven har fått direkte eller indirekte tilbakemelding på feil er det viktig at eleven selv gjentar det som har blitt sagt på en korrekt måte.

Svært uenig	Litt uenig	Hverken enig eller uenig	Litt enig	Svært enig

3. Observation schemes

The scheme was coded as follows:

Error responded to: Yes/No

Feedback types: Prompt, Explicit feedback, Recast, Translation.

Error type: Lexical, Phonological, Morphological/Syntactic, Combination.

Uptake: Successful, Unsuccessful, None, No chance.

The recast scheme was coded as follows:

Length of recast: Fewer than five morphemes, Five or more morphemes.

Prosodic emphasis: Unstressed, Stressed.

Segmentation: Segmented, Whole.

Number of changes: One change, Two or more.

Intonation: Declarative, Interrogative.

Class: VG1 Healthcare, Childhood and Youth Development

Date: March 10th, 2014

	Type of activity	Error responded to	Feedback type	Error type	Uptake
09:10	What the world eats: The teacher has put up 25 pictures of families from different countries, and what they eat on an average week. The students are supposed to walk around and study the pictures.				
09:15	The teacher asks questions about the content of the pictures.	No		Lexical	
09:16		No		Lexical	
09:16		Yes	Recast	Morphological/ Syntactic	No chance
09:17		No		Morphological/ Syntactic	
09:18		No		Morphological/ Syntactic	
09:19		Yes	Translation		None
09:19		Yes	Translation		None
09:20	Pair - or individual work. Written questions about the pictures.				
09:44		Yes	Recast	Phonological	None

09:47		No		Morphological/ Syntactic	
09:50	Break: 10 minutes				
10:02	The teacher goes through the questions in class				
10:05		Yes	Recast	Lexical	None
10:05		Yes	Recast	Lexical	None
10:06		Yes	Recast	Morphological/ Syntactic	No chance
10:09		Yes	Recast	Phonological	Yes
10:11		Yes	Explicit correction	Lexical	None
10:14		Yes	Translation		None
10:16		No		Phonological	
10:23		Yes	Translation		None
10:23		Yes	Translation		No chance
10:31		Yes	Recast	Lexical	None
10:34		Yes	Recast	Morphological/ Syntactic	None
10:36		Yes	Translation		None
10:37		Yes	Recast	Lexical	No chance
10:37		Yes	Translation		None
10:40	The class is dismissed				

Recast scheme

VG1 Healthcare, Childhood and Youth Development

Time	Length of recast	Prosodic emphasis	Segmentation	Number of changes	Intonation
09:16	Five or more morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	One change	Interrogative
09:44	Fewer than five morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	One change	Declarative
10:05	Fewer than five morphemes	Stressed	Segmented	One change	Declarative
10:05	Fewer than five morphemes	Unstressed	Segmented	One change	Declarative
10:06	Five or more morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	Two or more changes	Declarative
10:09	Fewer than five morphemes	Stressed	Segmented	One change	Declarative
10:31	Fewer than five morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	One change	Declarative
10:34	Fewer than five morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	Two or more changes	Interrogative
10:37	Five or more morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	One change	Interrogative

Class: VG1 General Studies

Date: March 10th, 2014

Time	Type of activity	Error responded to	Feedback type	Error type	Uptake
11:24	The teacher introduces a new topic: American politics. She asks the class questions.				
11:30	Pairwork, discussion				
11:31	Video about Obama, Father's Day				
11:35	Discussing the video in class				
11:40		Yes	Recast	Morphological/Syntactic	None
11:40		Yes	Recast	Morphological/Syntactic	No chance
11:41		No		Phonological	
11:41		No		Morphological/Syntactic	
11:45	Discussion in pairs				
11:47		Yes	Translation		None
11:47		No		Morphological/Syntactic	
11:47		No		Morphological/Syntactic	
11:47		No		Lexical	
11:48		Yes	Translation		None
11:48	Discussion in class				

11:49		No		Morphological/Syntactic	
11:49		No		Morphological/Syntactic	
11:52		Yes	Translation		None
11:55	Practical information				
12:05	Class dismissed				

Recast scheme					
VG1 General Studies					
Time	Length of recast	Prosodic emphasis	Segmentation	Number of changes	Intonation
11:40	Five or more morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	Two or more changes	Declarative
11:40	Five or more morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	Two or more changes	Declarative

Class: VG1 Technical and Industrial Production				
Date: March 11th, 2014				
Time	Type of activity	Error responded to	Feedback type	Error type
10:08	The teacher shows the class a picture. The picture is from a political advertisement. Discussion about what has happened in the picture.			
10:08		Yes	Translation	
10:08		No		Morphological/Syntactic

10:10		Yes	Recast	Combination
10:10	The teacher shows the class a video clip. Class discussion about the content.			
10:14		Yes	Recast	Lexical
10:18	Information about a program - Dipity. The students are to create an account, and make a timeline.			
10:50	Class dismissed			

Recast scheme					
VG1 Technical and Industrial Production					
Time	Length of recast	Prosodic emphasis	Segmentation	Number of changes	Intonation
10:10	Five or more morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	Two or more	Interrogative
10:14	Five or more morphemes	Unstressed	Whole	Two or more	Declarative

Class: VG2 Electricity and Electronics					
Date: March 28th, 2014					
Time	Type of activity	Error responded to	Feedback type	Error type	Uptake
08:35	The teacher introduces the topic: 9/11. He asks the students if they know what 9/11 is. Short class				

	discussion.				
08:37		No		Morphological/ Syntactic	
08:38	The teacher gives information about a class project on 9/11.				
08:40	Students take turns to read aloud from the task description handout.				
08:41		Yes	Recast	Phonological	None
08:41		No		Phonological	
08:46	The teacher gives information about a documentary about 9/11. He starts the movie.				
09:47	The teacher stops the movie. The class is to look at sources online about 9/11.				
09:59	Class dismissed.				

Recast scheme					
VG2 Electricity and Electronics					
Time	Length of recast	Prosodic emphasis	Segmentation	Number of changes	Intonation
08:41	Fewer than five morphemes	Stressed	Segmented	One change	Declarative

Class: VG1 Technical and Industrial Production					
Date: April 23rd, 2014					
Time	Type of activity	Error responded to	Feedback type	Error type	Uptake
10:15	Teacher introduces the topic: prejudice. He writes it on the blackboard and asks the students if they know what it means. This is followed by a class discussion.				
10:16		No		Morphological / Syntactic	
10:18		No		Lexical	
10:18		Yes	Translation		None
10:19	The students are to open their English books. They take turns to read aloud.				
10:20		No		Phonological	
10:21		No		Phonological	
10:22		No		Phonological	
10:24	The students are to do written tasks individually.				
10:59	Short break				
11:06	The teacher goes through the tasks with the students.				
11:08		No		Lexical	
11:09		Yes	Translation		None

11:10		No		Phonological	
11:11	The teacher hands out a text that the students have written. They are to correct the errors and hand it in. When finished they are to listen to a text and do some written tasks.				
11:11		Yes	Translation		None
11:41	The teacher gives information about next English lesson.				
11:43	Class dismissed.				

4. Interview guide

Bakgrunnsspørsmål:

1. Alder:
2. Språkutdanning og pedagogisk utdanning:
3. Kor lenge har du undervist i engelsk, og på kva nivå?

Introduserande spørsmål:

4. Kor viktig meiner du det er at elevane øver på å kommunisere på engelsk i klasserommet?
5. Korleis og i kor stor grad legg du opp til munnlege aktivitetar?
6. Kva tankar gjer du deg når det gjeld munnlege språkfeil i klasserommet?

Meir spesifikke spørsmål om negative feedback:

7. Synes du det er viktig at elevane blir retta når dei begår munnlege språkfeil i klasserommet?
 - Kva kjem det eventuelt an på?
 - Korleis vil du rette på dei?
8. I kor stor grad vil du seie at du er bevisst på når og korleis du rettar på elevane sine språkfeil i klasserommet?
 - Har du faste metodar som du brukar når du korrigerer dei?
 - Kvifor nyttar du den/dei metoden/metodane? / Kvifor ikkje?
 - Er det særskilte typar feil du vel å rette/vel å ikkje rette?
9. Kva syn trur du elevane har på det å bli retta på i klasserommet?

10. Kan du hugse å ha lært om corrective feedback under utdanninga di?

- Er du kjend med forskning på området?

Stimulated recall: Her vil eg spele av eit eller to lydklipp frå måndag, og be læraren om å kommentere på det.

Avslutningsspørsmål:

Grunnen for at vi har hatt denne samtalen var at eg ville få innsikt i dine tankar kring retting av munnlege feil i klasserommet.

Er det noko viktig som vi ikkje har snakka om?

Er det noko du tenkte på underveis men ikke fikk sagt?

Takk for intervjuet.

5. Interview transcription (female teacher)

I: Interviewer

T: Teacher

I: Meiner du det er viktig at elevane øver på å kommunisere på engelsk i klasserommet?

T: Ja, det meiner eg heilt klart er viktig.

I: Kvifor synes du det er viktig?

T: Det er viktig at ein kjem over dei sperrene som er med å bruke eit framandspråk. Viss vi ikkje får til det i klasserommet, vil ikkje vedkommande heller få det til i ein situasjon der han blir nøydd til å prate. Det er nokon som har som studieteknikk å skulle lære veldig mykje ved å lese og skrive, men vi må bli vande til å snakke i klasserommet. Nokon likar ikkje det, men det er viktig at dei kjem over den baugen. Det meiner eg ein del av engelsktimane skal brukast til.

I: No har ikkje du så lang erfaring frå læraryrket, men kan du likevel seie litt om korleis du vil legge opp til munnlege aktivitetar, og i kor stor grad du vil gjere det i forhold til andre aktivitetar?

T: Kanskje prøve å legge opp til aktivitetar der elevane snakkar med kvarandre. No er ikkje her så store klasser, men det er vanskeleg å få til i ein lærarstyrt time at alle bidreg munnleg. Viss dei får i oppgåve å snakke to og to, får dei i alle fall øvd seg litt før vi tek ting i plenum. Det kan vere ein måte.

I forhold til skriftleg tenker eg at det bør vere ein munnleg sekvens i kvar time, men viss det ikkje passar med det vi held på med ellers i timen, kan vi heller starte med å snakke litt om laust og fast slik at dei venner seg til at vi brukar engelsk i timen.

T: Så lurar eg på kva tankar du gjer deg når det gjeld munnlege språkfeil i klasserommet.

I: Der tenker eg at ein skal kjenne elevane veldig godt før ein korrigerer dei, fordi det viktigaste er at dei pratar. Vi veit at der er mange mellomfasar i språk, og eg opplever sjølv stadig å gjere feil som eg sjølv veit er feil. Men dersom ein ser at der er ein systematisk feil som ein elev begår, kan ein kanskje finne ei eigna stund til å seie frå. Å korrigere direkte ting ein høyrer i klasserommet trur eg kan verke hemmande på munnleg aktivitet, men eg prøver så langt eg får det til å rette utan at det blir sett på som retting. At eg svarar bekreftande men

gjer om på det som blir sagt, men då tenkjer eg ikkje på det som retting. Det er jo ei slags korrigering, men ei retting som «no sa du det og det, det heiter sånn og sånn», eller «hugs 's'en der»...då skal ein hvertfall vite at eleven har ein strategi om å bli flink og er villig til å vere 'svamp' på sånne typar tilbakemelding.

I: Så for deg er det altså viktig å kjenne eleven godt før du eventuelt byrjar å rette meir spesifikt på eleven sine feil?

T: Ja, det er det.

I: Akkurat. Det oppgåva mi handlar om er det som blir kalla 'negative' – eller 'corrective feedback', altså enkelt forklart korleis og i kor stor grad lærarar rettar på elevar sine munnlege språkfeil i klasserommet. Der er eg mellom anna interessert i kva slags metodar ein brukar når ein rettar på elevane, i tillegg til kva typar feil som blir retta og kva typar feil som eventuelt ikkje blir retta. Du har jo sagt litt om det allereie, men er der tilfelle der du meiner det er riktig å bevisstgjere eleven om at han har begått ein språkfeil?

T: Det kjem litt an på. Dersom vi har gått gjennom veldig spesifikt vokabular, og det blir sagt feil ord i den samanheng, vil eg kanskje rette merksemd rundt det. Dersom vi har lært noko og hatt det i lekse og det står på ei liste over ting ein skal kunne, men likevel blir uttala feil, då kan det kanskje vere greit å minne på det. Elles vil det få feil fokus for dei andre, som kanskje ikkje vil få med seg at det som var sagt ikkje er rett. Men når vi snakkar fritt, og eg ber elevane om å bidra, skal dei bli minst mulig 'arrestert' i hermetegn på grunn av det. Dei skal alltid bli belønna for at dei tok ordet i timen, samme kva dei seier.

I: Nettopp. Du nemnte at du av og til brukar å rette elevane utan at det blir oppfatta som ei retting, ved å omformulere det eleven har sagt. Vil du seie at dette er ein metode du bruker bevisst i undervisninga?

T: Eg trur kanskje at eg prøver å gjere det. Eg tenker at i alle klasserom vil der vere sterke elevar som vil få med seg kva eg seier, og eg trur at alle elevar har godt av å høyre den rette språkstrukturen. Ofte når nokon sit og skal uttrykkje noko, er det ein miks mellom å vere litt stressa fordi vi er i eit klasserom, og så har du ein idé som du skal prøve å få uttrykt, og så skal du tenke på kva ord du skal seie og kva måte det skal komme ut på. Så det at det ikkje nødvendigvis kjem heilt rett ut treng ikkje å vere eit teikn på ein systematisk feil. Når eleven

høyrrer det om igjen, kan eg av og til sjå gjenkjennande blikk hjå eleven om at det var eigentleg det han ville seie, eller at det var det han meinte.

I: Er det særskilte typar feil du som regel vil rette på, eller på den andre sida typar feil som du bevisst vel å ikkje rette på?

T: Dersom det kjem ord på norsk, så prøver eg å seie det på engelsk. Det er ikkje ein feil då, men eg trur, utan at eg er heilt sikker på meg sjølv når det gjeld dette, at munnlege grammatiske feil ikkje blir 'tatt' av meg fordi eg ikkje trur at eleven nødvendigvis vil få med seg den meldinga. Det vil ikkje føre til læring. Men kanskje dersom nokon gløymer tredje persons 's'en og eg seier det opp att med 's', då kan det hende at det glir inn. Eg ville aldri sagt det på ein grammatisk måte. Det tenker eg er betre skriftleg når vi har analyse av eigen tekst, og du set deg ned og får ei retting med ting som du skal jobbe med. Då vil du ha større føresetnader for å ta med deg den informasjonen.

I: Er det aktuelt for deg å ha undervisningsøkter der ein fokuserer meir på språklege emne?

T: Det kan eg godt sjå for meg, der ein isolerer eitt grammatisk mål, og 'arrestere' i hermeteikn både av lærar og elevar imellom alt som ikkje stemmer. Men då må vi ha fokus på ein ting slik at det blir ein slags leik eller aktivitet med eit mål. Det er viktig at det ikkje opplevast som «å nei, no sa eg noko feil, det skulle eg ikkje ha gjort».

I: Så lurar eg på kva syn du trur elevane har på det å bli retta i klasserommet? Kva trur du dei foretrekker?

T: Det trur eg varierer veldig frå elev til elev. Eg trur at i kvart klasserom er der elevar som alltid er litt i forkant av det vi held på med, og som får veldig fort oversikt over det vi held på med. Disse kunne gjerne hatt meir ting å brynt seg på, og vil sette pris på all input som kan hjelpe dei vidare. Men så trur eg der er elevar som vil bite i seg ei bemerkning, og ikkje vil snakke meir resten av semesteret fordi dei fikk...så då skal du vere rutinert lærar og godt kjend med klassen før du torer deg ut på det. Men det er klart at du må bidra til at dei utviklar seg i engelsk. Det er ein vanskeleg balansegang, men det er mykje tilbakemelding du kan prøve å gi når du snakkar med dei to og to, eller når dei er i grupper. Når det er diskusjon i plenum tenker eg at det ikkje er tidspunktet for å korrigere ting som blir sagt.

I: No er jo du under utdanning. Kan du hugse om du har lært noko om corrective/negative feedback, eller retting av elevar? Har de hatt noko om det i den pedagogiske utdanninga du har tatt?

T: Eg trur ikkje vi har hatt fokus på retting spesielt. Vi har hatt ein del om assosiasjonar til ord; at ein lærar kan gi synonym eller gi meir ordforråd medan ein pratar, utan å stoppe ordstrømmen til elevane. La dei få uttrykkje seg vidare, men berre fylle på med ord som dei kunne ha brukt, utan å stoppe og få dei til å bruke dei.

I: Nettopp, litt som dei omformuleringane du bruker.

T: Ja.

I: Er du kjend med noko forskning på dette området?

T: Nei. Eg har samfunnsfag i tillegg til framandspråk, og har fram til no hatt mest fokus på samfunnsfagdidaktikk. Eg har ikkje fordjupa meg i framandspråksteori. Det er heller ikkje engelsk som er hovudfaget mitt. Eg har master i Statsvitenskap, og engelsk grunnfag, så eg har ikkje stor oversikt på språksteori.

I: No skal vi gå over til to lydklipp frå undervisninga.

Here I turn off the recorder, so the teacher can listen to the sound clips. Transcription of the clips follow:

Stimulated recall:

Sound clip 1:

VG1 Helse og omsorg: (About moussaka)

T: Do you make it?

L: My mum do.

T: Your mum makes it?

Sound clip 2:

VG1 Studiespesialisering: (About advertisements)

T: Why shouldn't we have political advertisements?

L: Because the big parties have more money, and they could advertise for **themselves**, and people **that** don't know what to **elect** they just "ah, I saw him on television, he seems like... it seems like a good party, I think I'll pick them.

T: Yes, exactly!

The teacher's comments to clip 1:

T: Eg hugsar situasjonen. Eg hugsar at eg hadde intensjon om å rette det på ein måte som ho ikkje merka, men eg brukte eit anna verb og så tok eg meg i det og valte å ikkje legge meir fokus på det. Det er heilt klart noko eg ville ha gjort om viss eg hadde vore raskare å finne ein måte å gjere det på. Eg hadde ikkje lyst å seie «my mom does», fordi ho var midt i å fortelle noko, men eg hadde lyst å snakke om mora vidare. Men eg bytta verbet, og trur ikkje ho ville få med seg at eg snakkar i tredje person når eg seier «your mom makes it». Det var ei gyllen anledning som datt vekk, på ein måte.

The teacher's comments to clip 2:

T: Eg hugsar vel dette også, men eg fekk ikkje med meg at ho sa «what to elect». Eg trur eg snudde meg og begynte å skrive argument på tavla, men for resten tenker eg at eg ikkje ville ha retta på det som er feil i den setninga. Hovudpoenget var å diskutere political advertisements, og det var ting eg ville at elevane skulle komme fram til om det temaet. Så her ville eg ikkje satt fokus på å rette ting som «themselves».

I: Ville du ha reagert på «what to elect» om du hadde oppfatta den?

T: Ja, eg hadde kanskje omformulert. Istaden for å seie «yes exactly», så kunne eg tatt opp igjen mykje av det ho sa som var riktig og ta om igjen den delen av setninga kanskje. Men på det som går på rein grammatikk, då trur eg både eg og elevane misser fokuset på det som blir snakka om dersom eg skal ta kvar anledning til å rette grammatikk.

I: Grunnen for at vi har hatt denne samtalen var at eg ville få innsikt i dine tankar kring retting av munnlege feil i klasserommet. Er det noko viktig vi ikkje har snakka om som du kan komme på innanfor dette emnet?

T: Ikkje innanfor det reint teoretiske, men kanskje innanfor det relasjonsmessige. No er eg heil ny i disse klassene. Nokon av elevane hadde eg for tredje gong, og eg har fått klare beskjedar frå lærarar som kjenner dei godt om at ein må vere obs på forskjellige ting i klassen. For eksempel det som går på å vere veldig sjenert, eller å ikkje ønske å bidra munnleg. Så eg har tenkt at eg må ha som mål at vi skal jobbe munnleg disse timane, og eg skal skape eit klima for at det er greit. Det blir mi utfordring å finne ein balanse slik at eg fortsatt greier å tilføre elevane læring på det dei produserer feil munnleg, utan at dei får kjensle av å bli retta. Det ser ein at nokon gongar greier ein det, andre gongar ikkje.

I: Var det andre ting du tenkte på undervegs, som du vil seie no?

T: Nei, ikkje noko spesielt.

I: Då er det nokre bakgrunns spørsmål til slutt. Kan eg få vite alderen din?

T: Eg er 33.

I: Språkutdanning og pedagogisk utdanning?

T: Engelsk grunnfag, og eg tek fransk årsstudium no parallelt med PPU. All anna utdanning er samfunnsfagleg.

I: Då har du nok ikkje så mykje arbeidserfaring som lærar heller.

T: Nei, fem veker på ein ungdomsskule, og tre veker på ein vidaregåande skule.

I: Flott. Tusen takk for intervjuet!

T: Berre hyggeleg.

6. Interview transcription (male teacher)

I: Interviewer

T: Teacher

I: Meiner du at det er viktig at elevane øver på å kommunisere på engelsk i klasserommet?

T: Ja, jeg mener det er viktig å kommunisere i klasserommet, på engelsk. Det gjør vi mye.

I: Kvifor synes du det er viktig?

T: For det første er det viktig i livet. Alle har behov for munnleg engelsk, men alle har ikkje behov for skriftleg engelsk. Alle vil møte engelsk i dag nesten, så det er ein stor fordel å ha kome over redselen. Vi prøver å bygge eit grunnlag som du kan behalde resten av livet.

I: I kor stor grad vil du seie at du legg vekt på munnleg aktivitet?

T: Mye, meiner eg. Eg har ein årsplan der eg har mye munnleg i byrjinga. Så er det perioder med meir skriftleg, før eg går tilbake til meir munnleg igjen. Men eg er ein sånn som meiner at munnleg ikkje er presentasjonar. Eg synest at «games» er betre enn presentasjonar. Viss eg viser ein film så har eg «jigsaw intervju» etterpå. Der har elevane eit spørsmål kvar og så spørre dei kvarandre og sjekkar at dei har rett svar. Eg har også ein del leikar som tek to timar, der elevane skal snakke. Eg prøver å finne nye metoder å få dei til å prate på. Og så snakkar eg alltid engelsk sjølv i klasserommet. Nokre unntak med svakare klasser. Men ein må også ha vurderingsgrunnlag så ein kan ikkje berre halde på å prate i klasserommet. Eg prøver å få elevane til å snakke engelsk i klasserommet så godt det går.

I: Er det eit problem at elevane snakkar mykje norsk?

T: Det varierer. Av dei seks klassene eg har no, er det fire klasser som er gode på engelsk. Den eine klassen er litt svak så der må eg av og til gjenta ting på norsk. Den andre klassen kan bli litt vrang, så der blir det også ein del norsk. Ellers er klassene ganske flinke til å snakke engelsk.

I: Kva tankar gjer du deg når det gjeld munnlege feil som elevane begår i engelsk i klasserommet?

T: Alle snakkar jo feil av og til. Eg korrigerer veldig lite direkte. Det hender at eg gjentek setninga. Og dersom ein les noko, korrigerer elevane kvarandre av og til, meir enn eg korrigerer dei. Men det er veldig sjeldan eg korrigerer. Det hender eg spør elevane under elevsamtaler kor mykje dei vil at eg skal korrigere og seie frå, og då seier elevane ofte «ja, berre sei ifrå». Det skjer ganske ofte, men eg er likevel ganske forsiktig, for det viktigaste er at dei ikkje må bli redde for å «kjøre ut». Det er hovudprioriteringa for meg. Eg vil ikkje seie ting som gjer at dei byrjar å bli usikre. Det er betre å ha flyt, så trur eg dei fleste feil går over av seg sjølv. Eg ser jo skriftlig at elevane har fossilifiserte feil allereie. «With, v..h..i..t». Det kan du rette på 20 gonger og det fortsett likevel. Ein lurar på kva ein skal gjere med det.

I: Ja, då er vi over på den skriftlege delen. Men det du seier er at visst du eventuelt rettar på nokon er det ved å gjenta det som blir sagt på ein korrekt måte?

T: Ja. Eg rettar meir når vi les faktisk, enn når vi snakkar. For i ei vanleg samtale er ein mest oppteken av kommunikasjon. Når elevane les merkar ein ofte at dei er usikre på uttalen av eit ord. Då er det greitt å gå inn og hjelpe med det ordet.

I: Er det særskilte typar feil du meiner er viktigare å rette enn andre?

T: Ja, det er klart. Dersom ein har forståingsfeil er det meir alvorlig. Mange grammatikkfeil høyrer berre dumt ut men det leiar ikkje til forståingsproblem, eigentleg. «I are good» - alle skjønner kva ein seier, men det høyrer veldig dumt ut. Men det finnes feil som er dummare. «I have it good» er typisk norske feil som eg trur er veldig uventa for ei ikkjensorsk befolkning å høyre. Å gløyme -s i 3. person eintal er ikkje så farleg. Eg prøver heller å fokusere på dei «norske» feila.

I: Kva syn trur du elevane har på det å bli retta på i klasserommet?

T: Eg spør dei, og det er veldig individuelt. Og det er også klassemessig. Men eg trur at det ikkje må bli for mykje. Ein eller to gongar kan vere greit, men eg er oppteken av at det ikkje blir «hacking». Eg har måtte be andre elevar om å halde igjen på det faktisk, for elevane spontanrettar kvarandre meir enn eg gjer det, og av og til kan det bli for mykje.

I: Det kan altså bli for mykje medelevretting i timane?

T: Det kan det, og dei er mindre snille med kvarandre enn det eg er. «Ahh, du kan jo ikkje engelsk, det er jo...» Det er eit alvorlig problem. Ein må skape den atmosfæren, at alle føler seg trygge. Mange av elevane har allereie bestemt seg for kva haldning dei har når dei kjem hit. Det kan være vanskeleg å endre på. «Nei, eg les ikkje høgt i klasserommet». Men det går an å varme opp elevane til å bli vande med munnlege aktivitetar, og det går seg til somme gongar.

I: Er det klassemiljøet som bestemmer mykje?

T: Ja, det er viktig. Med eit godt klassemiljø blir det lettare.

I: Kan du hugse om det var fokus på det med retting av språkfeil i lærarutdanninga du tok?

T: Eg trur vi var inne på det. Men eg hugsar ikkje noko konkret. Eg trur det var noko med at ein ikkje bør halde på å rette heile tida, direkte. Det var heller ikkje så mykje fokus på grammatikk. Kanskje for lite faktisk.

I: Når var det du utdanna deg?

T: PPU tok eg i 1996-97.

I: Er du kjend med noko forskning på området?

T: Nei, eg er ikkje oppdatert på noko slikt sidan eg tok PPU. Men på ein måte småforskar ein sjølv i klasserommet, og eg har lagt merke til at uttalen til elevane ofte er superbra. Betre enn meg til og med. Og eg trur det er fordi dei veks opp med så mykje engelsk i kvardagen. Hollywood, film, musikk, internett. Munnleg har elevane lært seg mykje ved sidan av skulen, og dei har god uttale og forståing. Utfordringa er å skrive. Snakkar dei med ein engelskmann seier han «oh, they speak so well». Ser han korleis dei skriv, seier han «oh my God». Skrifta er meir ubarmhjertig. Der ser ein alt i motsetning til når ein snakkar. Så eg synest eigentleg at norske elevar er flinke munnleg, men dei klarar ikkje alltid sjå skilnad på skriftleg og munnleg språk. No har vi kjørt 9/11 som du var med på. Det er ei middels klasse. Eg har ei slik toppklasse som tok alt på den videoen, medan eg har ei anna klasse som ikkje forstod forskjellen på ein dokumentar og spelefilm.

Eg trur det kan vere lurt å auke inputen. Då får elevane ganske god uttale. Men eg synes ikkje det er alvorlige munnlege feil som går igjen. Dei er ganske gode. Eg er ikkje så bekymra for det. Skal ein reagere må det vere kommunikasjonsforstyrrende feil.

I: Den metoden du nyttar til å korrigere elevar kallar ein recast. Og det er ein del forskning som peikar på at elevane då ofte ikkje får med seg at det er ei retting.

T: Det trur eg skjer ganske ofte. Men ein vil ikkje fokusere for mykje på det. Det kan også vere at det fungerer på eit ubevisst plan, at ein likevel kan lære noko av det.

I: Nettopp, det er fleire forskarar som hevdar det også. Grunnen for at vi har hatt denne samtalen var at eg ville få innsikt i dine tankar kring retting av munnlege feil i klasserommet. Er det noko viktig vi ikkje har snakka om som du kan komme på innanfor dette emnet?

T: Nei, ingenting eg kan komme på.

I: Er det ting som du tenkte på undervegs, som du har lyst å snakke meir om?

T: Nei.

I: No til slutt har eg nokre bakgrunnsspørsmål. Kva slags språkutdanning har du?

T: Mellomfag i engelsk.

I: Kor mange år har du undervist i engelsk?

T: 19 år. Her underviser eg i engelsk og samfunnsfag.

I: Alder:

T: 68.

I: Då takkar eg for intervjuet.