

A CASE STUDY OF A TEACHER'S ORAL ERROR TREATMENT
STRATEGIES IN AN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSROOM.

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION
(ENGLISH SECOND LANGUAGE)

OF RHODES UNIVERSITY

BY

F.N.N. DLANGAMANDLA

FEBRUARY 1996

ABSTRACT

Theoretical perspectives on error treatment in second language acquisition research are divided on the effect and desirability of corrective feedback on the learner's output. Theorists like Krashen (1982), believe that correction hampers acquisition because it encourages the learners to avoid difficult structures and to focus on form rather than on meaning, while Long (1977) contends that error treatment possibly speeds up interlanguage development although errors disappear slowly. Edmondson (1985) asserts that bringing errors to the learner's attention helps learning and that error treatment contributes to consciousness-raising which is important for language acquisition.

Research findings present conflicting evidence on the effects of corrective feedback on those for whom correction is meant. Some researchers report no concrete findings on the relationship between corrective feedback and learning outcomes (Hendrickson (1978) and Brock, Day and Long (1986)). Others, for example, Chaudron (1977) and Crookes and Rulon (1985) report differential effects of corrective treatments. Salica, Ramirez and Stromquist and Wren (cited in Chaudron 1988) report some evidence of feedback on error resulting in the learner's ability to self-correct. However, Hendrickson (1978) reports that some direct types of corrective procedures have been found to be ineffective.

This research investigated a teacher's oral error treatment policy in different types of English lessons in a situation where L2 pupils study English as a subject according to an LI syllabus. The findings of this case study reveal that the teacher's manner of correction, when he decides to correct, is subtle and indirect. Rarely does he correct overtly and explicitly as his concern is to avoid hurting the error maker's feelings. He defers treatment and ignores most of the oral errors that learners make during classroom interaction.

Pupil perceptions of their teacher's corrective treatments were positive although some of the pupils reported that they found his corrections confusing and intimidating at times. Most of them expressed a wish to have their speech errors attended to explicitly, preferably by their teacher as his treatments were found to be motivational and unabrasive. Some of the pupils were opposed to peer correction for fear of ridicule. They also felt that fellow pupils did not always provide correct treatments. All the pupils in this study were of the opinion that oral error treatment is desirable because they believe that it improves their performance in English.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been completed without the guidance and support of several people.

I would like to express my sincere and heartfelt gratitude to:

1. My supervisor, Ms Sarah Murray for her sound guidance and support. Her incisive criticism made it possible for me to see this research through.
2. The principal of the school where this research was done, and the Std 9 teacher of English and his pupils, for their willingness to participate in this research.
3. My husband, Grey, for his unflagging support, throughout the period I was studying for this course.
4. Ms Vangiwe Tyumre, and the Plato Centre staff at the University of Transkei, who now and again came to my rescue when I had made costly mistakes on the computer. Without their impeccable computer skills, I would not have been able to see this research through.
5. Tracey Chambers, for adding the final touches to my document and making it readable.
6. Sithembele Marawu, for his companionship during the many trips we had to take to Rhodes and for his encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1. Introduction	1
1.2 Scope of this Study	3
1.3 Aims and Objectives of this Study	3
1.3.1 Aim	3
1.3.2 Objectives	3
1.4 Organisation of this Study	4

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 The Notion of Error	5
2.3 Interlanguage Theory and How it Explains Learner Errors	
2.3.1 The Nature of Interlanguage	7
2.3.2 The Role of Errors in Language Learning	9
2.4 "Error Treatment" Defined	10
2.5 Teacher Reactions to Learner Errors	13
2.6 Research into Error Treatment	14
2.7 Questions Addressed in Research on Error Treatment	
2.7.1 Should Learner Errors be Corrected?	16
2.7.2 When Should Learner Errors be Corrected?	17
2.7.3 Which Errors Should be Corrected?	17
2.7.4 How Should Learner Errors be Corrected?	18
2.7.5 Who Should Treat Learner Errors?	20
2.8 Conclusion	20

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	22
3.2	Ethnographic Research: Underlying Principles	23
3.3	Justification for the Choice of an Ethnographic Case Study as a Research Tool	25
3.4	Design and Implementation of this Study	
	3.4.1 The Case Study as a Research Method	27
	3.4.2 Design	27
3.5	Selection of Participants	
	3.5.1 A Short Background to the School and its Pupils	28
	3.5.2 The Choice of a Subject for Observation	29
3.6	Data Collection	
	3.6.1 Instruments	30
3.7	Data Analysis	31

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

4.1	Introduction	34
4.2	Beliefs Underpinning the Teacher's Correction Policy: An Analysis of His Interview Responses	34
4.3	How the Teacher Responded to Oral Errors in Different Types of English Lessons	
	4.3.1 Grammar Lesson	44
	4.3.2 Unrecorded Short Story: The Visits	50
	4.3.3 Language Tutorial: My Life as a Driller	51
	4.3.4 Reading comprehension: The Necklace	52
	4.3.5 Poetry Lesson: The Parting	54
	4.3.6 Twelfth Night: Dramatisation Lesson	57
	4.3.7 Class Discussion: Mixed Relationships	59
4.4	The Teacher's Repertoire of Corrective Strategies	62
4.5	Errors that were Ignored by the Teacher	63
4.6	Analysis of Pupil Questionnaire	66
4.7	Summary of Research Findings	73

CHAPTER 5 : DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1	Introduction	76
5.2	A Discussion of the Main Findings	76
5.3	Findings that Corroborate Research on Oral Error Treatment	78
5.4	Problems Experienced	79
5.5	Insights Gained	80
5.6	Further Research	80
5.7	Conclusion	81
	References	82

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Grammar Lesson
Appendix 2	Language Tutorial : My Life as a Driller
Appendix 3	Reading Comprehension : The Necklace
Appendix 4	Poetry : The Parting
Appendix 5	Dramatisation : A Scene from Twelfth Night
Appendix 6	Class Discussion : Mixed Relationships
Appendix 7	Structured Interview Questions and Responses
Appendix 8	Questionnaire Responses

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

What prompted this research was the realisation that mature second language (L2) learners produce erroneous output despite the relatively lengthy period of exposure they have had to English, as a medium of instruction, (MOI) and as a subject at school. The reappearance of "fossilised errors" (Selinker 1972), even after they have been treated in class and the occasional "backsliding" by L2 learners have always baffled me. What made me more interested in speech errors and error treatment was the discovery that even highly articulate L2 speakers produce "fossils". I chose oral error treatment as the subject of my investigation because I had always viewed it as more important than written corrections, which I saw as a waste of the teacher's valuable time. In my experience, as a student and as a teacher, papers that "bleed" put the learner off. The learners' interest is usually drawn to the mark that has been allocated, not the teacher's feedback. Instead of assisting the learners to get the erroneous formulations out of their L2 language system, they achieve the opposite: reluctance on the part of the learners to read through the comments and use them to their advantage.

As a teacher educator whose job description involves developing and promoting the global competence of teacher trainees I set out to discover from the literature on error treatment why L2 learners make errors, why it is not easy to eradicate them, and how best I could respond to them in my own teaching. The course work component of the M. Ed programme which focused on, amongst other things, theories of second language learning and teaching, afforded me the opportunity to reflect critically on my classroom practice and look at it against the theoretical framework I had been studying closely.

Although the effects of error treatment have not been clearly established in second language research (SLR) (Seliger and Long 1983), some teachers express unwavering faith in error treatment because they believe that it improves the quality of the learner's output (Bolitho 1985). On the other

hand some teachers do not attach much value to error treatment. Holley and King (cited in Seliger and Long 1983) observe that teachers whose first language is English are often more tolerant of error than non-native speakers and that experienced teachers often ignore linguistic errors and concentrate on intelligibility.

Those teachers who believe in the efficacy of corrective feedback contend that for it to be effective it should be informative, motivational and reinforcing (Zamel and Annette cited in Claudron 1988). Van Lier (1988) observes that learners may find classrooms where self-repair predominates more hospitable and less threatening than those where teacher repairs dominate. This suggests that corrective feedback has to be provided in the context of an unthreatening environment that takes into account the error-maker's feelings. A supportive learning environment instils confidence in the learners: consequently, learners use the language as a vehicle for communication. Secondly, the language learning environment has to create opportunities for pupils to experiment with the language and test their hypotheses about the language. When the conditions mentioned above exist for the learner, then self-repairs provide an opportunity for the learners to think about the grammatical correctness, appropriacy and the communicative effectiveness of their utterances.

The teacher's style of presentation can be seen as either facilitative or inhibiting language learning. Teacher dominated lessons often do not encourage experimentation with the language; consequently very few errors are made in those lessons. Pupil-centred lessons promote interaction; as a result pupils experiment with the language and make errors.

What makes the task of correction complicated is that factors like the teacher's attitude towards learner errors, syllabus demands, the amount of time within which one has to achieve the lesson objectives, the kind of pupils that one teaches and the teacher's level of proficiency often influence their classroom practice. Because teachers have different attitudes towards errors, which in most cases are reflective of their training and individual preferences, it is important for practising teachers to engage in classroom-based research so that they can reflect on their individual correction styles, the nature and quality of their corrective feedback and on how their classroom practice impacts on learners.

1.2 SCOPE OF THIS STUDY

The central concern of this study is establishing how a particular teacher of English responds to the oral errors of L2 pupils in different types of English lessons. It investigates the beliefs underpinning his correction policy and the decision making process that he goes through before responding to the pupils' erroneous utterances. It identifies the types of errors that he ignores or disregards and those that receive priority. It also establishes the degree of match between what the teacher says about his correction policy and his classroom practice. It investigates whether the learners do take notice of their teacher's corrective treatments and, if they do, what perceptions of his treatments they have and how they would like to be corrected. Other concerns of this study include establishing how the teacher influences the language learning environment during interaction through his style of lesson presentation and the manner in which he provides corrective feedback.

1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY

1.3.1 Aim

The aim of this study is to establish the teacher's oral error correction policy through observation and analysis of his classroom practice in different types of English lessons and analysis of his responses during an interview.

1.3.2 Objectives of this Study

1. To examine the teacher's beliefs about errors and establish how they affect his correction policy.
2. To establish this teacher's manner of correction and his repertoire of corrective strategies, which errors receive priority and which ones are ignored.
3. To find out about the degree of match between what he says about his correction policy and what he actually does with oral errors during classroom interaction.

4. To identify the pupils' perceptions of the teacher's corrective treatments, what they say he does when responding to learner errors and how they would like to be corrected.

1.4 ORGANISATION OF THIS STUDY

The report on this study reflects the following organisation:

Chapter 2 explores the notion of "error" and "repair" in communicative situations and reviews research on the causes of error and error treatment. The theory of interlanguage is described and its relationship to "error" and "error treatment" is explored.

Chapter 3 is the methodology chapter. It focuses on data collection techniques used in this research, justification for the choice of school and the participants, and lastly the manner in which the data were analysed.

Chapter 4 presents an analysis of the data from the three sources, namely the interview with the teacher, verbatim lesson transcripts reflecting error-response episodes and pupil questionnaire responses. It also presents an error analysis of students' utterances in one lesson. The purpose of the analysis was to establish the types of errors that were ignored by the teacher. This chapter concludes with a brief summary of the findings.

Chapter 5 which is the final chapter, presents a discussion of the findings and the conclusion.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents an overview of research findings on oral error treatment. It opens with a discussion of the concept of error and the concomitant problems that arise when attempts are made to define error. Various definitions of error treatment are considered, and interlanguage theory (IL) is discussed. Attempts are made to explain how IL theorists conceptualise error, and the role of errors in language learning is discussed. Teacher reactions to learner errors and the feedback types they employ when confronted with errors during classroom interaction are explored. Allwright's (1975) taxonomy reflecting the choices available to the teacher when an oral error has been made, is discussed. It was envisaged that Allwright's taxonomy would be adopted in this research as a framework for the analysis of the lessons recorded during observation. Lastly, a summary of the questions addressed in research on oral error treatment is presented..

2.2 THE NOTION OF ERROR

What constitutes an error in language learning has been defined in different ways by different researchers. According to Allwright and Bailey (1991:84) "typical definitions of error include some reference to the production of a linguistic form which deviates from the correct form". They refer to this conception of error as "the correct version" or "the native speaker norm". This means that utterances that would not be acceptable to fluent native speakers would be labelled incorrect. An example of "the native speaker norm" definition of error is the one provided by Brumfit, Broughton, Flavell, Hill and Pincas (1980) who view error as a systematic infringement of the normal rules of language.

Another definition of error is the one advanced by George (cited in Allwright and Bailey 1991:85), in which he states that "error is a form unwanted by the teacher". The above definition of error is

problematic because pupils are known for providing responses that are different from those expected by their teachers. Allwright and Bailey highlight the inadequacy of such a definition of error by pointing out that a close look at transcripts of classroom discourse reveals that the learners' responses are sometimes rejected by the teachers not because they are wrong but because they are unexpected. For example, the teacher's insistence on the use of full sentences when a shorter factually correct version would have sufficed can be seen as "an error of classroom discourse" (Fanselow in Allwright and Bailey). The problem of defining error has been associated with the teacher's refusal to accept variation in the manner in which pupils phrase their answers (Allwright and Bailey 1991). Such definitions of error do not take into account the existence of other varieties that the learners and teachers are exposed to, and these may not necessarily be standard varieties. Furthermore, the teacher's variety could be different from that of his/her learners'.

Chaudron (cited in Allwright and Bailey 1991:86) discusses various ways of looking at errors. Chaudron's definition of error can be regarded as a comprehensive view of error because it takes into account both the "native speaker norm" definition and the manner in which teachers view errors. He defines errors as "i.) linguistic forms or content that differ from the native speaker norms or facts, and ii.) any other behaviour signalled by the teacher as needing improvement". Chaudron refers to the signals sent out by the teacher to the learner as "corrective reactions". He defines "corrective reactions" as "any reaction by the teacher which transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of a student's behaviour or utterance". In this research, Chaudron's view of error will be adopted. Only those utterances identified as erroneous by the teacher will be considered as such. Incorrect and inappropriate responses that have been ignored by the teacher will not count as error, with the exception of the errors that were identified during the error analysis of one of the lessons.

According to Allwright and Bailey (1991), the problems that arise when attempts are made to define error stem from the fact that teachers' attitudes towards errors have shifted with the change in teaching methods and this has, in some cases, influenced the manner in which they define and respond to errors. They mention the advent of the communicative approach as an example of a teaching method that has shifted emphasis in language classrooms from a focus on accuracy to a preoccupation with communicative effectiveness, i.e the meaningful delivery of ideas and

information. They argue that such changes in pedagogy are likely to influence the ways in which teachers define errors and respond to the pupils' output.

Porte (1993), McArthur (1983), and Corder (1967) have advanced definitions of error from a mentalist perspective. Porte (1993:42) maintains that “an error demonstrates a fault at a deeper level, something that has not been learned or assimilated or whose correct version is unknown”. This definition seems to concern itself with the source of errors and not what constitutes an error. McArthur (1983:07) identifies two levels at which errors occur. These are the “competence” and “performance” levels. Competence mistakes arise from the inability to understand and master the rules of the target language while “performance mistakes” arise from the language user's inability to use or effectively apply those rules in actual communication. Such mistakes come about as a result of nervousness, tiredness, performance pressure, the effects of inner translation, and at times one simply forgets what to say for a moment. According to Corder (1967), errors reveal the learner's underlying competence. The competence view of error will be picked up later on when discussing interlanguage theory.

2.3 INTERLANGUAGE THEORY AND HOW IT EXPLAINS LEARNER ERRORS

2.3.1 The Nature of Interlanguage

According to Nemser (cited in Ellis 1985:46), IL theory, sometimes referred to as “approximative systems” or “transitional competence/idiosyncratic dialects” (Corder in Ellis 1985:46), was closely associated with Error Analysis (EA), a critical and systematic way of looking at learner errors which proposed a positive view of error. EA broke new ground in the study of learner errors by postulating that there are sources of error other than first language interference. For the learner, error was seen as a key to “creative construction” which provides a means whereby linguistic hypotheses can be tested. Interlanguage was defined as “the structured system which the learner constructs at any given stage in his/her development”. According to Ellis (1985: 47) the term refers to the series of interlocking systems which form the “built-in syllabus” of the interlanguage continuum. Corder (1981) claims that IL and EA are both concerned with the development of the language learner's language and errors are seen as indications of the learner's position on the IL continuum.

Nemser (cited in Ellis 1985: 47) identifies the following assumptions underlying IL:

1. At any given time the approximative system is distinct from the L1 or L2.
2. The approximative systems form an evolving series.
3. In any given contact situation, the approximative systems of learners at the same stage roughly coincide.

Selinker (cited in Ellis 1985:48) identifies five processes that operate in IL, and these are:

1. L1 transfer which is associated with interlingual errors.
2. Overgeneralisation of target language rules which gives rise to intralingual errors. Overgeneralisation occurs when the second language (L2) speaker extends the target language (TL) rules to inappropriate contexts.
3. Transfer of training, i.e when a rule enters the learner's system as a result of instruction.
4. Strategies of L2 learning, i.e the learner's identifiable approach to the material to be learned. Developmental errors are associated with this strategy.
5. Strategies of L2 communication, i.e an identifiable approach by the learner to communicate with L1 speakers. Communication-based errors are associated with strategies of L2 communication.

The five processes mentioned above constitute ways in which the L2 speaker tries to internalise the L2 system.

IL proponents maintain that L2 learners formulate rules through hypothesis-testing, a strategy that is used to make sense of the TL as they move along the IL continuum. They do not jump from one stage to the next, instead they revise the interim systems to accommodate new hypotheses and rules about the TL system. They do not simply imitate habitually statements that they have heard before but they creatively re-organise input. They abstract rules and constantly restructure their hypotheses

about the TL. The feedback they receive from other speakers, whether implicit or explicit, provides them with an opportunity to update their hypotheses. After an L2 speaker has internalised a new rule, its coverage is transferred and it gradually extends to other linguistic contexts.

According to IL theorists very few L2 speakers reach the end of the IL continuum because of fossilisation. Fossilisation occurs when L2 learners “do not make use of feedback and as a result do not alter their output. They then get stuck with a fixed system of linguistic forms that do not match the TL model” (Allwright and Bailey 1991:93). Brown (cited in Allwright and Bailey 1991:93) defines fossilisation as “the internalisation of incorrect forms which takes place by means of the same learning processes as the internalisation of correct forms, but we refer to the latter .. as 'learning' while the former is called 'fossilisation'”. Vigil and Oller (cited in Allwright and Bailey 1991) are of the opinion that the type of feedback that learners receive could be responsible for fossilisation. An example that illustrates the point made above would be the pupils' exposure to incorrect forms in the media and in the classroom.

According to Ellis (1985) interlanguage is a transitional language system that is permeable, dynamic and systematic. This means that the rules of interlanguage are not fixed, they are open to amendment, and that IL is constantly changing to accommodate new hypotheses.

2.3.2 The Role of Errors in Language Learning

Unlike behaviourists who viewed errors in a negative light and actively tried to avoid them by using mechanistic methods when teaching the TL, IL proponents attach a lot of significance to errors and view them in a positive light. They see them as an aid to learning. Error making is viewed as a strategy or evidence of internal processing. Corder (1981:10), in summary, explains their significance in the following manner:

1. They are indispensable to the learners because making errors can be regarded as a device the learners use in order to learn. Through hypotheses-testing, the learner gets to know which formulations are acceptable and which ones are not.

2. They inform the teacher if he/she undertakes a systematic analysis, how far towards the goal the L2 learner has progressed and consequently what remains for him/her to learn.
3. They provide the researcher with evidence of how language is learnt or acquired, what strategies the learners are employing in their discovery of the knowledge about the language.

2.4 “ERROR TREATMENT” DEFINED

The concepts “error treatment”, “error correction” and “corrective feedback” are often used interchangeably to refer to the input that one receives from a more competent speaker of the TL after making an error.

Chaudron (1977:31) advances four conceptions of “error treatment” which have been formulated by researchers in the field of language acquisition and learning. The first one views error treatment as “only those treatments which, after correction of a given item, succeed in establishing the learner's consistent, correct performance and his autonomous ability to correct himself on the item”. Chaudron argues that it would not be possible to identify such treatments within any one period.

A second conception goes thus: “a correction occurs when a teacher is able to elicit a corrected response from the committer of an error or one or more of his classmates”. This definition highlights the role of self-correction and peer-correction in language learning.

A third view of error treatment is “any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to or demands improvement of the learner's utterance”. Chaudron maintains that this is an all-inclusive definition that allows for an in-depth study of a teacher's reactions. It is this definition of error treatment which has been adopted in this research.

The fourth conception, which has its roots in behaviourism, defines error treatment as positive and negative reinforcement. Chaudron's critique of this definition is that it restricts any investigation into error treatment to words of “approval” and “disapproval”.

“Repair”, which is a form of corrective feedback, refers to “a response to a breakdown in conversation not due to an error. It is an attempt to clear up conversational problems” (Day, Chenoweth, Chun and Luppescu 1983:21).

Although there exists no conclusive research evidence to the effect that corrective feedback, i.e. the rejection and reformulation of erroneous learner utterances by the teacher, improves learner proficiency levels in the long term, Chaudron (in Long and Richards 1983:133) maintains that teachers are confronted with the decision whether to correct learner errors or not during classroom interaction. Many a time they respond to learner errors because they see their role as not only providing instruction but also that of providing error correction (Allwright and Bailey 1991:89) and Chaudron (in Long and Richards 1983:78). According to Allwright and Bailey (1991:110) the language teacher's role is two-fold. It involves helping pupils move along the IL continuum by teaching them what they need to learn next in the sequence and pointing out where their productions differ from the TL model. Once they “notice the gap” (Schmidt and Frota in Allwright and Bailey 1991:81), they are likely to make changes to the existing rule system.

Chaudron (1988:133) views “feedback” as constituting “correction”, while Long (cited in Long and Richards 1983:48) differentiates between feedback and correction in the following manner:

Feedback can be used in the case of a teacher's attempts to supply learners with information about the correctness of their productions, while “correction” should be used to refer to the result of feedback.

Vigil and Oller (cited in Allwright and Bailey 1991) identify two kinds of feedback, cognitive feedback and affective feedback. The former refers to information given to learners about the language they use, while the latter refers to the teacher's emotional reactions in response to what has been said.

Bolitho (1995:48) asserts that most teachers consider failure to give “negative feedback” and “positive sanctions” or “approval of learners' output” as an abdication of their responsibility. It is this perception of the language teacher's role that sometimes leads to overcorrection. Holley and King (1975) observed that L2 teachers have a tendency of being over-corrective. At times they find

errors where they do not exist because they have “exaggerated worries about accuracy , particularly pronunciation” (Bolitho 1995:47). Bolitho further observes that teachers give corrective feedback to the learners’ erroneous output because pupils want and need feedback on both their spoken and written output, a fact also pointed out by Cathcart and Olsen (1976). The latter reported that 75% of the students they surveyed wanted correction “all of the time,” however, when they were provided with the correction of nearly all of their errors they changed their minds about their wish to have all of their errors corrected and reported that they found it difficult to think coherently with “consistent correction” (Cathcart and Olsen 1976:50). Chaudron (1988:133), arguing from the learners' point of view, asserts that the use of feedback in repairing learner utterances and in repairing their interlocutor's utterances “may constitute the most potent source of improvement and other subject matter knowledge”. He considers characteristics of feedback as potentially able to promote TL improvement.

Bolitho (1995) argues that it is teachers' responsibility to make corrective feedback explicit and recognisable to learners so that they can interpret it and above all know what to do with it. He believes that the following issues are also central to correction and must be addressed by teachers before they can correct: variety in teacher's repertoire of feedback techniques; lesson objectives; their own competence levels as L2 teachers; their pupils' levels of competence and individual learner differences; and lastly the need to promote learner autonomy i.e affording pupils an opportunity to monitor and correct their output. Allwright (1975) cites the pupils' past history (i.e. academic record, errors previously observed, treatment types previously used), and the learner's current state (i.e. motivation, anxiety level, arousal level, fatigue, and level of aspiration), the social nature of the classroom context, the psychological effect of correction on pupils' self esteem and the source of the error in addition to individual learner differences, as important issues that have to be addressed before effecting corrections. All the above concerns make error correction an arduous and complex task that requires sensitivity and an open mind on the part of the teacher.

Although it might appear that all language teachers treat learner errors, not all teachers address erroneous output, possibly because of innovative methods which deliberately avoid error treatment, and downplay its role in formal instruction (Allwright and Bailey 1991), or simply because they find the task of correction tedious, complex and time-consuming. Chaudron (1988) contends that

the disadvantage of not addressing errors at all is that incorrect utterances are by default taken to be appropriate or correct.

2.5 TEACHER REACTIONS TO LEARNER ERRORS

Small-scale research studies into error treatment reveal variation in teachers' reactions to learner errors. Their reactions are characterised by inconsistency, (e.g what counts as an error at the beginning of the lesson is accepted as correct later on), ambiguity, and lack of precision, (Allwright 1975, Fanselow 1977, and Long 1977). Inconsistency is caused by teachers' attempts to cater for differences in learner proficiency, the nature of the teaching task, lack of precision, and lack of self discipline on the part of the teacher (Ellis 1990 and Allwright 1975). Some errors are intentionally uncorrected, while others remain unnoticed. Sometimes errors are erroneously repeated by teachers and a given error is rarely corrected all the time (Chaudron 1977). Fanselow (1977) found out that treatments occurred in combinations, not all the errors were corrected, some teachers did not use particular treatments at all, hypothesis testing and experimentation were not encouraged and modelling of the correct answer was the most commonly used treatment. Chaudron (1988) and Gaies (1983) cite the teacher's status and superior knowledge, individual teacher styles, the type of classroom activity during which an error occurs, and the fact that linguistic errors are treated differentially, depending on whether they are phonological, lexical or syntactic, as some of the factors that influence the nature of error treatment.

The following are some of the feedback types which are often employed by teachers in response to learner errors: confirmation checks, modelling of the correct response by the teacher, repetition and explanation. Chaudron (1988) asserts that with these feedback types several functions can be realised and this could lead to ambiguity. He illustrates the multiple functions of repetitions in the following way: a repetition could signal a correction or agreement, acceptance and understanding. For learners whose proficiency does not encompass all the TL rules, it is usually not easy to interpret the teacher's response. This is what makes error treatment an inherently confusing aspect of classroom interaction to pupils.

In view of the fact that numerous research studies cite the teacher's inconsistency as a common feature of error treatment, Krashen and Seliger (1975) contend that error treatment may not make

as vital a contribution to language teaching and learning as has been suggested before. Some authorities in the field, eg. Allwright (1975), maintain that although clarity and consistency are desirable they may not be easy to achieve and that what seems to count the most is the way in which teachers treat errors. The manner in which errors are treated is central to teacher effectiveness. However, Allwright cautions that a teacher's overall correction policy should not be the only yardstick used to judge his/her effectiveness. He argues that the effectiveness of a teacher's treatments depends partly on how such treatments are perceived by the learners themselves. Cathcart and Olsen (1976) reported that older learners expressed a strong preference for overt and explicit correction so that they could avoid making the same errors again.

Allwright suggests that teacher effectiveness in respect of error treatment can be achieved by paying more attention to the following aspects which are central to any investigation into ET:

1. Improving our understanding of the teacher's contribution for good or ill, to the learner's learning.
2. Improving our understanding of learners' way of learning in the classrooms.
3. Developing some techniques that would play some part in helping teachers improve their classroom skills.

2.6 RESEARCH INTO ERROR TREATMENT

Models of error treatment have been developed to enhance our understanding of error treatment. Chaudron (1977), Allwright (1975), and Fanselow (197) to name a few, drew up schedules and detailed models of error treatment which covered treatment techniques employed by teachers when effecting corrections. For the purpose of this research only Allwright's taxonomy will be summarised, since it is the most comprehensive of those available.

Allwright (1988) recommends that when an error has been made by the learner the teacher should first categorise the error. The teacher can thereafter sum up the whole situation on the spot and react appropriately. That would involve taking learner needs and individual learner differences into account and making sure that the pupils are not left confused by the teacher's correction. The teacher

should make sure that his\ her corrections benefit not only the transgressor but also all the other pupils. Having done all of the above, the teacher can then ask the following questions:

1. What was actually said or done?
2. Who said or did it?
3. What was meant by it?
4. What should have been said or done?
5. What should the native equivalent be?

Having established answers to the above questions Allwright recommends that the teacher can then select from the following treatment options:

TREATMENT TYPE

A: BASIC OPTIONS

1. to treat or to ignore completely
2. to treat immediately or delay
3. to transfer treatment or not
4. to transfer to another individual, subgroup or whole class
5. to return or not, to original error maker after treatment
6. to call upon, or permit another learner \learners to provide treatment
7. to test for efficacy of treatment

B: POSSIBLE FEATURES

8. fact of error indicated
9. blame indicated
10. location indicated
11. opportunity for new attempt given
12. model provided
13. error type indicated
14. remedy indicated
15. improvement indicated
16. praise indicated

Allwright regards the treatment types mentioned above as tentative, "especially the distinction between basic options and possible features, hence the continuous numbering from 1 to 16" (Allwright 1988:207).

2.7 QUESTIONS ADDRESSED IN RESEARCH ON ERROR TREATMENT

The following is a synopsis of the five pertinent areas that studies on oral error treatment have concentrated on. The questions on which this framework is based were first identified by Hendrickson (1978). These are: Should learner errors be corrected? If yes, when should they be corrected? Which errors should be corrected? How should they be corrected? Who should correct learner errors?

2.7.2.1 Should Learner Errors be Corrected?

The preceding discussion on the role of errors in language learning has demonstrated the need for reinforcing, informative and motivational feedback as it assists learners to modify their hypotheses about the language. According to George (1972), Corder (1967) and Allwright 1975 (cited in Hendrickson 1978:389), when pupils are not able to recognise their own errors they need the assistance of someone who is more proficient in the language. It is the teacher who has the traditional right to provide learners with corrective feedback (Ellis 1990). Pupils themselves have expressed preference for more correction from their teachers (Cathcart and Olsen 1976). Krashen and Seliger (in Hendrickson 1978: 389) claim that error correction is especially useful to adult second language learners because "it helps them learn the exact environment in which to apply rules and discover the precise semantic range of lexical items".

Allwright and Bailey (1991) maintain that before decisions can be made about whether to correct or not the error itself has to be noticed first. Second language teachers' position on the IL continuum may not make it possible for them to identify erroneous utterances. This is possibly why some errors cannot be identified by such teachers.

Allwright and Bailey assert that the teacher first has to ask himself/herself before penalising the error maker with negative cognitive feedback whether that pupil has been exposed to the form or

function in which the error occurs. Another consideration facing teachers before deciding whether to treat errors or not would be “whether the error is within the learner's grasp in terms of his or her place on the interlanguage continuum” (1991: 241). Allwright and Bailey's contention here is that it may not be wise to provide feedback on a structure that learners are not yet ready to learn. A problem that arises when an erroneous utterance goes uncorrected is that it often serves as input to other learners and the fact that it has been disregarded may create the impression that it is correct. It is also possible that some pupils may alter their existing hypotheses “in order to conform with their classmates' uncorrected output” (Allwright and Bailey 1991: 103).

2.7.2.2. When Should Learner Errors be Corrected?

Teachers are likely to correct learner errors when they pertain to the pedagogical focus of the lesson and when they inhibit learners (Chaudron, 1988). This suggests that not all erroneous utterances should receive treatment. Bolitho (1995) places language lessons into three categories, namely, fluency lessons, accuracy lessons, and something in between. Although he does not give guidelines on how errors should be treated in the third category, he recommends re-formulation techniques in fluency lessons as they are unlikely to make pupils feel insecure and embarrassed. He recommends non-delayed intervention in accuracy lessons. Hendrickson (1978) argues that there is cognitive and affective justification for tolerating some errors produced by learners as this boosts learner confidence and instils a feeling of success in learners. Birckbichler (in Hendrickson 1978) recommends that error correction be reserved for manipulative grammar exercises and that teachers should be more tolerant of error in communication based activities.

2.7.2.3 Which Errors Should be Corrected?

Hendrickson cites three major categories of errors that should receive priority, these are: global errors i.e those that impede communication (Hanzeli 1975 and Powell 1975), those that stigmatise the learner from the native speaker's perspective (Johansson 1973, Richards 1973, Sternglass 1974, Hanzeli 1975, Birckbichler 1977), and high frequency errors (Holley and King 1975, George 1972, Dresdener 1973, Bhatia 1974, and Allwright 1975). According to Burt (in Hendrickson 1978:391) “the correction of one global error in a sentence clarifies the intended message more than the correction of several local errors”. Burt argues for limiting correction to communicative errors as

that is likely to boost learner confidence and motivation. She contends that only when learner output is relatively error free can the focus be shifted to local errors, i.e errors that do not necessarily hinder communication. According to Murphy (1986) errors that should receive priority are those that may affect fluency and errors of accuracy that interfere with intelligibility.

Hendrickson (1978:392) recommends that fossilised errors i.e those errors that have not responded to correction and appear to be a permanent feature of second language speech and writing, be corrected "based on their degree of incomprehensibility and unacceptability as judged by native speakers". Cohen (1975) argues for the treatment of errors that are relevant to the focus of a lesson before attention is given to less important ones while Johansson (1973) argues for prompt attention to errors involving general grammatical rules as compared to those involving lexical exceptions. From the language learners' perspective, pronunciation and grammatical errors should receive priority (Cathcart and Olsen 1976).

2.7.2.4 How Should Learner Errors be Corrected?

Holley and King (1975) caution against heavy-handed corrective strategies or treatments that might frustrate or embarrass the learner. This suggests that error correction could be counter-productive if affective matters are not taken into consideration during correction and that teachers need to strive for the creation of a supportive classroom environment that does not threaten learners.

Kilfoil (1989) maintains that before teachers can think of correction they will have to decide in advance whether they are going to demand accuracy or fluency as the nature of the task will influence their correction style. She condemns the correction of grammatical errors while pupils are making oral presentations because if pupils are forced to concentrate on how they are saying something instead of what they are saying they become inhibited. Kilfoil recommends that only when communication breaks down can a teacher ask for clarification.

Broughton et al (1980) recommend that errors made during group and pair work be given on the spot treatment as the teacher moves round the class supervising the pupils. They also recommend the promotion of self-criticism. For example, after students have presented they should be encouraged to identify mistakes that they have made and correct them.

Fanselow (1977) and Allwright (1975) caution against the excessive use of modelling because it is an ineffective corrective strategy that does not afford learners an opportunity to learn from their mistakes, or alter their hypotheses about the TL. Consequently, they reproduce erroneous utterances in a variety of contexts. Instead of using modelling excessively, Fanselow proposes the presentation of a number of follow-up tasks which are meant to help students modify their hypotheses about the language; these are: discrimination tasks, classification tasks, mechanical manipulation exercises and tasks involving analysis. Edge (1993) recommends modelling for treating intonation, pronunciation and stress and maintains that such corrections should not be done out of context.

Allwright (1975) recommends that teachers be made aware of the kind of potential they have for creating confusion in their pupils' minds, given their lack of precision and inconsistency. Allwright (1975) and Fanselow (1977) recommend that lack of precision and inconsistency be countered by giving pupils clear and precise indication of where the error lies in a student's utterance as that would create a learning opportunity for the learner. Another strategy would be for the teacher to develop good questioning skills and give pupils reasonable "waiting time" before pointing out the error or modelling the correct answer. Failure on the part of the teacher to give waiting time so that the error makers can restructure their statements is "error creating" behaviour (Allwright 1975:100). Contrary to what Allwright says about "waiting time", Krashen (1982) argues that the provision of waiting time does not necessarily change language behaviour.

Fanselow (1977) maintains that effective training in listening skills would enable pupils to distinguish between their own incorrect responses and their teachers' or fellow pupils' corrected responses.

Chastain (cited in Hendrickson 1978) suggests re-wording an answer in an acceptable manner, possibly in the same fashion that errors are treated in out-of-class situations, or summarising and reviewing the most common mistakes at the end of the lesson. Secondly, self-correction could be encouraged by making tape recordings of students' conversations and then encouraging them to edit their own tapes for errors.

Edge (1993) suggests that the teacher's manner of lesson presentation should sometimes reflect his/her correction style. For example, if explanations were given during teaching there is no reason why explanations cannot be used to correct learner errors. Edge recommends that teachers give short working explanations or better still, encourage pupils to explain in their own way.

2.7.2.5 Who Should Treat Learner Errors?

Error treatment is often regarded as the teacher's prerogative because of his/her superior knowledge and status in the classroom. However, Allwright and Bailey (1991:107) point out a need for teachers and researchers to ask whether treatments emanating from the teacher are "fruitful in terms of the teacher and learners' common goal". Although the teacher's role in helping pupils move along the IL continuum has been acknowledged, Hendrickson (1978:396) cautions that teachers should not dominate correction procedures. They should instead encourage self-correction by allowing pupils time and opportunity for self-repairs (Allwright and Bailey 1991). According to Bolitho (1995) self-correction would promote learner autonomy and responsibility. Chaudron (in Seliger and Long 1983) points to a need to train learners in the appropriate use of communication strategies i.e the ability to handle breakdowns in communication, as mastery of such strategies is likely to promote learner confidence.

Peer-correction has been cited as another valuable aspect of error treatment for the following reasons: it presents a learning opportunity to both the error maker and the one offering correction, it affords the teacher an opportunity of gathering information about the learners' linguistic abilities. When learners have mastered the art of self-correction they can transfer such skills to pair and group work (Edge 1993). Peer-correction is likely to work when the teacher has established a supportive environment that does not put pupils on the defensive (Allwright and Bailey 1991).

2.8 Conclusion

The preceding discussion on oral error treatment reflects unequivocally the complexity of the task of correcting learner errors. It also reveals that it would be unwise to generalise about correction and its effects on learning as there is no conclusive research evidence to suggest that it changes language behaviour for the better.

What appears to be of importance when teachers do decide to correct is the manner in which errors are treated. Heavy-handed treatments batter the learner's self esteem and stifle communication in the classroom. Communicative effectiveness can only be achieved in the context of a non-threatening classroom environment.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This study seeks to understand how a Std 9 teacher of English responds to oral errors that L2 pupils make in different types of English lessons. It aims at exploring and unearthing the belief system which underpins this teacher's correction policy. It also seeks to explore the pupils' perceptions of their teacher's correction methods.

An interpretative research paradigm in the form of a descriptive ethnographic case study was adopted to investigate the concerns mentioned above. The central concern of an interpretative paradigm is the provision of rich descriptions of the phenomenon that is being investigated. It is not evaluative.

'Ethnography' has its roots in the human sciences like Sociology and Anthropology and has been criticised for not being 'scientific' (Hammersley cited in Graddal, Maybin, and Steirer 1994:4). Despite criticism levelled against it educational researchers have frequently drawn upon ethnographic approaches when doing descriptive studies, and classroom process research (CPR), which seeks to describe and understand classroom interaction has come to be associated with ethnographic techniques. According to Ellis (1990: 65) CPR

is concerned with the careful description of the interpersonal events which take place in the classroom as a means of developing and understanding about how instruction and learning take place.

There has been a lack of consensus among researchers on the definition of 'ethnography' because of the plethora of techniques and meanings it has come to be associated with. Hammersley (cited in Graddol et al 1994:1) has drawn up the following list of concepts which he maintains has been associated with ethnography and these are the 'qualitative method', 'interpretative research', 'case

study', 'participant observation', 'life history method' and discourse analysis. Le Compte and Goetz (cited in Nunan 1992:59) define 'ethnography' as a shorthand term to encompass a range of qualitative methods including case study research, field research and anthropological research. Chaudron (cited in Nunan 1992:46) characterises ethnographic research as a qualitative, process oriented approach to the investigation of interaction. It is a rigorous tradition involving considerable training, continuous record keeping, extensive participatory involvement of the researcher in the classroom and careful interpretation of the usually multi-faceted data.

3.2 ETHNOGRAPHIC RESEARCH : UNDERLYING PRINCIPLES

According to Nunan (1992) ethnographic techniques in research have come to compensate for an inherent weakness of the experimental method. The experimental method fits into the positivist paradigm and is theory driven. It sets out as its goal the need to isolate the phenomenon under observation and test hypotheses. Ellis (cited in Nunan 1992:52) argues that "psychometry does not produce the definitive answers that some researchers expect". In its quest for objectivity it disregards the human element in research, the attitudes, beliefs and values that both the researcher and the researched bring into the research situation. Ethnography on the other hand has humanistic learnings in that "it focuses on real situations and settings where people actually live and work rather than in laboratory or simulated settings, and also gleans cultural meanings revealed by the behaviour of the subjects under study" (Watson-Gegeo and Ulichny in Nunan 1992:54). It questions the belief that there is an 'objective reality' which is independent of the subjective perceptions of the researcher and the researched. It is based on the understanding that the subjective perceptions and belief systems of those involved in the research influence their behaviour. Watson-Gegeo and Ulichny (cited in Nunan 1992:54) refer to this understanding as the 'qualitative-phenomenological hypothesis'.

The second principle on which ethnography is based is referred to by Wilson (in Nunan 1992:53) as the "naturalistic-ecological hypothesis". It stresses the importance of carefully studying, describing and understanding the context in which the behaviour occurs. The researcher has to investigate the natural context in which the behaviour occurs rather than contrived laboratory settings because the context in which the behaviour occurs has a significant influence on that

behaviour. No attempts are made by the researcher to manipulate or isolate phenomena under investigation.

'Ethnography' aims at constructing a holistic picture of phenomena under investigation and is data driven. This does not mean that it is unstructured and unsystematic but that it acknowledges that knowledge is socially constructed and the role of the researcher is to explain and understand it. Ethnographic researchers have questions in mind that they would like to have answers to before engaging in the actual research. The difference between them and psychometricians is that they do not set out to prove anything. Their approach is not evaluative but is illuminative. They might end up with more questions and insights at the end of their task. Although their aim is not to generalise because each situation is unique and therefore not replicable, their insights "emerge from close contact with data and hypotheses and generalisations emerge during the course of data collection and description rather than being predetermined by the researcher" (Nunan 1992:56)". In this sense, the insights gained from this inductive and qualitative approach contribute to theory building.

Data collection techniques often used in ethnographies include extensive field notes and observation which could either be participatory or non-participatory. The former entails the regular involvement and participation of the researcher in the research activities while the latter "sets the researcher outside the classroom events being observed" (Ellis, 1990:3).

Although non-participatory observation is used extensively as a data collection tool by educationists who adopt ethnographic techniques in their research, it is known to present problems for the observer and the observed. Allwright and Bailey (1991) cite participant anxiety and the "observer's paradox" as problems facing the participants. The former refers to the possibility of the researcher being seen by the teacher as a threat to his power base. This induces apprehension in the observed because he or she feels the researcher is judging his/her personal adequacy. The latter refers to "an alteration in the normal behaviour of the subject under observation, due to the observation itself" Allwright and Bailey (1991:64).

Allwright and Bailey argue that the two problems caused by the presence of an observer cannot be eliminated totally. They suggest that the researcher explain ethical issues to those being observed and be cautious that these should not be over-emphasised lest they create a suspicion in the

researched that the risk is greater than what the researcher had disclosed. Allwright and Bailey (1991) further caution that deception about the purpose of the study could be counter-productive in the long run and argue that if secrecy is an essential ingredient of one's study then it should be explained to the observed that the purpose of the research would be explained later. Openness is likely to create and promote trust between the parties involved in the research. The researcher should make repeated visits to the classroom, familiarise subjects with data collection instruments that will be used, make himself/herself available before and after observation and strive to create a relationship with the observed. The "paradox" with openness lies in the fact that if subjects know the purpose of the study they might put on an act and do exactly what the researcher expects. This is known as "social desirability" in social science research. Stern (1979) refers to this artifact of research as an "on stage effect" and maintains that it occurs when the researcher holds a higher status than the person involved in the research and when the research is obtrusive.

The collaborative involvement of a number of participants is a distinctive feature of ethnography. Through triangulation the researcher is able to get multiple perspectives 'as data taken from a single perspective is unlikely to be accurate' (Allwright and Bailey 1991:76). Triangulation counterbalances observer and observee bias.

3.3. JUSTIFICATION FOR THE CHOICE OF AN ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY AS A RESEARCH METHOD

Although ethnographic studies have been criticised for their lack of external validity and reliability, I adopt the view that condemning ethnographies and declaring them unsuitable as research tools in classrooms would be like throwing the baby away with the bathwater. Ethnographies have a significant role to play in classroom process research as they seek to understand and explain the nature and quality of classroom interaction. If language practitioners are aiming at getting a holistic picture of what actually happens in classrooms and what methods are actually seen to be working by the teachers themselves, then classroom process research affords them the opportunity of observing both the teacher and the pupils in action. Long (in Nunan 1992:56) adds another dimension to the statement made above when he states that:

The primary purpose of educational ethnography is to describe classroom processes so that they may later be subjected to experimental manipulation.

Although Long appears to be supporting the weak view of ethnography i.e. seeing ethnography as preliminary to psychometry, I am of the opinion that “ground-clearing” techniques like ethnographies which offer “thick explanations” of classroom processes have much more to offer both teachers and researchers, as they contribute to an understanding of particular educational contexts and it is my view that ethnography could be seen to be complementing psychometry. The former seeks to capture the complexity of the relationship between instruction and learning in the naturalistic environment of the classroom. However, Ellis (in Nunan 1992) is of the opinion that experimental research succeeds only in providing researchers with an understanding of individual pieces of the language learning jigsaw but not the whole puzzle. The contention here is that ethnographic techniques are qualitatively superior to psychometry as they provide a holistic picture of classroom processes and do not assume a linear relationship between teaching and learning. Ellis (in Nunan 1992:53) further contends that

Innovation in the classroom can never just be a question of implementing a recommendation derived from research. It is always a process of negotiation, involving the teacher's overall educational ideology, the learner's expectations and preferences and local constraints that determine what's feasible. There is no single pedagogical solution which is applicable to all classrooms.

CPR takes into account all the concerns that Ellis mentions above.

As this research is not aimed at generalising its findings on oral error treatment, the ethnographic case study would be suitable for exploring and understanding the teacher's oral error correction policy and beliefs underpinning it.

3.4 DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS STUDY

3.4.1 The Case Study as a Research Method

The case study method is rooted in the ethnographic research tradition. Like all ethnographies it emphasises the individuality and uniqueness of the participants and the setting. Sommer (1980:103-4) define a case study as:

an in-depth investigation of a single instance. It can involve a unit as small as an individual or as large as an entire community. It provides the opportunity to apply a multi-method approach to a unique event.

(Walker in Hammersley 1986:48) further contends that the case study is:

the examination of an instance in action. The study of particular incidents and events, and the selective collection of information on biography, personality, intentions and values, allows the case study worker to capture and portray those elements that give it meaning.

3.4.2. Design

The case study was selected to address the concerns of this study. Data collection was done through non-participatory observation of the teacher in action and different types of lessons were video-taped. Preliminary visits were paid to the school with a view to familiarizing the teacher and the pupils with having a third party during the English lessons. By so doing, I was attempting to counteract "the observer's paradox". Detailed field notes were taken during observation to supplement the video-taped lessons. A structured interview was conducted with the teacher to establish what he had to say about his correction policy. Finally, the pupils' perceptions of their teacher's correction strategies were explored through the analysis of their responses on the questionnaires. Through triangulation, it became possible to explore multiple perspectives on this teacher's oral error correction policy. Initially I had set out to give a quantitative flavour to this research by adapting and using Fanselow's (1977) schedule of oral error treatment. Tallies of the different oral error treatment techniques were to be recorded on the schedule. However, after

attempting to use the schedule once during the first observation I abandoned the idea because the teacher and I had different perceptions of error treatment; consequently it became difficult for me to classify the teacher's responses and at the same time keep pace with the lesson. Secondly, very few errors were corrected, hence the decision not to use Allwright's taxonomy as a tool for the analysis of the recorded lessons.

3.5 SELECTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

3.5.1 A Short Background to the School and its Pupils

The school selected for the research is a private school. The perceived failure of the ex-Transkeian schools to provide quality education and the fact that good schools that had infrastructure and highly qualified teaching personnel were exclusively for white pupils led to the establishment of the school by a group of concerned black parents who were worried about the quality of education their children were receiving in some black government schools. Another reason behind the establishment of this private school, the first one of its kind in the ex-Transkeian region, was the fact that parents wanted to ensure that their children had access to English because it was and still is seen by many L2 speakers as a language of opportunity and power in South Africa.

This school adopted a straight for English model. This means that, unlike the black government schools where a transition model had been adopted, the medium of instruction (MOI) in this school became English from pre-school onwards. This was in line with what was happening in other private schools in the now Eastern Cape region. All of them had adopted a straight for English model but, whereas those schools were offering the English first language syllabus to L1 pupils and Afrikaans speaking bilinguals who had reached native-like proficiency in English, this one was offering English as a First Language to L2 pupils. A curious situation arises here; although the pupils at this school are L2 speakers of English they are expected to perform at the same level as L1 pupils. The Matriculation Board of the Committee of University Principals, which sets the matriculation requirements, prescribes the same norms that it sets for L1 pupils. If they fail English they have to repeat Std 10 the following year.

According to Cummins and Swain (1986) a subtractive model like the one adopted by this school does not promote enliteration in the mother tongue (MT) and as a result it puts L2 speakers at a disadvantage to some degree. Although they can use their MT for various purposes they usually fail to achieve high levels of proficiency in their MT and in the TL. Their speaking, reading and writing skills in the MT lag behind those of pupils who have had initial enliteration in their mother tongue.

The trend in this school has been to recruit and employ L1 English speaking teachers and highly proficient bilinguals to teach English to L2 pupils as a first language. A possibility exists that some of these teachers have had minimal exposure to L2 issues during their pre-service training, given the divisive nature of education in South Africa in the past.

3.5.2 The Choice of a Subject for Observation

This school was selected because of the positive attitude shown by the acting - principal when permission was sought to involve the school in this research. He was then teaching English to the Std 9's and was due to retire at the end of April 1995. When he offered himself for observation, I respectfully declined to use him as a subject as he did not have much time left before his retirement. I was informed that the new English teacher would be arriving in a few weeks time and that the acting - principal would only be leaving after he had inducted the new teacher. The acting principal assured me that he would clear the ground and talk to him on my behalf about my research interest.

I was asked to write a letter to the school explaining the nature and scope of my research. This I did and submitted it to the school two days later. After the Easter holiday I broached the subject of my research to the new Std 9 teacher who was more than willing to participate. We both saw the need to allow him to settle down first and give him an opportunity to establish a relationship with his class before engaging him in this research. In the light of the understanding reached between the two parties, data collection only started early in May and stopped shortly before the start of the June examinations.

I then wrote a letter to the parents asking for permission to involve their children in this small-scale research. The purpose of the study was outlined briefly in the letter and the parents were asked to

indicate whether they wished to have their children participating in this research. All 16 parents agreed to have their children participating. After having been granted permission by the school to carry out this research I outlined its purpose to the pupils and explained the shape that it would take. All the participants in this research were assured of confidentiality and anonymity.

3.6 DATA COLLECTION

The case study method was selected because it affords one the opportunity of using a varied number of elicitation techniques during the data collection process.

3.6.1 Instruments

The following instruments were used to collect data in this research: video-taped and transcribed lessons, an interview with the teacher, and questionnaires which were administered to the pupils. The lessons were video-taped only after I had been visiting the school for a week's observation. By then it was hoped that the three parties would have formed a relationship characterised by trust and openness.

A video recorder can inhibit learners, but the advantage of using one lies in the fact that it captures the context in which learning and teaching occur, i.e. nature of the physical situation, the identity of the participants and aspects of non-verbal communication like gestures, eye contact, grouping patterns and proxemics. These aspects were useful during data analysis.

Detailed field notes were recorded as well as conversations with the teacher at the end of each lesson in my diary. Interesting observations which were revealing of the teacher's correction policy and beliefs were also recorded. A number of problems were experienced during the actual data collection process. The lessons could not be recorded in succession as had been planned. As a result there were days on which the lessons could not be recorded. I then sat through those lessons and took down field notes. All five lessons that were recorded were analysed.

The second step in the data collection process involved engaging in a structured in-depth interview with the teacher with a view to understanding how and why he corrects the way he does in the different kinds of lessons.

It was envisaged that the exploration of an individual teacher's correction style would contribute to the growing body of knowledge on oral error treatment because the nature of descriptive ethnographic case studies is such that they contribute to theory building. It was also hoped that a non-evaluative study like this one would consciously raise the teacher's awareness of the beliefs that inform his correction style. During the interview this teacher could be seen pausing and reflecting on the questions before giving answers to them. Throughout the interview I was careful not to let my beliefs on oral error treatment get in the way and influence the observed. I was cautious about the manner in which I phrased the questions.

The third stage involved administering questionnaires to the pupils with the aim of finding out whether they do take notice of error treatment and how they perceive it. Their questionnaire responses also contributed to an understanding of their perception of their teacher's correction strategies.

3.7 ANALYSIS

Yin (1979:105) recommends the following methods of analysing case study evidence, namely, "examining, categorising, tabulating or otherwise recombining the evidence to address the initial propositions of a study". Although Yin believes that there are no foolproof recipes or formulas for analysing case study evidence he reckons that "much depends on an investigator's own style of rigorous thinking along with the sufficient presentation of evidence and careful consideration of alternative interpretation".

Stern (1985) maintains that the researcher would also have to discover how patterns interrelate in the system, explain how these relationships influence the phenomenon under study and acknowledge insights gained. These concerns at the analysis stage reflect that qualitative ethnographic studies are not haphazard but are systematic and illuminative.

Yin (1979) believes that every case study investigation should start with a general analytic strategy as that would yield priorities for what to analyse and why. The two analytic strategies that he identifies are relying on theoretical propositions that led to the case study and developing a case description. Of the two general analytic strategies suggested by Yin for analysing case study evidence, I chose to follow the theoretical propositions 'that led to this study' by adopting Allwright's taxonomy for the treatment of oral errors as a framework for analysis. This taxonomy has been presented in summary in the literature review chapter. The error-response episodes in each lesson were to be classified using Allwright's categories.

The assumptions that led to this study were that when pupils make errors during classroom interaction their teachers respond to them in one way or another. I then also set out to investigate the following issues which are pertinent to correction in addition to the central concern of this study mentioned in Chapter 1.

1. Which errors were ignored?
2. Which ones received priority and why?
3. Was the teacher consistent in his correction?
4. What was the teacher's attitude towards errors and error treatment?
5. Would his correction policy be different if he was teaching L1 pupils?
6. Did the teacher's style of teaching influence his correction policy?
7. How did this teacher influence the language learning environment during correction?

The lessons were transcribed verbatim for analysis purposes and non-verbal communication aspects were reflected on the transcripts. Only selected discourse units reflecting error-response episodes were woven into the write-up. These were then analysed rigorously.

Supportive evidence in the form of the interview with the teacher and the pupils' responses to the questionnaire were analysed using discourse analysis (D A). Allwright and Bailey. (1991:65) define discourse analysis as "a variety of procedures for examining chunks of language whether spoken or written". In the case of classroom research, DA involves the analysis of spoken language as it used in classrooms among teachers and learners. Van Lier (cited in Allwright and Bailey 1991:57) describes DA as "an analysis of the processes on interaction by means of a close

examination of audio-visual records of interaction. It covers many analytic processes from coding to quantification to more qualitative interpretations”.

Although I am fully aware of the limitations of elicitation techniques that rely heavily on memory and recall, the structured interview and the questionnaires gave valuable insights into this teacher’s correction policy. The advantage of conducting the interview after the lessons had been recorded was that the teacher could recall instances in which he had reacted to oral errors in the recorded lessons and use them to illustrate a point.

During the analysis of the teacher’s interview responses I paid the teacher another visit so that he could clarify points that did not come out very clearly during the interview possibly because of my inexperience with interviewing or ‘the observer’s paradox’.

Finally, the degree of match between what the teacher said about his correction policy in the interview and what he actually did in the classroom was explored.

On completion of the write-up the discussion chapter and the pupil responses were taken back to the teacher for comment. This was done in order to ensure that I had not misrepresented him and to further develop trust and openness in our relationship.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

The presentation of the data in this chapter does not reflect the sequence in which the data were collected. The teacher was first observed in action, then followed the interview and administration of the pupil questionnaire. I have presented the data in such a way that the interview presents what the teacher thinks he does when he responds to oral errors. This leads the reader into the classroom observation, and the pupils' perceptions of their teacher's correction policy is presented last.

4.2 BELIEFS UNDERPINNING THIS TEACHER'S CORRECTION POLICY: AN ANALYSIS OF HIS INTERVIEW RESPONSES. (See Appendix 7 for structured interview questions and responses)

An attempt was made to establish the degree of match between what the teacher did when responding to oral errors in the different kinds of English lessons and what he said about his correction policy during the interview. No criteria were set for determining which lessons would be analysed, and all six lessons which were recorded were analysed. The verbatim transcripts of those lessons appear in the appendices. It was envisaged that the teacher's concern in each type of lesson would throw light on how he regards oral error treatment and language learning in an L2 situation and what his attitude is towards errors and error treatment. The overall effect of his attitude towards oral errors was determined by taking a close look at what the pupils' questionnaire responses revealed about their perceptions of his correction policy. To establish how the teacher regards oral error treatment, the manner in which he responded to learner errors in the different types of lessons was analysed. The teacher's interview responses were compared to what he actually did with learner errors during classroom interaction. An attempt was also made to find out which errors were given priority by the teacher.

This teacher teaches the English First Language syllabus to L2 Std 9 pupils at a private school in Umtata. The situation that arises where L2 pupils study English as an L1 has been outlined in the

Methodology chapter. The teacher speaks Afrikaans and German as well as English and has had extensive teaching experience in bilingual classrooms. He is a university graduate and holds a post-graduate teaching diploma.

The teacher reported that the post-graduate teaching diploma that he did in the 1980's was "not based purely on 1st or 2nd language teaching principles". This kind of training makes him feel inadequate at times, particularly when it comes to teaching English as a First Language to non-mother tongue speakers. The volatile political situation in the country at the time of his training necessitated that the students be trained "to respond to the teaching situation in class, so it was almost as if it was an emergency measure to respond to People's Education. So it wasn't based purely on second language teaching principles".

Although the teacher prefers teaching LI pupils [i.e pupils whose mother tongue or first language is English] because he finds them more outspoken and more open-minded and also because they have the necessary linguistic skills to deal with almost any topic, he finds the opportunity of teaching English to L2 pupils challenging. For him this is a learning experience which will undoubtedly contribute to his professional growth. He was quick to add though, that he could not generalise about the learning styles and linguistic abilities of L2 pupils.

At the introductory stage of the interview when I asked him about his attitude towards oral errors that his pupils [the present Std 9 class that he is teaching] make during classroom interaction, he admitted that error treatment was not something he had consciously thought about until I came along and asked him to participate in this research. He went on to say that although he had not adapted his teaching because of my presence in his class he was more aware of how he responded to learner errors now that I was doing research in this field. He observed that when somebody reads a text and he hears that they are making an error then, "my response would have been different from what it would have been before I knew the significance of that kind of correction". This response made me think of the "observer's paradox". It forced me to reflect on how my presence as a non-participatory observer had impacted on this teacher's classroom practice. I then went back to him to establish what he had made of my presence in his classes. I wondered whether I had not overstated my case at the introductory stage when I explained the nature and scope of this small-scale research to him and had perhaps unconsciously influenced his correction policy. I asked him

whether his correction policy would have been the same had I not been physically there to observe him responding to learner errors. His response was that I had not influenced his correction policy, but he admitted that my interest in the field of error treatment in an L2 situation made him realise that this was an important aspect of language teaching. He then started reflecting on his correction policy, actively tried to bring to conscious awareness his correction strategies and came up with explanations on why he corrects the way he does.

Although I had initially categorised the lessons into fluency, comprehension and accuracy based lessons in the interview schedule I later had to abandon this classification at the analysis stage because a close examination of this teacher's interview responses revealed a different classification of the lessons. He had two categories of lessons, namely, language and fluency lessons; I had three. It was during the actual analysis of the data that I realised that this teacher regarded fluency and comprehension lessons as belonging to one category and that error treatment in such lessons was much the same. In fact the teacher consistently deferred error treatment in all the lessons except for the few extracts that have been referred to in 4.2. The following extract reveals not only this teacher's understanding of the lesson types but also the similarity with which he treats oral errors in the different types of lessons:

When I'm not thinking and am doing fast oral work with them, reading and discussing,... I correct it [i.e the oral error] right at that moment when I think it's necessary, otherwise most things I just let go.

This teacher is a sensitive, considerate and sympathetic teacher who is consciously aware of his pupils' differential proficiencies. It is this kind of awareness that seems to guide not only his correction policy but also his teaching activities in general. The reason he gave for selective treatment in the types of lessons involving "fast oral work, reading and discussing" was that some of his pupils had difficulty expressing themselves in English and he felt that by highlighting and correcting their errors every time they ventured to speak up, he "wouldn't get much in the form of a response the next time". He did not want to make their linguistic shortcomings stand in the way of meaningful communication, for he sees his role as that of guide who has to facilitate language learning through meaningful communication. It appears that what is of paramount importance to him is assisting pupils to gain confidence so that they can communicate their perceptions and ideas and negotiate meaning with others.

Such beliefs reflect the assumptions on which the communicative approach is based. One can hypothesise at this stage that the communicative approach to language teaching may have influenced this teacher's classroom practice. Gaies (1983) cites individual teacher styles as a variable in error treatment. Teachers correct errors in varying degrees: some correct, others do not, and there are those who take a middle position when it comes to error treatment. Another possibility is that this teacher's correction policy may not have been influenced by the communicative approach but is only reflective of the correction style that he prefers. Later on during the interview he mentioned that he encourages his pupils to discuss any topic that may be of interest to them "as long as it is in English because essentially I'm teaching communication".

His conscious awareness of the pupils' differential proficiencies and the fact that constant and consistent error treatment could make pupils "clam up and be reticent to speak up in class" could be seen as some of the ways in which this teacher influences the language learning environment.

The teacher reported that when his pupils cannot provide him with appropriate answers in "comprehension focused lessons" because the text is difficult and the questions have been set in a complicated manner, he goes back to the text and reads the part in which the answer is contained and then asks them to interpret and reconsider the question. If that does not work he provides them with the appropriate response and then goes back to the text "to show them exactly how I arrived at the answer". He further reported that he avoids supplying the answer without first having given them time to interpret the text themselves and reconsider their responses. He adopts an uncritical and reassuring tone when correcting content errors. He would politely say, "Yes that's an interesting way of looking at it". Even if the response was wrong he would follow the train of thought together with the rest of the class and then when they had reached a 'cul-de sac' he would encourage the error-maker to stand back and consider other alternatives. In instances where only one word answers are required, he would indicate that the answer is inappropriate by saying, "No!...no that's not right," and then transfer correction to another pupil only after the error-maker had been given enough time to reflect on his/her response.

Fluency lessons focus mainly on orality and one's ability to sustain an argument. Examples of such lessons include dramatisations, interviews, debates, individual and group presentations. The teacher added 'reading aloud' to the list. The teacher and I had the same understanding of what constitutes

a fluency focused lesson. He confessed that he had reservations about reading aloud because it exposes the weak reader to a lot of ridicule from fellow classmates. He reported that he cannot do much to protect the weak reader though he would have liked to as the syllabus demands that pupils be evaluated on oral fluency as well. He observed that he gives equal opportunities to both weak and good readers and offers support particularly to the weak readers by not intervening or interrupting while they are reading. "Only in serious cases would I correct their reading - interrupt their reading and correct but otherwise I would let it go if I think it's not serious". However, contrary to what the teacher believes he does, I observed that in most lessons that involve reading aloud he did the reading himself and stopped every now and again to check on the pupils' understanding. When I wished to know which errors he regarded as "serious," he listed basic language errors like grammar, concord, tense and pronunciation. These he said he would give on the spot treatment because they could lead to ambiguity. It is worth mentioning that some of the errors that he regards as serious do not affect meaning, intelligibility and comprehension in spoken discourse because those engaged in communication often arrive at meaning as a result of a shared context. For example, concord is less likely to interfere with communication than pronunciation is.

The theme that runs through this interview is the teacher's reluctance to treat errors during interaction. He maintained that he usually does not intervene during oral presentations. He listens and lets the whole thing run through while making a mental note of the pupils' mistakes. He then addresses recurrent mistakes in a follow-up lesson later on. Again this means deferring treatment. The reason he gave for deferred intervention is that "an oral situation is practice for a real-life situation out there, so if I correct certain things it does teach them certain skills for that real life situation out there". This is an indication that he does not always defer treatment in such lessons; where necessary he gives on the spot treatment. After going through the teacher's responses, I paid him another visit to find out exactly which errors he was likely to correct during oral presentations. His response was that the nature of his correction takes the form of consciousness-raising. It is neither "value laden" nor "accuracy focused". Instead it concentrates on making the error maker more aware of the socio-linguistic context, for example, audience analysis, discourse signals, non-verbal aspects of communication, politeness and appropriacy. What he says about his correction policy in fluency-focused lessons is confirmed by the fact that in the dramatisation lesson he

avoided correcting language errors during the actual presentation by the pupils. He only corrected a fluency error in an attempt to repair a communication breakdown.

He reported that he treats fossilised learner errors (i.e. recurrent and persistent errors that have not responded positively to treatment in the past) by constructing a worksheet based on the problem structure and then offers explanations as to why that type of error occurs. The grammar lesson on concord and sentence types involving the correction of written exercises orally is one such example of the kinds of exercises this teacher uses to treat "oral errors". This is how this teacher conceptualises oral error treatment. The fact that he raises the pupils' awareness of the kinds of errors that most L2 speakers make in the grammar lesson is an indication that he is treating fossilised learner errors in the written mode. He added that he then includes questions in tests based on the problem structure to establish whether the pupils have "de-fossilised".

Accuracy-based or form-focused lessons are aimed at promoting and developing grammatical accuracy. When I wanted to establish how the teacher responds to oral errors in such lessons, he reported a preference for overt correction. The manner in which he informs the pupils about their erroneous utterances is not abrupt and abrasive but polite and considerate. For example, if somebody made a mistake he "very politely says, No" and then if the pupil could not provide the correct answer he would, after giving the pupil enough time to reflect and restructure their response, call upon another pupil to provide a suitable answer. He usually gives everybody a chance to respond and avoids the fast ones for the first three answers. He asks the weaker pupils first and then gives the turn to the fast ones. He then goes to the original error maker to find out whether he/she agrees with the answer given by a fellow pupil.

He maintained that in form focused lessons he often takes into account the prevailing atmosphere in the class at that time. "If it is relaxed, yet attentive" he avoids being abrupt in his correction. He wouldn't just say straight out "No" but would use prompts like, "Ah, come on, don't be silly, it can't be that, think about it again". If "they can't think about it again," and if he sees that someone else has the answer, he calls upon that student to give the required answer. He corrects the weaker ones "in a way that they would be able to accept". For example he would say, "No man, think about it again, don't be silly or that's a stupid answer, but I wouldn't mean it". A stupid answer implies a response to content, whereas I was interested in oral linguistic errors. I wondered whether the

teacher had not perhaps heard “comprehension focused lesson” instead of “accuracy focused lesson” and as a result had misunderstood the question. He cautioned though that he does not use such comments with everybody because some of the pupils could take exception to that. Again his concern is making sure that he does not hurt the error makers' feelings.

His sympathies appear to lie with the weaker pupils. He reported that he often avoids being abrasive and strives for a warm and friendly atmosphere. His reported use of body language and physical contact at times conveys a feeling of warmth and caring to the error maker. He observed that his approach is different when dealing with the confident and risk-taking error maker because they can deal with criticism. With such learners he is usually challenging and thinks less about not hurting their feelings. There is evidence of him doing this during the class discussion on mixed relationships.

This teacher considers basic language errors like concord, tense and pronunciation serious errors that call for swift and precise action because they often affect meaning. “I would deal with them at that moment”. For him language learning is about establishing shared meaning and ambiguity obscures meaning and leads to confusion and communication breakdown. He cited the learner's inability to see phonemic differences as an example that could lead to ambiguity. It is for this reason that he “would correct serious errors at that moment”. He would make sure that he explained the phonemic difference between the two words e.g “live” and “leave” and write them out on the chalkboard so that the pupils could also see the difference in spelling. However, as pointed out earlier on, those involved in communication can often work out what has been said using context clues. Consequently, this does not necessarily make all pronunciation errors serious errors. In the lesson transcripts there is no evidence of him correcting errors in this way; in fact he consistently ignores the errors he reported that he considers serious.

Anything else other than concord, tense and pronunciation he considers “less serious” and does not bother to correct it because he knows that he will pick up such errors in the pupils' written work later on. Alternatively he designs a follow-up lesson or worksheet based on the errors he has not treated. He adopts an uncritical tone when responding to comprehension errors and treats the error in the following manner, “No....no...no...” and would “sort of fish for the right answer”. That would involve reformulating the question, throwing it open for discussion by the whole class. He

contended that open discussions encourage the learner to reflect on the question and that in most instances pupils manage to come up with ideas leading to appropriate answers.

Discourse errors like speaking out of turn, lack of floor-holding strategies and the inability to take a turn are not regarded seriously by this teacher. He does not shut anyone up unless they are making silly comments that disturb others and concentrates on promoting active participation and encouraging his students to speak up even though it might appear that his class is chaotic and unruly. He maintained that because he is not a quiet teacher himself he allows pupils to be vociferous during English lessons. I observed that the teacher did not sanction choral answers during interaction. Should pupils present an answer in unison and speak at the top of their voices, he concentrates on the weaker ones, those who hardly ever speak up, and tries to draw them out of their shells.

It transpired during the interview that this teacher has a positive attitude towards oral error treatment. He explained that in his experience he has found oral error correction to be of more value than written corrections. He observed that not only are written corrections often done out of context, but they are also time consuming and less effective than oral error corrections. He believes that for corrections to be effective they have to be contextualised and this is possible with oral errors. He argued that contextualised oral error correction is even more effective for L2 pupils as they often have difficulty with pronunciation. According to this teacher, modelling or making pupils repeat the correct answer after the teacher is hardly effective and should be done minimally in the L2 classroom. It appears that this is a strategy he rarely uses because only 25% of the pupils cited modelling as one of the strategies that their teacher uses. He further reported that a verbal explanation, accompanied by a written statement on the board if necessary in which the teacher explains why the utterance is incorrect goes a long way to promote the pupils' performance in the TL. The pupils would then positively transfer their linguistic knowledge and skills from one situation to another.

When I wanted to find out in which lessons he found himself correcting the most and why, he started off with the least being oral discussions because he wants the discussion to flow. Intermediary would be "language lessons" [grammar lessons in which he would read and do oral exercises]. He was a bit hesitant when it came to identifying lessons in which he corrected the most.

The reasons he gave for this being time constraints, how fast he wanted the lesson to go and the purpose of the lesson. For example, if he is discussing an oral topic for the following day he concentrates more on intensive discussion and less on accuracy because errors that have not been treated at that time would occur in the written form. Presumably he would correct the errors that were made during the discussion held the previous day then. He reckoned that "he is more particular about correction in the written form of the exercise following an oral discussion". Once more he defers oral error correction.

The principle or belief guiding this teacher's correction policy seems to be that errors are normal and should be expected during the process of learning a language. Besides, he argued, "most of the errors that pupils make are not serious". It is for this reason that he feels that error treatment should not be done excessively as it would "bog down teaching and stifle communication". For him what is more important is the source of the error, not the error itself. It is difficult to tell in what sense the source becomes more important than the error itself. Even after he had indicated the source of error to the error maker he "wouldn't insist that the next time you don't speak that way anymore". The above statement by the teacher reveals that he downplays the role of oral error treatment in language teaching and learning. Although he leads one into believing that with him oral error treatment is more effective than written treatments, there is a lack of fit in his argument because he says he defers treatment in almost all the lessons. A close look at the lesson transcripts reveals that he rarely ever corrects oral errors. Some of the few oral error treatments that were gleaned out of the transcripts appear to be incidental not intentional.

The teacher maintained that he is accommodative of code-switching during English lessons although this goes against the school policy. Pupils at this school are expected to communicate in English at all times during school hours, the popular belief behind this being that L2 pupils need more practice with English in order to perfect and hone their linguistic skills. He feels differently about this school regulation because he sees the pupils' L1 as a resource not a hindrance to L2 learning. He admitted though that he does feel left out at times when the pupils switch to Xhosa and he misses out on their jokes and humour. This is what has made him set limits within which code-switching should occur during English lessons. For example, when pupils embarrass or ridicule others he protects the pupil who is the focus of fun by insisting that they use English.

He allows pupils to discuss amongst themselves in their mother-tongue because he has realised that immediately he insists on English he puts a damper on the discussion and because they have difficulty expressing themselves in English and cannot put their ideas across successfully, "I allow it to happen especially in oral discussion when it becomes very heated, then I know they are angry, they are excited, it's difficult for them to express these feelings in a second language". After they have had their discussions, he usually insists on the use of English when reporting back to the class. By then the ideas are clearer as they have had a chance to think and talk about ways of transmitting their ideas in the TL to their teacher and the rest of the class. I noticed that although this teacher allows the pupils to code-switch, he insists on English the minute he feels they are overdoing it.

Although this teacher has ambivalent feelings towards the use of varieties other than standard English during English lessons, mainly because he says the syllabus demands that he teaches standard English, he allows pupils to use other varieties during classroom interaction. It is difficult to tell what he means by "Standard English" at this stage because even the previously stigmatised "non-standard" varieties now have a place in the language classroom. It is possible that he is not aware of the new syllabus or that he has not yet internalised the contents of the new syllabus. He admitted that the pupils' ability to use other varieties gives him another perspective on their linguistic abilities. It is for this reason that he allows his pupils to use them in certain instances. For example, they are acceptable during oral presentations and when the topic has to do with a particular variety but not in formal contexts like composition writing. I find this teacher's position rather difficult to understand because in most instances oral work activities precede writing and pupils are expected to make use of the knowledge and linguistic skills they have gained during oral discussions.

The use of communication strategies to compensate for breakdowns in communication is acceptable to the teacher because he is aware of the fact that L2 speakers employ other strategies to help them put their ideas across. He does not penalise them for employing these strategies. If a pupil has momentarily forgotten a particular word or concept he provides the word and writes it on the board so that they may see how it is spelt. He does not regard memory lapses as errors and when he finds out that the word that he has provided is new and unfamiliar to the pupils, he explains its origin and gives a list of other related words.

This teacher's perception of his role in the language classroom is that of guide and facilitator who has to lead his pupils out of the "cul-de-sac" of error making. This, he believes he can do successfully by taking into account the following factors: the learner's linguistic ability, level of proficiency and personality, the kinds of errors that they normally make especially in their essays, what understanding they have, their level of maturity and the skills they have in expressing themselves in English. For example, to illustrate his acknowledgement of personality differences and their effect on language learning and teaching, his corrective treatments, when directed at a less confident and weaker pupil are guiding, reassuring and more informative. However, for a confident and more articulate pupil he is highly critical and challenging. He reckoned that his correction policy in an LI situation would differ remarkably from what has been outlined above. It would be "less informative and less guiding as he would be dealing with understanding, not language".

4.3 HOW THE TEACHER RESPONDED TO ORAL ERRORS IN DIFFERENT TYPES OF ENGLISH LESSONS

4.3.1 Written Grammar Exercises done Orally (See Appendix 1 for lesson transcript)

Shortly after the preliminary observation week, which did not involve any video-recording, I recorded the following field notes with regard to how the teacher responded to oral errors in a lesson involving written exercises done orally. Although these exercises were not "strictly oral" I decided to use them in order to understand the teacher's concerns during oral error treatment.

The pupils were first given a theoretical framework on sentence types, non-simple sentences, clauses and phrases. Sentence analysis including the identification of the deep structure followed the rigorous discussion of sentence types and numerous examples from the grammar handbook and from the pupils themselves were provided in each case. Application exercises were given on sentence types, case and concord and were done orally because the teacher felt that it would be fruitful to do language exercises of this nature orally as "a written version does not promote a rigorous discussion". From what the teacher says, it appears that a written version of language exercises is not always suitable for error treatment. He was also of the opinion that an oral version of this exercise would eliminate guesswork and promote reflection on the part of the learner.

I observed that the pupils were given overt and explicit correction in this lesson. Pupils were not simply informed that their responses were incorrect but were given an opportunity to work out answers themselves using the theoretical background provided at the beginning of the lesson. They also used the theoretical foundation to self correct. They had to justify their choices in cases where they had to choose the correct response from a number of alternatives. The pupils confirmed that their teacher usually explains why an utterance is unacceptable.

Pupils worked on concord exercises in pairs and were allowed to consult with others when they came across difficult and confusing exercises. This stimulated discussion and peer correction.

The concord exercises were marked by the teacher himself. He went round the class checking on the pupils responses and progress and gave assistance where he felt it was needed. He supplied examples which he wrote on the chalkboard to illustrate a point. These examples generated a lot of discussion among the pupils. They then went back to their books and "changed or corrected" inappropriate responses. Those who had finished working on the exercise were marked individually by the teacher who went through the exercise with the pupil discussing the incorrect responses. Three days later they were given a test which contained a concord exercise as one of the test items.

Throughout this lesson the teacher insisted on the exclusive use of English. However, the pupils code-switched at times during discussions amongst themselves and their teacher disregarded this. During the lesson I observed rapport and a warm and easy working relationship between the teacher and the pupils.

The following observations and findings emanate from a video-taped and transcribed written grammar lesson done orally. The error-response episodes that have been selected for discussion do not reflect oral error treatment as it is normally understood in the literature as the pupils' responses are reactions to written exercises or sentences. The error treatment is more a response to the content of what the pupils are saying rather than to the way they are saying it.

- 1 T: How many clauses are in the deep structure of this sentence?
 "You and me could not stop him".

- 2 P: Two.
- 3 T: Two. Which ones are they?
- 4 PS: (in unison) "He said that you could not stop him".
"He said that he could not stop him".
- 5 T: No, remember we did it last time.
The first one, "You could not stop him". The second sentence, "I could not stop him". We'll combine the two, leave out repetitions and link the two with "he said that you and I". Do you understand why it is "I"? He said that, [pause], is one sentence. So it's two different subjects, okay. So, he said that, "You and I could not stop him".

The teacher indicated clearly when the response was incorrect. "No, remember we did it last time". He jogged the pupils' memories through reference to a previous lesson with the hope that they would relate this one to it. He then provided the two required sentences and explained how they could be combined to form a single sentence after making the necessary changes. Then after spelling out the basic rule at work he asked for confirmation, "Do you understand why it is I?" This is the teacher's way of finding out whether the pupils have understood the grammatical rule that applies here and how it is applied.

In the next exercise a slightly different pattern emerged. The pupils were not required to identify the two clauses contained in the sentence "I think me and Sally would rather go out," but had to identify the error contained in the sentence first, explain why the sentence is incorrect and thereafter identify the two clauses. The first clause was identified by the teacher and the second one by the pupils. This was followed by an explanation by the teacher on the number of subjects in the two clauses and how the error arises i.e "Sally and me" when it should be "Sally and I" depending on whether these phrases have been used as objects or as subjects. He then brought to the pupils' attention the fact that this was a mistake most L2 speakers make. This was consciousness-raising aimed at raising their awareness about a structure most L2 speakers have difficulty mastering. More examples of this nature were cited by the teacher e.g. "My friends and me," "Vuyo and me," and an explanation was given as to why these are incorrect when used as subjects. He further

explained that some users of English, even those who appear on television are actually unaware that they are making an error when they speak in this way. The teacher went over more exercises of this nature for the rest of the one hour long period. He referred the pupils to an exercise in their language handbooks in which they were expected to fill in blank spaces in each of the sentences with who or whom. He insisted that they explain their choice, possibly to limit guess work and check on their understanding.

This teacher's manner of correction was polite and sensitive. The following extract illustrates this point:

- | | | |
|---|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 | T: | You are correct.
I am correct.
What is the subject and the verb in each case? |
| 2 | P: | (inaudible) |
| 3 | T: | We know that. Why does the verb to be differ? Why is it you are, I am, she is? It's the same verb but why is it different? |
| 4 | P: | Where is that? |
| 5 | T: | No.4 page 208. Why can't I say "I are so tired or you am so stupid". Why not? |
| 6 | P: | It doesn't sound. |
| 7 | T: | Sound is not enough. It doesn't sound like... |
| 8 | P: | Agree |
| 9 | T: | Exactly. Thank you. It doesn't agree. |

The last three lines of this utterance constitute an error-response episode. The teacher is indicating to the pupil that his utterance is incorrect and offers him a clue to the correct construction. This he does by expanding the pupil's one word utterance. This appears to be his main mode of response in most of the lessons that were recorded.

When the pupils were not quite sure of the required response and gave two different answers the teacher did not indicate right away which of the two responses was correct or whether both were

correct. Instead he carefully explained the rule they should have applied in order to arrive at the correct answer. Where there was disagreement on the rule that should be applied he again explained his choice and drew comparisons with sentences they had to correct before. The lesson did not focus on the rules only. The pupils were exposed to colloquial use as well. This is how the lesson went:

- 1 T: Okay let's see. If you use the first one, "You and I am correct".
What are the two clauses contained in here?
- 2 P: You are correct.
- 3 T: And?
- 4 P: I am correct.
- 5 T: So we've combined the two. We've cut out the repetition because "correct" occurs in both clauses. So we only use it once and we've combined these two with and but now there are two different verbs. So are we able to omit one of the two verbs? We could omit one word because they are repeated in both clauses. But, can we do the same with the verb?
- 6 PS: Yes.
No.
- 7 T: When we started off didn't we say that when we combine the two sentences we can only cut out the repetitions. For example, "I bought a pen, I bought a ruler, I bought a book [becomes] I bought a pen, ruler and a book. We've cut out the repetitions but now these are not repeated. They are totally separate words. So we can't really delete. We can't say, "You and I am correct". Can we?
- 8 P: You can say that.
- 9 T: You can say, "You and I are correct". Why? Because ----- (inaudible) This [i.e You and I] is like a subject, a combined subject and it's a plural subject. "You and I are correct". Okay, people do speak that way and they say, "You and I am correct," and this sounds wrong. And it shouldn't necessarily be wrong. There's a rule that might say it's wrong but when

- we speak it's easy for us because the subject is closer to the verb. So we assume, let's just use that verb. Do you understand?
- 10 P: People don't say that.
- 11 T: [pointing at the two sentences on the board] Don't they say this? Do they say this?
- 12 P: Yes.
- 13 T: Let's see which is the most frequent form. Exercise 37 page 243. "Neither you nor I were correct". Is that right?
- 14 P: It's right.
- 15 T: But do you say "I were"?
- 16 P: (silence)
- 17 T: You don't say "I were". What are the two classes?
1. You were correct.
2. I was correct.
- So if you combine the two, "Neither you and I---
Should it be was or were?
- 18 P: Was
- 19 T: Why?
- 20 P: It's plural. Is it plural?
- 21 P: No.
- 22 T: No, it's singular.
- 23 P: Was.
- 24 T: So it's "was". Thank you. "Neither you nor I was correct" because it's two separate subjects referring to each one individually. Understand? Okay, "Neither you nor I was correct," because you are referring first to the one and then to the other. You use the number of the one closest to the verb.
- Understand?

There is no evidence of pupils making oral errors in the above extract. The focus of these exercises is grammatical correctness, and because the focus is not on language use corrective treatments became corrections of content.

4.3.2 Unrecorded Short Story: The Visits

Due to a technical problem which the video-recorder identified minutes before the start of this lesson, it was not possible to do any recording. I sat through this lesson and took down field notes.

No oral error correction was observed throughout the 60 minute long lesson. There was more emphasis on the critical interpretation and analysis of the short story. This teacher invited personal reactions to questions, considered them and then allowed the class to debate them. His personal response came only after the pupils had discussed and exhausted alternative responses.

The teacher read through the short story himself and developed the pupils' vocabulary when he came across words that were difficult and unfamiliar to the pupils. He did not simply explain the meaning of a word out of context but made sure that he introduced them to "a family of related words". At times the pupils themselves provided the meanings of the words through the skilful use of context clues.

After the lesson this teacher explained to me that in "discussion lessons" he consistently avoided correcting errors as the lesson objective is usually understanding and arriving at shared meaning. He further explained that "there usually aren't right and wrong answers to questions" posed to pupils concerning the text under discussion. However, this is not the issue as my concern was with how pupils say things and not only with content. It appears that in such lessons his focus is on content, not linguistic errors. His perception of the language teacher's role is that of guide in such lessons. He feels that "the teacher has to guide the lesson towards a certain direction". These are the sentiments he echoed during the interview when I asked him to outline his correction policy in comprehension focused lessons.

4.3.3 Language Tutorial: My Life as a Driller - See Appendix 2

The teacher had prepared a tutorial exercise in the form of a reading comprehension from a journal article. The responses to the questions had to be presented in writing before the end of the period.

He first explained what the exercise was about and then went through the questions explaining what was expected in each one. This also involved making the language used accessible and comprehensible to the pupils. He then read the passage himself and in instances where the language used was unfamiliar to the pupils, those who knew the meanings of the difficult words were called upon to explain them to the rest of the class. The teacher elaborated on the answers given by the pupils.

As he read through the article, he pointed out that the language used by the writer who happened to be a miner with a Std 8 education, was not always correct and then went on to correct the punctuation, spelling and word division in the text himself. Although these extracts do not strictly reflect oral error treatment they were cited mainly to illustrate the teacher's concerns regarding errors in "discussion lessons". The following are examples of the corrections he effected:

There's that mistake there, "Its a hard job". There's that comma there which has been left out.

He then continued reading and identified another error. "Infact," those are two words. "Couldnt" should have been written as "couldn't". "Loose" that's a spelling error. There should only be one "o". The teacher then brought to the pupil's attention the fact that newspapers often make deliberate spelling and punctuation mistakes. Again this is not oral error treatment. The teacher is correcting errors in a written text.

Other than the errors identified above by the teacher as he read through the article, I did not observe any oral error correction in this lesson.

4.3.4 Reading Comprehension: The Necklace - See Appendix 3

The teacher read through the passage himself after he had given the pupils a brief introduction to the writer of the article. The interpretation of the text was a joint exercise by the teacher and the pupils. As the teacher read through the text he now and again asked questions to check on the pupils' understanding.

There were very few instances of oral error correction observed in this lesson. The teacher only supplied additional information in cases where he felt that the answer given was not all embracing. For example, after reading from Paragraph.1 he asked, "Do you know what a dowry is?"

- | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------|
| 1 | PS: | (in unison) Lobola. |
| 2 | T: | Sort of. |

He then supplied additional information, "Normally in those days the parents or the father especially would make sure that his daughter had some kind of dowry or---(inaudible) something like lobola so that she could be taken care of as soon as she got married because the child has got to leave her family and become the property or member of the man's family. So she could have some kind of independence - financial independence". Expansion of this kind is one of the key strategies he uses to treat oral errors.

The teacher's response elicited different reactions from the pupils. His selection of the word "greedy" when two answers were presented at the same time made one pupil realise that he had made an error. The teacher's sharp retort also confirmed to him that his response was inappropriate hence his decision to remain silent and not take the turn the next time. The other pupil whose response was selected by the teacher became certain that his response was correct and this is why he took the second turn.

- | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------------------|
| 1 | T: | What do you make of this woman? |
| 2 | PS: | Greedy.
Shortage. |
| 3 | T: | What? I thought I heard greedy. |

- 4 P: Greedy. [the other pupil did not respond this time]
5 T: Perhaps a little proud, a little vain. That's the word.
Making much of herself. Let's keep an open mind.

Again the teacher gave additional information thereby expanding their vocabulary.

At times the teacher's manner of correction was subtle to the point of being rather confusing as it was not explicit enough. The following example illustrates this point.

- 1 T: What fairy tale does the story remind you of?
2 P: Cinderella.
3 T: Cinderella, yes.
Do you think the same fate would befall her that befell Cinderella? That some magical time something would happen and all her dreams would vanish? What indications are there perhaps in the story? How is the writer setting her up as a target for this to happen?
4 P: [doubtfully] Enjoyment.
5 T: Okay. But I think it's like putting her away on a pedestal. Such a beautiful perfect evening as if nothing can be wrong and one always has some kind of expectation that she's going to fall - very hard.

The teacher's response "Okay, but" is a polite way of disagreeing in English. Because it is an indirect speech act it might confuse L2 learners. I went through the tape once more in order to establish whether the teacher's correction had been taken notice of. This could not be established because after modelling the correct answer the teacher did not use the pseudo-acceptance again.

This teacher rephrased his question when he felt that the response given by the pupil had not addressed the question directly.

- 1 T: Now, where do our sympathies lie, with the rich friend or Louise?

- 2 PS: Louisel.
- 3 T: Why? We started off thinking that she was proud, she was vain, stupid and greedy and now we suddenly sympathise with her.
- 4 P: 10 years.
- 5 T: Okay, 10 years. How could she have known that she could have wasted her life? How does one call this type of shock effect?
- 6 P: Climax.
- 7 T: Yes, it is called the climax but this device is called IRONY. [T writes the word on the board] I told you initially that it is difficult to define this word. This is how it is demonstrated, "It is ironic that she had to spend all this time suffering [pause] 10 years of her life to make up for something that was not actually genuine".

The pupil's response in line 4 constitutes a linguistic error. Although it is factually correct it does not connect with the teacher's question because of the manner in which it has been presented. The provision of one word answers is a very common pattern in this class. However, one word answers are not always syntactically correct, sometimes they are used in order to avoid making an error. The pupil's one-word answer in Line 4. is followed by expansion from the teacher. This happens again in this lesson in lines 7 and 8. The pupil should have said "A climax".

4.3.5 Poetry: My Mistress' Eyes by William Shakespeare - See Appendix 4

The Parting by Michael Drayton

The first poetry lesson on Shakespeare's sonnet, My Mistress' Eyes could not be video-recorded. This is how the teacher reacted to learner errors as recorded in the field notes.

Detailed background information on the life of the poet and the history, structure and content of his sonnets was given. This was a teacher fronted lesson and as a result there was not much oral error

correction done. The teacher did most of the talking. In one instance when the pupils gave two different responses simultaneously he only selected and announced the correct version. When he asked for a definition of the word “cliche” he acknowledged the pupil's response as correct and went on to give a more comprehensive definition which was accompanied by an example. When he asked one of the pupils to explain the meaning of the word “conceited” the pupil's response was, “He likes himself too much”. The teacher rephrased this response and gave a fuller description of the word together with a host of other words like “vanity”, “arrogance,” “pride” which are also related to “conceited”. He was found to be supportive to pupils who were not confident in their answering. He rephrased his questions and without pressuring them gave them another turn before moving on to another pupil to provide the appropriate response. However, he did not always indicate explicitly whether a pupil's response was incorrect or not before giving the turn to someone else. His personal response to a question demanding critical reflection and a well thought-out answer came only after a number of pupils had had their say. The pupils' responses were paraphrased by the teacher when the expression used was not so good and as a result obscured meaning.

Michael Drayton's sonnet entitled “The Parting” was video recorded. The teacher read the poem first and concentrated on vocabulary building and extension using the context of the poem as a starting point. A discussion on the structure of the sonnet and its rhyme scheme preceded the interpretation of the poem.

Modelling was used a number of times as an oral error treatment strategy in this lesson. In the following example the teacher modelled the correct answer only after he had given them a clue (How much is a jot of love?) which was not made use of by the pupils.

Example 1.

- | | | |
|---|-----|-------------------------------------------|
| 1 | T: | What is a jot? How much is a jot of love? |
| 2 | PS: | [silence\ no response] |
| 3 | T: | Speck of love, drop of love. |

Example 2.

- 1 T: Where is the quatrain? What is the quatrain?
2 P: ab,ab
3 T: What? (with a rising intonation)
4 P: ab,ab
5 T: ab,ab, four lines. Okay those are your quatrain. What happens in the quatrain? I'm sure I gave these notes.
[T. writes on the board]
6 PS: [no response]
7 T: The argument is presented ,okay.
8 P: The idea is presented.
9 T: The idea is presented. Thank you.

The teacher modelled the correct answer in line 7. Apparently this teacher's reference to a previous lesson succeeded in making the pupil recall how the required information was actually worded by the teacher in a lesson they had the week before on Shakespeare's sonnet, "My Mistress' Eyes".

The teacher used prompts to encourage pupils who were not confident enough in their answering. However, the clue given by the teacher, "I hear some con--at the end that I'm looking for" misled the pupils into believing that he was looking for a word that begins with "con", only to have him accepting "couplet" as the correct answer. Perhaps he might have forgotten to mention that "conclusion" and "couplet" are related in this context. Another possibility is that the teacher's tone or response, "What?" confirmed to the pupil that his previous response was incorrect; hence he saw the need to self-correct and offer "couplet" as an alternative. It was not clear from the tape whether the responses cited here came from one or more pupils.

- 1 T: Okay, if you break up the poem into its greatest parts, what will it be? What does the--[inaudible on tape] consist of? You wrote it down, didn't you?
2 P: Ja.
3 T: Yes.
4 P: Conclusion.

- 5 T: Yes, I hear some con---- at the end that I'm looking for.
- 6 P: Concord
- 7 T: What!
- 8 P: Couplet.

There were times when the teacher did not indicate clearly whether the pupil's response was acceptable or not. In the following extract he simply ignored the incorrect response. Why does she say, "Now I've done you get no more of me?"

- 1 P: Tired.
- 2 T: It's a response to what he says, "No don't stop me. I've had enough". Perhaps she was protesting. Perhaps she was trying to say "please" and he says "No, no, I've had enough".

The teacher consistently accepted single word answers from pupils. This reduces the opportunity for pupils to experiment with the language and make errors in the process. The fact that they avoid making errors by consistently providing telegraphic answers also does not afford the teacher an opportunity to give them corrective feedback. It is possible that this pattern has been established because the teacher is much more concerned with the 'content' of the lesson than the way in which the pupils use the language.

4.3.6 Twelfth Night: Dramatisation - See Appendix 5

The pupils had been asked to prepare for the dramatisation of the reunion between Sebastian and Viola, each telling the other of their adventures. Although they had to base their performance on a scene they had read and discussed from the play depicting the reunion, they were not expected to recall the script as it is. This was a lesson focused on the ability to communicate rather than to memorise lines from the text.

The pupils were nervous and reluctant to participate at first possibly because for some this was their first experience with video-recording. One could also attribute their nervousness to the fact that this

was the first lesson to be recorded and they could have been worried about the impression they were going to create on both the video operator and the researcher.

Their teacher together with a fellow pupil broke the ice by actually demonstrating the reunion. This had a positive effect on the pupils and from then on most of them participated willingly.

Although the teacher and I had initially agreed not to use this lesson for analysis purposes because the video-operator became obtrusive at some stage during recording, we decided in the end to make use of it as it was the only dramatisation lesson I had.

There was no evidence of oral error correction in this lesson except for the incidental treatment of a fluency error in a very subtle manner. The participants were allowed to act out their roles uninterrupted and the performances generated a lot of humour as the role players tried very hard to bring out their hidden acting talent. The occasional errors were disregarded by the teacher and the focus was on the delivery of the message and not on grammatical accuracy. The teacher assumed the role of chairperson and called the pairs to the stage. He made brief comments between presentations and encouraged the less enthusiastic ones to participate.

Pair 2

P: I've been looking for you. I thought you were dead on that shipwreck.

P2: [Remains silent and unresponsive as if he is at a loss for words]

T: He's not ready.

Come on, I don't expect you to remember the script.

Just say what comes to mind.

Silences are a normal feature of communication in and outside the classroom situation. However, when turn taking has not been handled appropriately and there are 'prolonged' silences before the 'hearer' responds to an utterance [i.e. not providing feedback], they can be viewed as mistakes of fluency. Murphy (1984) asserts that mistakes of fluency which need not be corrected immediately include the inability to take a turn, the deliberate avoidance of the gaze of the current speaker to avoid having to speak next' and the decision to go silent because one is unclear on how to proceed. I believe that the hearer's silence in the above discourse unit indicates his failure to convey that the

speaker's message has been communicated successfully. His silence may also be an indication of his inability to maintain communication although the speaker's construction happens to be unambiguous, flawless and clear.

One could argue that the context of the reunion between long lost siblings demands that the 'pairs' feign surprise and shock at seeing each other after so long a period. The teacher does not interpret the silence as a reflection of surprise only. He decides to intervene after some time because he thinks that the hearer is either not ready or perhaps lacks the necessary creativity and spontaneity that an exercise like this calls for and wants to recall the text as it is, hence the prolonged silence. Because he wants the pupil to repair the perceived breakdown in communication he does not reprimand or punish him, instead he reminds him that he does not expect him to remember the script as it is. He is actually encouraging him to take the turn. He is giving him an opportunity for a new attempt. Allwright and Bailey (1991) and Murphy (1986) are of the opinion that when a fluency error occurs it becomes necessary at times to intervene and comment on why communication has broken down.

4.3.7 Class Discussion: Mixed Relationships - See Appendix 6

A context was prepared by the teacher for the discussion on mixed relationships the following day. He read out to the class a magazine article on mixed marriages and the content of this article was briefly discussed. Copies of the article were made available to the rest of the class so that they could read it closely and prepare for the discussion the following day. They were specifically asked to concentrate on the problems facing couples in such marriages. The information gained from reading this magazine article assisted them in preparing for their discussion on "mixed relationships" the following day.

This lesson took the form of a teacher directed classroom discussion. According to Ellis (1990) the pervasive lesson structure in teacher-pupil exchanges is the Elicit-Reply-Feedback (E-R-F) type. Unlike in the Initiating-Responding-Feedback (I-R-F) lesson structure which is not facilitative of language development the E-R-F structure creates ample opportunities for language learning and makes it possible for learners to participate in extended discourse. Characteristics of teacher talk in such lessons include framing moves, pseudo-acceptance, question reformulations and paraphrase.

There was a vibrant and lively discussion of problems experienced by people in mixed relationships and the pattern of telegraphic responses was broken this time. The teacher's open-ended and close-ended questions provided the pupils with an opportunity to engage in a meaningful discussion of the topic. The pupils' responses were varied and although they still produced short and telegraphic sentences, their responses were original and the sentences were longer. The errors that they made were largely ignored. The following extracts reflect how the teacher responded to the errors.

Example 1

- 1 T: Then, now as the child grows up the child will have to be made aware of the traditions of the family. Which one of the two is going to take precedence? Which one is going to be emphasised?
- 2 P: Father.
- 3 T: Is that?
- 4 P: No. [Pupils all talk at the same time and it becomes difficult to make out what they are saying.]

The grammatical error made by the pupil i.e failure to indicate possession was ignored by the teacher, instead he allowed time for the pupils to discuss for some time uninterrupted.

Example 2

- 1 T: If you assume 50:50 how are you to practically do this. The child week-ends with the one family then the other one the following week-end? How is the child going to be exposed?
- 2 P: During the June holidays he goes to -----.
(laughter)
- 3 P: (same pupil) something like that.
- 4 T: Alright, okay.
- 5 P: (boy) stupid, only one thing to do is to go to the father.
- 6 T: But, this is unfair to the child.
- 7 P: The child should be exposed to both traditions.
- 8 T: Both traditions?

The teacher disregards the linguistic error in utterance no 5, and responds to the content of the utterance in no. 7 with his tone of voice suggesting that the topic under discussion is controversial. He is trying to stimulate debate and carry the discussion forward. The pupils' responses are much longer and qualitatively better than in the previous lessons.

Example 3

- 1 T: Your wife puts her foot down and says 'look, no, I'm not here to clean for you.
I'm not here to (laughter)
Okay, what if she as an individual ... she has rights also as a woman which are different (say) from those of the traditional Xhosa woman .
- 2 P: What rights?
- 3 T: For example she would like to work.
(laughter)
- 4 T: She has a right to own her property.
- 5 PS: (boys) (exclaiming in disbelief) Yhu, what's that? Why?
No.

The teacher ignores the sudden introduction of a Xhosa exclamation into the discussion. This confirms what he said during the interview about his not regarding code-switching as undesirable. He is trying to generate debate and involve the students as much as he can. There is rapport between the teacher and the pupils, and the relaxed atmosphere presumably makes the pupils forget about the correctness of their responses and react personally to the issues raised by the teacher, hence the longer sentences this time around.

Example 4.

- 1 T: Okay, what about living conditions? Who decides where you're going to be living?
- 2 P: The man.
Others: Both.

- 3 P: Every decision in the family is made by the father.
4 P: Do you know what you are speaking? [Direct translation from MT]

The teacher ignores the direct translation from the MT in utterance 4 and carries on with the discussion. The focus is once more on the message, not how something is said.

4.4 THE TEACHER'S REPERTOIRE OF CORRECTIVE STRATEGIES

An analysis of the teacher's interview responses reveals that this teacher believes he has a positive attitude towards oral error treatment. The following extract reveals not only his attitude towards oral errors but also the fact that he finds oral error treatment more beneficial for treating phonological errors in an L2 situation. However, in the lesson transcripts there was not a single instance of phonological error treatment.

I think it is perhaps of more benefit than any kind of written corrections because I've noticed that in their essays I don't let them do spelling or remedial work afterwards because I found in my experience it's a waste of time because it's done out of context. I would mark it in the book and write the correct version there but I wouldn't pay too much attention unless it was something really serious then I would draw up a worksheet of all their mistakes and deal with it but orally I think it's important for this kind of pupil where they have difficulty with pronunciation that it's done within the context and not only corrected and said, "No, you must not say this, the whole class repeat after me". Not only that but to give an explanation even on the board if necessary around that so that they understand why it is wrong and can apply the same principle to other situations.

Although he believes that oral error treatment is more effective than treating errors in the pupils' writing, in practice in the lessons observed he does not concern himself much with oral error treatment. He defers treatment of oral errors, prepares a worksheet on the problem structures and treats them in the written form. This was confirmed by the pupils in their questionnaire responses. The teacher's understanding of oral error treatment is that although it is necessary for treating "serious" errors [his hierarchy reflects grammatical errors like concord, tense and pronunciation as

serious errors] it “should not bog down teaching”, hence the tendency for this teacher to defer treatment and concern himself with affective matters, i.e taking into account the error-maker's feelings, making sure that he is not abrasive if and when he decides to correct. This does not mean that he ignores oral errors altogether in practice. This is confirmed by the fact that when the pupils were asked to recall how their teacher responds to their spoken errors, they were able to draw up a list of the corrective strategies that he usually employs during classroom interaction. It has to be borne in mind that the information supplied by the pupils may not be a true reflection of what normally happens in the classroom for the following reasons: memory is not always a reliable data collection tool, secondly, they had just changed teachers - a possibility exists that they had not yet become fully aware of his correction style at the time this study was undertaken.

The lesson transcripts reflect the following repertoire of treatment strategies, namely, modelling, allowing very short responses from the pupils and in so doing, allowing pupils to avoid errors, expanding them, giving explanations as to why something is wrong [in the written form of the exercise that is done orally], selection of only the acceptable response when pupils give two different answers in unison [this strategy was used quite often by the teacher], use of the rising intonation to indicate that the response given is unacceptable, the use of encouraging statements, “Come on, I don't expect you to recall the script as it is” to correct a fluency error, and the use of pseudo-acceptance, i.e “okay, but” - a very common way of disagreeing in English. The pseudo-acceptance was accompanied by a tone that is suggestive of the unsuitability of the response given.

The pupils' perceptions of their teacher's correction policy, how they would like to be corrected and the strategies he adopts to treat their errors are reflected in 4.3. What they seem to like the most about the manner in which he corrects them is the fact that he does not only give them cognitive feedback but he takes their feelings into account when giving them feedback on their performance in spoken English.

4.5 ERRORS THAT WERE IGNORED BY THE TEACHER

I decided against applying Allwright's model of corrective treatments because there were very few instances of oral error treatment in the lessons recorded. I kept an open-mind regarding reasons behind the teacher's reluctance to correct despite the fact that the pupils were making errors in

spoken English. When he did correct his manner of correction was subtle and indirect. I then decided to do error analysis to establish what kinds of errors were ignored and chose a dramatisation lesson for this. This lesson revealed a few instances of code-switching, an area that remains unresearched in the field of error treatment. The lesson presented me with an opportunity to look at extended speech from the pupils and get a sense of the kinds of errors that they make.

I did not find the error analysis exercise easy to perform because of the differences between spoken and written discourse. In spoken discourse there are repetitions, false starts, hesitations, gap fillers and silences. These do not make it easy for one to identify errors in spoken discourse or to respond to them. It becomes extremely difficult for the teacher in the flow of discourse, to identify an error and decide whether or not to 'react' to it. What compounded the situation even further is that when I took my analysis to an L1 speaker for comments, her categorisation was slightly different from mine. The fact that she identified fewer errors than I supports the view that L2 speakers are less tolerant of errors than L1 speakers. It could also mean that L2 speakers sometimes see errors where they do not exist; they do not take account of the flexibility of colloquial spoken English. This could perhaps explain the teacher's reluctance to treat errors. Holley and King 1975 (cited in Seliger and Long 1983) corroborate this view.

Chaudron (1977) identifies three error categories, namely, the strictly linguistic errors (phonological, lexical and morpho-syntactical errors), subject matter or content errors (content-related errors that have to do with factual and conceptual knowledge) and errors of classroom interaction and discourse (speaking out of turn, failing to speak, not speaking in full sentences and taking up the wrong question in the lesson). The categories listed above were made use of to code the errors.

It was difficult for me to draw the line between discourse and content errors as there seemed to be some kind of overlap between the two.

Errors that the teacher ignored were grammatical. They involved mostly direct translations from the MT, prepositional errors, tense, the wrong use of modality, incorrect word order, the wrong choice of articles, omission of articles and the wrong choice of logical connectors. It is worth noting

that the untreated grammatical errors did not obscure meaning, or interfere with comprehensibility. This is probably why they were ignored by this teacher.

This teacher only treated a fluency error in this lesson and disregarded the rest. I believe that this was incidental treatment; the teacher had to repair the breakdown in communication by encouraging the pupil [who appeared to be at a loss for words] to say something. Besides, nowhere else does he treat discourse errors.

Here are a few “vignettes” of the utterances containing errors that were ignored:

Viola: When the chief master told me the story about Orsino I went to the town to find a job and there I worked for Orsino and I was a servant for Orsino on Olivia.

The prepositional error made by the pupil above was ignored by the teacher. Redundancy, i.e. repeating what had been said before was not categorised as an error because redundancy is a feature of spoken discourse.

P1: I thought you were dead in that shipwrecking.

Although the above utterance reflects the creativity of the learner's language, the addition of the “ing” constitutes a grammatical error.

P2: I was also sent by u-Antonio who gave me a purse and money and I went to Orsino's place where people thought I was u-Cesario. I had a fight with Sir Toby. He thought I was Cesario.

It was difficult to categorise code-switching because both error analysis and error treatment have not addressed this aspect. The u- above is a Xhosa prefix which has been used in this context to achieve a particular effect. Its omission would not affect meaning. Its use here was meant to achieve humour and judging from the reaction of the class it was evident that the pupil who made the above utterance had successfully achieved his goal. A question that came to mind is whether code-switching in this context can be seen as “undesirable”. One could argue that it depends on

whether speakers code-switch in order to avoid using English or to achieve a particular communicative effect.

P1: Okay, that's why the guy wanted my purse. He mixed up us. He thought I was you.

There are no phrasal verbs in Xhosa. This is probably why the pupil who made the utterance above could not get the word order right.

The following table reflects the categories into which the pupils' utterances were placed.

Table 1

Linguistic	Content	Discourse
15	None	One

This classification reveals that most of the errors that were ignored by the teacher were linguistic. I have selected only those utterances reflecting that errors have been made. The errors contained in those utterances have been underlined. A full verbatim transcript of the lesson is in Appendix 5.

4.6 ANALYSIS OF PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE (see Appendix 8 for questionnaire responses)

Although I had been through the questionnaire with the pupils prior to administration, explaining briefly what was involved in each question and trying to make the language used in the questionnaire more accessible to them, when I went through their responses during the analysis stage, I realised that some of them had given responses that did not directly address the questions. For example, when asked, "How does your English teacher usually respond to oral errors that you make when expressing yourself in English? Explain fully". One of the responses was, "He corrects me when I say something wrong". Whereas I was expecting responses that would help me draw up the teacher's response profile, some of the responses were not explicit enough for me

to be able to achieve this. One can only speculate that the problem lies partly with the difficulty in making the question simple enough without actually spelling out the required response. Another reason could be the fact that the question requires them to recall what their teacher usually does during the “crisis point” of error making. There are problems with being asked to recall a past event, and consequently these responses cannot be taken as a true reflection of how the teacher usually responds to oral errors during classroom interaction. The learner may not have been consciously aware of the teacher's corrective treatments. Another possibility is that some of the respondents had difficulty explaining what the teacher does in a second language.

Some of the pupils' responses were rather general but succeeded in giving me an idea of how their teacher handles oral errors; for example, “He corrects the student,” “Discusses the problem with the student”, and “He usually discusses the problem in class so that if other students also have the same problem they are aware of it”. Interesting as these responses are they are not explicit enough.

Other responses were more revealing of the teacher's behaviour. For example, one of the pupils stated that he doesn't make them feel embarrassed when correcting their errors. Another pupil responded, “He doesn't correct while we are talking”. Statements like these reveal the teacher's sensitivity and confirm what he says in the interview about his conscious effort not to hurt their feelings by being abrasive and unmindful of individual learner differences in his treatment of spoken errors during classroom interaction. He takes into account the fact that some pupils are introverted, shy, have poor self esteem and easily get hurt if the teacher's manner of correction is abrasive. Less confident pupils are likely to sit back and not participate if their feelings are not taken into account by the teacher.

Some of the responses dealt with the teacher's manner of correction quite explicitly. For example, one of the pupils reported “He first listens to what I have to say and then corrects my errors”.

One of the pupils wrote, “He doesn't rush me, he gives me a chance to have my say”. Another one had this to say, “He corrects the sentence or word and gives me a chance to say it the correct way”.

According to the respondents, their teacher uses a variety of error treatment techniques when responding to their erroneous utterances. "He usually responds by correcting your error immediately". The teacher sometimes delays treatment. "He prepares a lesson teaching us about the mistakes we usually make in class, but sometimes if the mistake is bad he corrects it in class" [i.e on the spot]. At times he gives immediate treatment. "He corrects on the spot but sometimes he ignores oral errors". The responses provided above reflect that the teacher has a wide range of corrective treatments which he uses according to the demands of each individual situation. The fact that he sometimes ignores errors confirms the findings made by Allwright (1975) and Fanselow (1977) in their studies on oral error treatment that teachers do not always correct all the errors that learners make. In some instances the fact that teachers do not correct all the errors that their pupils make does not reflect a flexible correction policy, instead it may reveal the teacher's inconsistency when treating spoken errors. During the interview, when asked about his usual response to oral errors during classroom interaction, the teacher reported that he consciously avoids intervention in fluency-focused lessons and deliberately delays treatment. He takes note of the pupils' mistakes and refers to them afterwards in a different lesson. When he does correct, he usually avoids focusing on grammatical accuracy and concentrates on the sociolinguistic rules e.g appropriacy, politeness, audience analysis and non-verbal aspects of communication. In the dramatisation lesson, for example, he disregards all the linguistic errors and corrects only one fluency error, while in the lesson involving a discussion on mixed relationships he concerns himself only with content errors. It appears that some of the pupils are aware of error gravity and the fact that their teacher categorises learner errors into serious and less serious errors. The perception is that "serious" errors are given priority and on the spot treatment by their teacher.

Oral error treatment is sometimes a "public event" for this teacher, and is meant for the benefit not only of the error maker but also that of fellow classmates. Pupils report that "He sometimes corrects them in front of the class so that no one can make the same mistake again". Another pupil wrote, "He usually discusses the problem in class so that if other students also have the same problem they are aware of it". At times he rephrases the questions for the benefit of the error maker. This affords the pupil an opportunity to reflect on his/her response, reconsider it and then self correct. Rephrasing involves making the language used more accessible to the learner, weeding out possible ambiguity and negotiating meaning with the other party.

Modelling was cited by four of the respondents as a commonly used treatment strategy by their English teacher. "The teacher corrects me and tells me the right way". "He usually tells us the right thing to say". "He just says what you wanted to say in a correct way". "He provides me with the correct answer".

QUESTIONS 2 & 3

12 out of the 16 pupils who participated in this research expressed a preference for the correction of all their spoken errors while the remaining 4 pupils preferred to have some of their errors corrected. The above findings confirm the findings of a survey on "Attitudes and Preferences of ESL Students to Error Correction" (Chenoweth, Day, Chun and Luppescu 1983). Non-native speakers reported liking corrective feedback, and in fact, wished they could get more of it. They perceived error treatment as facilitating and contributing to the improvement of their spoken English.

When they were asked to explain their choice in Question 2, those who preferred correction of all their oral errors advanced explanations which echo the sentiments expressed in the Chenoweth et al (1983) study: constant error correction affords them an opportunity to improve their performance in English. "I want to know where I've gone wrong so that I can improve my English". Another pupil wrote, "I know that English is not my First Language so correcting me makes me learn better". Some of the pupils were acutely aware of the dominant role that English has assumed locally and internationally in all spheres of civil life. They did not want to be left behind because they had not mastered English. "I want him to correct all my errors so that I can be able to communicate with Europeans or any other tribe". The assumption is that if all their spoken errors are corrected their level of proficiency will improve by giant leaps. Others felt that after correction they would consciously avoid making the same mistakes again. One of the pupils wrote, "I chose A [i.e. having all of my spoken errors corrected] because I want to know when I have made a mistake".

Those who preferred to have only some of their oral errors corrected, also felt that correction improves one's performance in English. One of the pupils expressed the feeling that constant correction of all errors made would deprive one of an opportunity to identify the error oneself and self-correct. In the words of the student, "I have chosen B (i.e. having some of my spoken errors

corrected) because I don't always like to be corrected, sometimes I would like to see the mistake I've done and correct it myself". This suggests that some pupils appreciate "waiting time" so that they can restructure or rephrase their statements. Getting it right on their own gives them a sense of achievement. Another pupil preferred to have only some of the "serious" errors corrected, possibly because they lead to serious breakdowns in communication. The same pupil preferred self-correction to other treatment methods. It appears as if teachers are not the only ones who have established hierarchies of error; L2 pupils do too. Whether these coincide or not still remains to be investigated in further research.

QUESTION 4.

In this question I wanted to establish which methods of correction pupils prefer. The pupils had to give reasons for their preferences. A number of them felt that any method or strategy adopted by the teacher would be acceptable as long as the teacher took into account the error maker's feelings. "He can use any method he prefers if it's not embarrassing me". There was a preference for on the spot treatment, "I prefer him to correct me immediately I make an error so that next time I won't make it again". One of the pupils wished to be corrected "in a nice manner" and to be shown where he had made a mistake. The same pupil resented being ridiculed by others for having made an error.

Some, probably the introverted or less confident ones or those who marvel at the attention that their teacher gives them, preferred individual correction, "I think talking to me alone is better". The same pupil did not mind the teacher's intervention while he was engaged in the act of communication. Others preferred being corrected in the presence of the rest of the group because this presented an opportunity for fellow classmates to learn from their mistakes". "I prefer to be corrected in class in front of the other students so that they also don't make the same mistakes in the future".

The pupils expected their teacher to provide explicit cognitive feedback. "I believe that the teacher shouldn't leave any errors uncorrected. The teacher should explain clearly what the right answer is and how one arrives at the right answer". One of the pupils reported that he preferred having all the spoken errors so that he might know about them and "take notice of them". Thus

it seems that mature L2 pupils appreciate having their errors pointed out and corrected so that they do not repeat erroneous utterances in other situations.

One of the pupils was against being corrected all the time and also preferred not to be corrected during oral work activities as that often distracted his attention. "I prefer that he tells me where I'm wrong sometimes and leave me when I'm doing something like oral work because after he has corrected me maybe I can lose my attention and stop concentrating on what I was saying".

Modelling of the correct response by the teacher was seen as an appropriate treatment method particularly when a pupil mispronounced a word. One of the pupils wrote, "I prefer he'd tell me how a word is said - I'd want him to tell me the right way of saying things".

There was also the perception that oral error treatment not only improves one's linguistic knowledge but that it also raises the error maker's awareness of the corrective treatments meted out by the teacher. "I prefer correction of all errors, you get to have more knowledge and self-awareness of correction methods". Implicit in this statement is the understanding that an awareness of the teacher's repertoire of corrective treatments benefits L2 learners.

QUESTION 5.

Most of the pupils had a positive attitude towards their teacher's correction policy. For example 6 out of the 16 respondents stated that their teacher's correction strategies were enlightening. However "enlighten" tied with "confuse" 5 times. 5 of the remaining 11 pupils felt that although their teacher's correction methods were enlightening they were also found confusing at times. I attribute this reaction partly to the fact that at the time this small scale research was done their English teacher had recently joined the school and both teacher and pupils were at the exploratory stage - getting to know one another. It could also mean that the teacher's explanations are not always explicit enough. Perhaps these pupils expect their teacher to be more detailed and explicit in his correction. Four of the pupils perceived their teacher's correction methods as both enlightening and intimidating, and only one of the pupils perceived the teacher's corrective treatments as intimidating. I would again attribute this perception to the fact that they had not known one another for long at the time this research was conducted.

QUESTION 6.

When asked to state which correction methods they preferred, their teacher's or fellow pupils', all the pupils preferred their teacher's and advanced the following reasons for their choice: Their teacher who had sound educational training on how to deal with learner errors was more competent than fellow L2 pupils and was therefore better suited than them to give corrective feedback. "The teacher's correction is the best because I believe that he knows more than my classmates and is even more qualified than them". They also appreciated the fact that their teacher's feedback took affective concerns into account. Fellow pupils were often unmindful of such matters. "My teacher's correction is the one I can regard as right because he is qualified for doing so. The ones that my classmates correct are done in order to embarrass me". Others felt that transferring treatment to fellow classmates was tantamount to the abdication of one's responsibility as a teacher. One of the pupils who preferred his teacher's correction responded, "He's the one who knows and he will be doing his job. Another thing, the student may know something better but they tend to correct the person in a rude way". Some of the pupils did not have a high regard for peer correction. "Classmates are just as poor in the language as I am". They looked upon their teacher as a model worthy of emulation. "He knows what is right. He always wants what's best for you".

Some of the pupils felt that corrections effected by fellow classmates were primarily meant to embarrass, hurt and ridicule the error maker. Others claimed that having their errors identified and corrected by fellow classmates made them more aware and ashamed of their linguistic deficiencies. Implicit in these statements is the perception that the teacher's manner of correction often takes into account the error maker's feelings, a fact pointed out by the pupils in their responses to the question on how their teacher usually responds to spoken errors during classroom interaction. Another pupil who did not have a high regard for peer correction reasoned that all the pupils in their class had reached the same level of proficiency and were therefore not suited for the task of correction, "Classmates are just as poor in the language as I am".

One of the pupils had mixed feelings towards peer correction. He would enlist the help of a fellow pupil if he had not quite understood the teacher's corrective treatment. "I would ask my classmate to explain what was said [by the teacher] if I didn't quite understand what was said by the teacher". This statement could also mean that this pupil approves of peer correction.

One of the more confident pupils who also preferred receiving corrective feedback from the teacher wrote, "The other students could make fun of you but I wouldn't mind if they do it correctly". This suggests that corrective treatments meted out by fellow pupils are not always correct, which is probably why the teacher's feedback is preferred. Again the assumption here is that the teacher is always right. This student's response could also mean the opposite of "making fun of" [i.e. behaving appropriately].

QUESTION 7.

All the pupils who took part in this study felt that oral error correction benefits them immensely as it undoubtedly improves their overall proficiency in English. One of them wrote, "I always make sure that I do not repeat the same mistake again". It appears that oral error correction consciously raises their awareness of grammatical structures and speech acts that they have not mastered fully. One can hypothesise at this stage that they commit the corrected utterances to memory and actively avoid repeating the same mistake again.

There was also the feeling that oral error correction benefits pupils not only in their school and academic activities but also outside of the language classroom situation. One of the pupil's responses was that oral error correction benefits the learner, "It helps because I learn not to make many errors when speaking with people outside the school". The perception here is that oral error treatment makes it possible for pupils to use language for their purposes in a variety of contexts.

4.7 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

A close examination of this teacher's belief system concerning oral error treatment and his classroom practice reveals that although he believes that oral error treatment is more effective than written treatments particularly for treating phonological errors, in practice what he does is slightly at variance with what he believes he does when responding to learner errors during classroom interaction. The manner in which he treats oral linguistic errors in the different types of lessons is unvaried. He defers treatment and only treats the errors he has made a mental note of during interaction, in writing. He usually constructs a worksheet on the problem structures and works through the exercises orally with the class.

In the lessons observed there were very few instances of oral error treatment. In practice the teacher downplays the role of oral error treatment and emphasises affective factors. He makes sure that he avoids being abrasive and hurtful to the error - makers' feelings. Consequently, he ignores most of the discourse and linguistic oral errors that pupils make. The error analysis confirmed that although the pupils in this study have a good command of spoken English, they do make linguistic errors. Their teacher tends to ignore linguistic errors and treats only fluency errors that lead to communication breakdown. Although I believe that this was incidental treatment, this finding confirms that the teacher's concern is promoting communication, intelligibility and understanding.

The few instances of oral-error treatment cited in this research reveal that the teacher employs the following corrective strategies: pseudo- acceptance accompanied by a tone that is suggestive of the fact that the response given is inappropriate, modelling, a rising intonation, statements that encourage the learner to take another turn, the selection of only the correct answer when pupils present different answers in unison, and elaboration and expansion of the pupils' responses.

The teacher's style of presentation and the nature of the tasks given to the pupils greatly influenced the manner in which oral errors were treated by this teacher. For example, in communication activities that were teacher controlled, the teacher focused on the transmission of ideas and as a result content errors received priority while discourse errors were ignored. In communication activities involving pupil-pupil interaction this teacher consistently avoided treating errors and encouraged the pupils to contribute to the discussion, while in written grammar exercises that were done orally the focus was more on grammatical content than on oral linguistic and discourse errors.

In some teacher-fronted activities the structure of the lessons afforded the pupils very little opportunity to experiment with the language and test their hypotheses. For example, in the poetry lesson the pupils received rich and qualitative input from the teacher who did most of the talking, but the pupils' linguistic participation was limited to one-word answers throughout the lesson. They did not get an opportunity to make errors. However, in class discussion that involved pupil-teacher interaction the pupils participated as they were afforded an opportunity to react personally to the topic under discussion. As a result, errors were made and the pupils' linguistic output was

qualitatively different from that of the other lessons that were recorded and transcribed. Their teacher chose to ignore most of the linguistic and discourse errors and concentrated on the delivery of the content.

The pupils who participated in this study reported a positive attitude towards their teacher's correction policy and expressed a preference for teacher intervention over peer correction. The reasons advanced for this choice were fear of ridicule from fellow pupils and the perception that their teacher, who usually takes into account the error makers' feelings, was better suited for the task of correction than fellow pupils because he had been trained to respond to learner errors. Although they sometimes found their teacher's correction confusing and intimidating, the general feeling was that it is beneficial to them as it undoubtedly improves their linguistic performance in the classroom and in a variety of social contexts.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the preceding chapter a summary of the main findings of this research was presented. In this final chapter an attempt will be made to draw the threads from the various chapters together. A discussion of the main findings will be presented first, followed by insights gained from conducting a study into oral error treatment and the problems I encountered as a novice researcher. Lastly, suggestions for further research into oral error treatment will be presented.

5.2. A DISCUSSION OF THE MAIN FINDINGS

A close observation of this teacher in action reveals that although his classroom practice confirmed most of what he had said about his correction policy, there were instances where his practice was slightly at variance with what he had said about his corrective reactions to oral errors made by pupils during classroom interaction. For example, although he maintains that he believes in the efficacy of oral error treatments, he defers treatment consistently in the different types of lessons. The inconsistency reveals that error treatment is no simple task, and that beliefs do not always guide practice. A teacher might express certain beliefs about error treatment only to discover that conditions in class e.g. time constraints and the pupils' proficiency levels dictate that he/she corrects in a different manner. One of the reasons the teacher gave for not correcting errors during discussions was that he had realised that although these pupils were made to study an L1 English syllabus, most of them were still struggling with the language. He felt that corrective treatments could make them reluctant to participate.

The teacher's classroom practice reveals that he concerns himself more with affective matters during interaction. The literature review on oral error treatment stresses the importance of affective matters during correction. However, not much has been said about the weighting that should be given to the two forms of corrective feedback, namely, cognitive and affective feedback.

Can one be emphasised at the expense of the other? The danger in emphasising affective matters over cognitive feedback is that the teacher, in his attempts to create a non-threatening atmosphere, is not demanding enough of his pupils. For example, the pupils in this study persisted in using short “telegraphic” responses; such responses do not promote hypothesis testing and the creative use of language, and as a result the pupils successfully avoided making errors. This deprived the teacher of an opportunity to react to learner errors. I am not in any way suggesting that telegraphic responses are incorrect or inappropriate all the time, or that pupils should always be reminded to offer longer utterances. What I am pointing out is that error avoidance is possible when pupils deliberately and consistently construct telegraphic sentences. One way in which pupils could be encouraged to engage in extended discourse would be through asking probing and open-ended questions and by cutting down on teacher talk.

One of the corrective strategies this teacher uses quite frequently are expansions. His continued acceptance of telegraphic sentences and the subsequent provision of expansions has created a visible pattern during the language classes. Because the pupils are used to having their telegraphic responses accepted by their teacher, the tendency is for them to expect the “extra help” from him. He provides the “extra help” in the form of rich and qualitative input. I also noticed that the teacher's pace when presenting lessons was rather fast, possibly because he had just taken up this post and was trying to cover a good deal of ground. This could be one of the reasons why he did not correct much.

When this chapter was taken to the teacher for comment he admitted that there is a fair amount of teacher talk in his language classes. This he attributed to the fact that “pupils often take off in unrelated direction when no guidance structure has been given, their responses become too varied”. It is for this reason that he gives explanations and expands on their responses. What seemed to have been of great concern to him was the realisation that some of the pupils found his corrective treatments confusing although he believes that he makes it a point that he gives explicit corrective feedback. He said that he did not find it surprising that some of the pupils found his corrections intimidating. His explanation for this was that the shy pupils who are self-conscious would prefer not to be corrected publicly. His concluding remark was that he would keep the pupils' responses in mind when he responds to their errors.

An interesting and unexpected finding was that the teacher's understanding of oral error treatment was different from mine. As a second language speaker I tend to worry too much about the correctness and appropriacy of utterances, and as a result I am inclined to correct more on the spot, using varied and explicit feedback types. He does the opposite, and uses indirect and implicit feedback types when he decides to correct. What seems to be his priority is getting the pupils to open up and participate in the various activities that he designs. For example, in the lesson on mixed relationships he asked probing open-ended questions and the responses he received this time were varied. Although the pupils still constructed telegraphic responses there was a genuine attempt on their part to communicate. There was originality in their responses and the utterances were longer than in the other lessons.

Another interesting finding was that although I had observed very few instances of error correction in this class, the pupils reported that their teacher uses varied techniques to treat their errors, and that they highly appreciated his concern for their feelings when reacting to their erroneous utterances. Their reports on his correction policy reinforce a point I had made earlier on; that is, longer periods of observation could reveal that this teacher treats errors more frequently using a variety of feedback types. The danger of relying on the respondents' memory when collecting data has been dealt with in the findings chapter. What is also worth noting is that the pupils' reports on their teacher's manner of correction confirmed what he had expressed during the interview, i.e. the fact that he often takes their feelings into account when he does correct.

5.3 FINDINGS THAT CORROBORATE RESEARCH ON ORAL ERROR TREATMENT.

The main findings of this study corroborate some of the literature readings on oral error treatment, namely, that some teachers treat errors minimally and concentrate mostly on promoting communication. They do not treat all the errors that occur. In this research, content errors (i.e. errors that have to do with the content that is being discussed) received priority over other types of error. The literature on oral error treatment reveals that L1 teachers and experienced language teachers are more tolerant of error, they disregard oral linguistic errors and concentrate on intelligibility (Holley and King 1975). Although the teacher under observation reported that

treating oral errors is much more effective than treating them in writing, in practice he seldom corrects.

The teacher revealed after one of the recordings that he was aware that most of the pupils were struggling with English and that he did not want to discourage them from participating by responding to their errors. It is this overriding concern that prevents him from treating learner errors during interaction. A possible explanation for deferring treatment is that because he speaks several languages and has had to learn and teach German, a second language to him, he empathises with the L2 learners whose linguistic abilities do not match the demands of an L1 English syllabus.

The pupil's responses corroborated some of the findings on the nature of error treatment. For example, they expressed a need for correction because they believe that explicit corrective treatments help improve their performance in English, an observation also made by Cathcart and Olsen (1976). The pupils also reported that they found their teacher's corrections confusing at times. This corroborates findings made by Allwright (1975) and Chaudron (1988).

5.4 PROBLEMS IN THE WAY I APPROACHED AND CARRIED OUT THIS RESEARCH

The literature review on error treatment gave me insight into how teachers react to learner errors during interaction, but it also got in the way when I was constructing the structured interview questions. Instead of establishing lesson categories during the analysis stage, I was influenced by Bolitho's (1995) classification and adopted it during the interview stage. This framework prevented me from realising during the interview that the teacher had only two lesson categories instead of the three that I had. It was only at the analysis stage that I realised that we did not have the same number of lesson categories.

During the analysis stage I also realised that there is a need for me to hone my interviewing skills. Although the teacher was afforded the opportunity of expressing his correction policy in detail, I sometimes provided the "required response" for him. However, because I was interviewing an experienced teacher, he - after considering my "extra help" - went on to outline his correction

policy. Looking back at the interview I now realise that I did not handle the pauses and the silences as normal features of communication.

5.5 INSIGHTS GAINED

Before my encounter with theory on error treatment, I uncritically assumed that the provision of affective and cognitive feedback improves learner output significantly, and that generally, all language teachers perceive oral error treatment as desirable and effective. Now that I have had exposure to the literature on treatment and have conducted this small-scale research, I realise how complex and involved the task of correction is. Because each classroom situation is unique it would not be wise to generalise or make sweeping and evaluative statements about error treatment.

The value of a small-scale ethnographic case study, particularly for a teacher educator like myself, is that it presented me with an opportunity to look at oral error treatment in depth and this has helped purge all assumptions I had about error treatment which were not grounded on theory and research. I doubt if I would have been able to gain as much insight into error treatment had I opted for a survey instead of a descriptive case study. Although case study findings are not generalisable I had to compare my correction policy with this teacher's and the exercise had a humbling effect on me. Apart from this study making me more open - minded about correction, it made me realise that there exists no simple equation between beliefs and classroom practice.

5.6 FURTHER RESEARCH

In view of the changing face of South African classrooms brought about by the removal of divisive education policies, teachers will have to confront the role of code-switching in their language classes and across the curriculum. An interesting and unanticipated issue which came out of this study was how to categorise code-switching. Code-switching, which has been frowned upon and viewed as undesirable in language classrooms by some teachers, has been accommodated in the new dispensation. There is now a need for in-depth local studies into code-switching and how it relates to error treatment. Here are some of the questions that could be addressed by such studies:

1. How do teachers understand code-switching?
Do they view it as facilitative of learning or as erroneous output?
2. When do pupils code-switch and why? Is it done to avoid making errors or to achieve a particular communicative effect?

5.7 CONCLUSION

Most of the research into error treatment was undertaken outside South Africa. Other than Mafanya-Mntambo's (1995) small scale research into oral error treatment across the curriculum, there does not seem to be much South African based research into this area. The paucity of research into this field points to a need for South African teachers to contribute to the body of literature on error treatment by engaging in classroom process research (CPR) both in English classes and across the curriculum.

Trainees whose area of specialisation is language teaching could be encouraged to make use of micro-teaching and practice-teaching sessions for research into error treatment. Assignment topics could involve research too. Instead of INSET and PRESET operating individually as is the case at the moment, the two could be merged and a research institute established to empower both trainees and practising teachers with research skills. A practical hands on approach like the one suggested above could be of use to these graduates once they start teaching.

REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, M. (1991). Focus on The Language Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allwright, D. (1988). Observation in the Language Classroom. New York : Longman.
- Allwright, R.L. (1975). Problems in the Study of the Language Teacher's Treatment of Learner Error. In New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching, and Bilingual Education: 96-109. Washington, D.C. : TESOL
- Annette, J. (1969). Feedback and Human Behaviour. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Bhatia, A. T. (1974). An Error Analysis of Students' Composition. International Review of Applied Linguistics 12: 357-350.
- Birckbichler, D.W. (1977). Communication and Beyond. In June K. Phillips (Eds.), The Language Connection: From the Classroom to the World. Skokie, IL National Textbook Company, 53-94.
- Brown, H. D. (1987). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: N. J. Prentice Hall.
- Bolitho, R. (1995). Current Issues: Error Correction. Modern English Teacher, 4 (1).
- Bolitho, R. (1994). Current Issues: Error Correction. Modern English Teacher, 3 (4).
- Brock, C., Crookes G., Day, R.R., and Long M. (1986). The Differential Effects of Corrective Feedback in Native Speaker - Nonnative Speaker Conversation. In R.R.Day, (Ed.). Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition, 229-226. Rowly, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Broughton, C., and Brumfit, G., Flavell, R., and Pincas, A. (1980). (Eds.). Teaching English as a Foreign Language London: Routledge Education Books.
- Burt, M. K. (1975). Error Analysis in the Adult EFL Classroom. Tesol Quarterly 9:53-63.
- Cathcart, R.L and Olsen, J.W.B., (1976). Teachers' and Students' Preferences for Correction of Classroom Conversation Errors. On TESOL '76, (Eds.) J.Fanselow and R. Crymes, 41-53. Washington, D.C.: TESOL
- Chaudron, C., (1988). Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C. (1986). Teacher's Priorities in Correcting Learners' Errors in French Immersion Classes" in R.R. Day (Ed.). Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition. pp 64-68. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

- Chaudron, C. (1977). A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. Language Learning 17: 29-46.
- Chastain, K. (1971). The Development of Modern Language Skills: Theory to Practice. Philadelphia: Centre for Curriculum Development, Inc.
- Chenoweth, A.N., Day, R.R., Chun, A.E., and Luppescu (1983). Attitudes and Preferences of ESL Students to Error Correction. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, Vol. 6 No. 1. 79-87.
- Cohen, A.D. (1975). Error Correction and the Training of Language Teachers. The Modern Language Journal 59:414-422.
- Corder, S. (1981). Error Analysis and Interlanguage. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics 5 (4) : 161-170.
- Crookes, G and Rulon, K.A. (1985). Incorporation of Corrective Feedback in Native Speaker / Non-speaker Conversation. Technical Report No. 3. Honolulu: Centre for Second Language Classroom Research, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Cummins, J. and Swain, M. (1986). Bilingualism in Education. London: Longman.
- Dresdner, M.P. (1973). Your Students's Errors Can Help You. English Language Journal 1:5-11.
- Edmonson, W. (1985). Discourse Worlds in the Classroom and in Foreign Language Learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7:159-168.
- Ellis, R. (1990). Researching Classroom Language Learning . In C. Brumfit and R. Mitchell (Eds.). Research in the Language Classroom. London: Modern English Publications .
- Ellis, R. (1990). Instructed Second Language Acquisition. Oxford : Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Ellis, R. (1985). Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edge, J. (1993). Mistakes and Correction. London: Butterworths.
- Fanselow, J.F. (1977). The Treatment of Learner Error in Oral Work. Foreign Language Annals, 10: 583-93.
- Gaies, S.J. (1983). The Investigation of Classroom Processes. In Tesol Quaterly 17 (2) 205-
- George, H.V. (1972). Common Errors in Language Learning. Massachussets: Newbury House.

- Hammersley, M. (1994). Introducing Ethnography. In D. Graddol, J. Maybil and B. Steirer (Eds.). Researching Language and Literacy in Social Context (pp 1-15) Open University Press.
- Hammersley, M. (1986). Controversies In Classroom Research. Open University Press.
- Hanzeli, V.E. (1975). "Learner's Language; Implications of Recent Research for Foreign Language Instruction". The Modern Language Journal 59: 426- 432.
- Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. Modern Language Journal, 62 (8) 387-396.
- Holley, F.M. and King, J.K. (1975). Imitation and Correction in Foreign Language Learning. Modern Language Journal 55 (8) 494-8.
- Johansson, S. (1973). The Identification and Evaluation of Errors in Foreign Languages: A Functional Approach. Erata Papers in Error Analysis Lund, Sweden: CWK. Gleerup 102-114.
- Kilfoil, W.R., (1989). Learn to Teach Pretoria: Academica.
- Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krashen, S.D., and Seliger, H.W. (1975). The Essential Contributions of Formal Instruction in Adult Second Language Learning. Tesol Quarterly 9 (2), 173-183.
- Le Compte, M., and Goetz, J. (1982). Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research. Review of Educational Research , 52,1.
- Long, M.H., (1990). The Design and Psycholinguistic Motivation of Research on Foreign Language Learning. Center for Second Language Classroom Research, University of Hawaii. 1990
- Long, M. (1977). Teacher feedback on learner error: mapping cognitions. In H.D Brown, C.A. Yorio, and R.H.Crymes, (Eds.). On TESOL '77: Teaching and Learning English as a Second Language: Trends in Research and Practice, 278-293. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
- Long, M., Richards, J. (1983). (Eds.). Second Language Classrooms. London: Cambridge University Press
- Mafanya-Mntambo, N. (1995). A Case Study of Oral Linguistics Error Treatment in Second Language Classrooms where English is the Medium of Instruction. Unpublished.
- McArthur, T. (1983). A Foundation Course for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murphy, D.J., (1986). Communication and Correction in the Classroom ELT Journal 40 (2).

- Nunan, D. (1992). Research Methods In Language Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nemser, W. (1971). Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners. *IRAL* 9 (2) 115-123.
- Porte, G. K. (1993). Mistakes, Errors, and Blank Checks. English Teaching Forum January 1993 42-44.
- Powell, P. B. (1975). An Investigation of Selected Syntactical and Morphological Structures in the Conversation fo Secondary Students after two years ' Study of French. Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Ramirez, A. G., and Stromquist N,P. (1979). ESL Methodology and Student Language Learning in Bilingual Elementary Schools. *TESOL Quarterly* 13:135-158.
- Richards, J.C. (1973). Error Analysis and Second Language Strategies. In Oller and Richards (Eds.). Focus on the Learner: Pragmatics Perspectives for the Language Teacher. Rowley, M.A: Newbury House 114-135.
- Salica, C. (1981). Testing a Model of Corrective Discourse. M.A. in TESL thesis University of California, Los Angeles.
- Seliger, H.W. and Long, M.H., (1983). (Eds.). Classroom Oriented Research in Second Language Acquisition. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *IRAL* 10 (3) 209-232.
- Somer, R. and Somer B. (1980). A Practical Guide to Behavioural Research. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Stern, Paul.C. (1985). Evaluating Social Science Research. Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Sternglass, M.S. (1974). Close Similarities in Dialect Features of Black and White College Students in Remedial Composition Classes. Tesol Quarterly 8:271-283.
- Schmidt, R.W.and Frota,N.G. (1986). "Developing Basic Conversational Ability in a Second Language: a case Study of Portuguese," in Day 1986: 237-326.
- Van Lier, L.A. (1988). The Classroom and the Language Learner: Ethnography and Second Language Classroom Research. London: Longman.
- Vigil, N.A. and Oller, J.W., (1976) Rule fossilisation: A Tentative Model. *Language Learning* 26: 281-95.
- Walker, R. (1978). 'The Conduct of Educational Case Studies, 'in Dockerill B. and Hamilton, D. (Eds.). Rethinking Educational Research. London, Hodder & Stoughton.

- Watson-Gegeo, K.A. and Ulichny, P. (1988). Ethnographic inquiry into second language acquisition and instruction. University of Hawaii Working Papers in ESL, 7,2.
- Wilson, S. (1982). The Use of Ethnographic Techniques in Educational Research. Review of Educational Research 47, (1) 245-265.
- Wren, D. (1982). A Case Study of the Treatment of Oral Errors. Selected Papers in TESOL 1, 90-103. Ca.: Monterey Institute of International Studies.
- Yin, Robert. K. (1989). Case Study Research: Newbury Park, Sage Publications.
- Zamel, V. (1981). Cybernetics: A Model for Feedback in the ESL Classroom Tesol Quarterly 15: 139-150.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 - GRAMMAR LESSON

(Teacher writes on the chalkboard)

- T: Let's go. It's actually saying "Let us go". Right, somebody is already making the suggestion, "Let's you and me, let's you and I". It sounds better to me because the subject of the sentence is still you and I. Let us, you and I, go to the disco. It sounds correct to me.
- T. READS FROM THE TEXT- He said that you and me could not stop him. T. asks a question. How many clauses in the deep structure of this sentence? How many clauses are there in that sentence?
- P: Two.
- T: Two, which are they?
- P: He said that you could not stop him.
- T: No, remember we did it last time.
- P: He said that he could not stop him.
- T: The other one? The first one "You could not stop him". The second one "I could not stop him". We'll combine the two, we've left out repetitions and link the two with "He said that you and I". Do you understand why it's "I"? He said that is one sentence, "you and I could not stop him" is the other sentence. So it's two different subjects, okay? So, he said that you and I could not stop him. **T. READS ANOTHER SENTENCE FROM THE TEXT.** I think me and Sally would rather go out. Where is the error?
- P: Me and Sally.
- T: Me and Sally?
- P: Sally and I.
- T: Me and Sally. What are the two clauses?
- P: I think.
- T: I think, thank you and the other one?

T: I think is the one. Sally and I would rather go, is the other. I think has got it's own subject, Sally and I is the subject of the next one, so it can't be Sally and me. Do you understand? Because it's the subject of the second clause. So it's "I think Sally and I would rather go". This is a mistake particularly the second language speakers always make, they say "my friends and me, Vuyo and me, it's all wrong it should be "my friends and I, Vuyo and I" because it's the subject of the sentence that you are expressing but you can see people. In fact, even on TV people don't speak that way but that is actually the correct way to say right it. Right? As the subject it's not "me and my friends". Okay, page 36. Fill in the blank spaces in each of the sentences with words who or whom. T. READS-The boy___you saw yesterday is an orphan.

P: Who.

T: Do you say who?

P: Whom.

T: Now you say whom, did you say whom? Okay, the boy whom you saw. Why is it whom? What is the subject?

P: The boy.

T: Yes, the boy. What is the object?

P: Whom you saw

OTHERS: Orphan.

T: The boy, the subject is you, who did you see?

P: The boy.

T: The boy and that is the object, so it must be?

P: You.

T: Must it be you, who or whom?

P: Whom

T: Yes, whom like him _____ (inaudible) for the object case.

P: What's the object?

T: Whom

P: I suggest the boy.

T: You saw yesterday, there are two clauses. What is the full sentence? The boy-----
-you saw yesterday?

P: The boy whom you saw yesterday is an orphan.

T: (Writes the two sentences on the board)

T: Those are the two clauses: The boy is an orphan. You saw him yesterday. Because this is the subject and that is the object and if you combine the two it's "The boy whom you saw yesterday is an orphan. Do you understand?

P: Yes.

T: Everyone?

PS: Yes No

T: Let's see again: That is the girl _____ won the race.

P: Who

T: Who won the race. Okay, why is it who? What is the clause?

P: That is the girl.

T: That's a girl, and?

P: The girl who won the race.

T: The girl won the race. Who stands in the place of the girl. Okay . T.

READS _Melanie is the girl ___ I gave the money.

P: Whom.

T: To whom ,alright, what is the subject? Who gets the money?

P: I

T: Who did I give it to?

P: The girl.

T: The girl is object to whom? That is the girl _____ I saw at the disco last night.

P: Whom

T: Again the same place whom I saw at the disco last night. The man _____ I adore has just walked past.

P: Who, whom.

T: Who or whom.

P: Whom?

T: What are the two clauses? That is the man . I adore him. So it's the man whom I adore. Same thing with love and trust. That is the girl who I love or whom I love?

P: Whom.

T: That's the girl ----I saw at the disco last night.
The man ---- I adore has just walked past.

P: Who? Whom?

T: Who? Whom?

P: Whom

T: What are the two clauses? That is the man. I adore him. So, it's, "The man whom I adore".

Same thing with love and trust. That's the girl who\whom I love?

P: Whom

T: That's the girl whom I love.

That is the person whom I trust the most. Because "I" is the object, you are the object, do you understand? Again it's the proper way but people don't speak that way. You don't often hear it. You never hear whom because it sounds funny. It sounds as if you are (pause), you want to show off.

PS: (LAUGHTER)

T: We are now at page 208 No. 3

(reads out a cartoon)

The subject is who, object is whom. And why is -----(inaudible on tape)

Because there are two persons when you use whom, one is used when as the object and the other as a preposition: to whom, from whom, by whom, for whom. They are not saying we should speak this way. We should know what the basic rule is.

[T. reads out the definition of a non-simple sentence from the grammar book.]

T: (READING FROM THE TEXT)

She is the girl who squashed the salamander.

Who refers to?

P: The girl

T: The girl. She's the subject

She is the girl whom the salamander attacked.

Who is attacking here?

P: The salamander

T: Salamander, and whom did the salamander attack?

- P: The girl
- T: The girl, she's the object, so we don't need to go through those exercises but, the basic rule is, the conjunction or the pronoun who takes its case from the clause in which it occurs. Alright, that means in sentence (b), She is the girl... there's one clause, whom the salamander attacked is another clause. And it's whom because the noun in that clause is the subject of that sentence.
- Alright, no. 4(a). You are correct.
- (b). I am correct.
- What is the subject and the verb in each case? We know that. Why does the verb to be differ? Why is it you are, I am and you, she is. It's the same verb to be but why is it different?
- P: Where is that?
- T: No. 4. page 208. Why can't say I are so tired or you am so stupid, why not?
- P: It doesn't sound
- T: Sound is not good enough. It doesn't sound like---(inaudible on tape).
- P: It doesn't agree.
- T: Exactly. Thank you, it doesn't agree. Now, how do we know that? Okay it doesn't agree, so we know that to be has to change to fit with the subject. Alright, so I am, they are, you are, she is, alright?
- Try combining these sentences with the conjunctions either and or. Which words can you omit, which form of the verb to be do you use? Are or am? You and I
- P: Are
- T: You and I are, why do you say you and I are?
- P: _____(inaudible response)_____
- T: Okay you are saying in the one case its plural you and I is plural so it's you and I are? Okay let's see. If you use the first one you and I am correct, what are the clauses contained in here?
- P: You are correct
- T: And?
- P: I am correct
- T: So we've combined the two so we've cut out the repetition, we've cut out correct because correct occurs in both clauses so, we only use it once

And we've combined these two with and but now there are different verbs, so are we able to omit anyone of the 2 verbs? We could omit one word : they are repeated in both clauses.

But, can we do the same with the verb?.

P: Yes \ no

T: We could omit one word because they are repeated in both clauses but can we do the same with the verb?

P: Yes, no

T: When we started off didn't we say that when we combine the two sentences we can only cut out the repetitions for example I bought a pen, ruler and book. We've cut out the repetitions but now the two are not repeated, they are totally separate words. So we can't really delete, can we?. We can't say you and I are correct, can we?

P: You can say that

T: You can say you and I are correct why? because _____ This is like a subject a combined subject and its a plural subject you and I are correct okay. People do speak that way and they say You and I am correct and this sounds wrong and it shouldn't necessarily be wrong but there's a rule that might its wrong but when we speak, it's easy for us because the subject is closer to the verb, do you understand?

P: People don't say that.

T: He ___ don't they say this, do they say this? } Points at the board.

P: Yes

T: Okay let's see which is the most frequent form. Exercise 37 on page 243

[The teacher goes through more exercises of this nature and there is no evidence of oral error treatment throughout.]

APPENDIX 2 - MY LIFE AS A DRILLER

LANGUAGE TUTORIAL

T: Read the accompanying extract taken from the NUM newspaper carefully, then complete the following exercises:

It's about a mineworker, a driller, alright, and this newspaper is brought out by the Union. So what do you think NUM stands for?

P: National Union of Mine Workers

T: National Union of Mine Workers

Yes, alright. Let's look at the questions first, before we look at the text.

2.) In point form, describe the typical day in the life of a miner, alright, in point form, that means a summary, not full sentences. That means clauses or phrases. So you'll say, Get up at five 'o'clock, do this and that until the end of the day. You'll do that in six forms, alright. It is not----- (inaudible on tape).

P: Do what?

T: This, in point A.

P: No, one of them as a written exercise.

T: Yes, in writing. You'll do it all here, but the space is not big enough, but you can use the extra page.

P: It's not big enough.

T: Then no. (b). Briefly describe the training this miner received, by completing the following phrases in your own words. He was trained for only what, on what? Okay, it's not only the word that's missing, it's a clause, one word or three words or a sentence that's missing. So, if you can't put it in here again, do it on the back of the page.

(c). Describe way in which accidents can occur. Your own words there, and then

(d). What is--- (inaudible on tape).

We'll go try the text now, so that you can answer that question.

T: Yes

P: (Response inaudible)

T: What is the miner's ultimate goal? What's the miner's ultimate goal in life? Will he ever reach his goal, why will he, why will he not? Depending on the previous question. What side effect will he suffer as a result of the nature of his job?

(e.) This article appeared in a union newspaper. 1. What do you think NUM stands for?

2. What is the main demand of the members of the NUM?

And then let's go the last page quickly before we go to writing the text. Imagine you are Elise Morekens, this miner. Write a letter to your family at home in Khutsong in which you tell them something about your work, and your life on the mine in the hostels, your feelings, and your plans to visit them. Remember to also address your children in the letter. Speak to the kids, say what you do when you get home. Let's go to the text quickly.

T: What does improvise mean?

P: provision, to provide

T: Well, the word that can be deduced from improvise is provide, to improve, to make use of what you have.

P: To make use of

T: Ja, thank you. To make use of what you have. To improvise, to make a plan. Alright, do you know the Afrikaans expression, "A boer maak a plan".

P: Ja. (laughter)

T: Ja, to improvise is to use whatever you have around you, like McGyver, you know McGyver.

PS: Yes, No

T: That is the perfect example of improvisation. Just making use of whatever you have around you, and making a plan.

P: Guys

T: What? Guys?

P: Yes. . . . (inaudible)

T: Those improvisations have to do with sound principles of science (inaudible), home.

(T. reads from text).

There's a mistake there in paragraph 2. Its a hard job, isn't it?

P: Yes

T: Because it should be it is a hard job. So there's that comma after it's. In fact, those are two words. Sometimes in newspapers they make deliberate spelling or

punctuation mistakes. It is because the space is (inaudible), so they actually leave (inaudible). T. reads again. That probably is once a (inaudible) they have this huge numeric. Do you know what this (inaudible) is?

P: No

T: What is. . . . Do you see that?

P: Yes

T: What is the other word that is used when you are sick and affected in your lungs?

P: Pneumonia

T: Pneumonia, alright, thank you. Oh! Yes, how do you know. Once the drilling is done in which way will the rocks fall? Then you put up supporters. (The teacher continues to read from paragraph 3.)

T: That's Bantu Education. Charging up means once. . . . (T. reads from par 4). You can imagine if you started to have a drill at a wrong angle that might sort of. . . . result in an accident and this drill is quite a heavy thing to operate. It does not automatically switch off. So, one could have serious accidents if it does happen. [T. reads from text].

P: Yho! How deep is two?

T: Oh! Two metres is [inaudible] So imagine with all the power and the weight of the drill you have to drill about twelve holes. [T. reads from par 4.]

T: Is there anyone here who knows what mahewu is? What is it?

P: Marewu (laughter)

PS: It's usually made of mielie-meal.

T: Oh! In the form of. . . . ?

What is the Sotho word for that?

P: Mahewu, in Xhosa it's marewu. Some kind of drink made from Shake, Shake.

T: Okay, so nobody uses it because it has a high concentration of sugar. [T. reads from text].

Okay, the language is not always correct. It's obviously his own language, the way he said it. So, it won't always be correct, "Loose," that's a spelling error. There should be one "o".

[T. reads from par. 4].

So, don't worry about all the spelling and punctuation errors. As I said, it's probably the language that this miner used. The text is fairly easy, so ,when you get the questions in front here, as far as possible, use your own words. As I said, if there's not enough space try to use either the back page or extra page. If this is the life and the training and the kind of education that miners get and the kind of safety measures that are not there, then no wonder that the accident that occurred two weeks ago did happen, if one looks at it in that context now.

Six days's training and people - they don't even understand the questions but they get their certificates. So it seems as if whoever is in charge of training miners , all they want to do is to get the miner down there as quickly as possible to do the job as long as possible, if you look at the type of the day the miner has also. So, there's still a lot that needs to be done in the mining industry in terms of safety measures and training also. Okay, let's do the work now.

APPENDIX 3 - READING COMPREHENSION : THE NECKLACE

The Necklace by the French writer Guy de Maupassant.

It's called The Necklace and the introduction or a passage -----to make her on. (inaudible)

T: (reads out from the book)

It was dazzlingly beautiful ---- and more costly than anyone could have imagined.

T: Something that seems like the description of the necklace. Now If one just looks at the title and perhaps just that one description. What does one expect from this story, what would it be about?

P: A necklace.

T: About a necklace?

T: What about a necklace? What ideas surround it?

P: Beautiful, Valuable.

T: Okay, valuable.

T: Any people involved in the story perhaps---do you think?

P: The owner.

T: Owner, okay. Any happening, any incidents between the owner and the necklace?

PS: Stolen.

T: Stolen, okay --- let's have a look.

T: (reads from the text) 1st paragraph.

T: So it starts off with a description of a lady who does not have a very high understanding. You know what a dowry is?

PS: Lobola.

T: Well--- sort of --- like lobola. (inaudible)

T: It's not from the husband's side or from that side.
She marries 'c a dowry. Normally in those days 17, 18 something the parents \father especially would make sure that his daughter had some kind of dowry or something like lobola so that she could be---as soon as she got married (inaudible). because the child has got to leave the family and become the property or member of the man's family. So, she could have some kind of independence or financial independence.

T. READS PARAGRAPH 2

So, the ladies who were born poor had to depend on their virtues or their own talents in the place of money for the wealth of the fine clothes that they didn't have.

Though she had no finesse what she could depend on was her own characteristics, perhaps her inner strength. And they had to make sure that at least they married well

T. READS FROM TEXT.

T: (explains) She felt that she'd been born unfair. She hadn't been born to live a good life. T. READS FROM TEXT

T: Breton is a coastal region in the Western France.

T: (explains)Right, thinking of what kind of life she would have lived had she been born in a different social class. Had she been born richer than she is. T. READS FROM TEXT

T: The two great "footmen"(Teacher explains the text). The servants would be the butlers as we call today. T. READS

T: She thinks of what kind of life of luxury and leisure she would have lived had she been born in a different social status. (T. explaining the text)T. READS

T: (explains)Imagining the fantastic food she would be eating in the fantastic room that she would be having his food.

T: READS PARAGRAPH 5 (explains)Frocks are these little cloths that are used to make dresses. CONTINUES TO READ

T: If we stop there for a moment. Where do you think the necklace comes in at this stage? How do you think the necklace fits in at this stage?

P: The rich friend gave it to her or maybe she stole it-gave it to her.

T: For what reason?

T: Maybe she stole it, she feels angry, bitter disappointed that she couldn't be in that ----
----- (inaudible)T. READS PARAGRAPH 6

T: (explains) That means all official people, appointed people. T. READS AGAIN
FROM THE TEXT

PS: (exclaim in surprise)

P: Greedy, shortage.

T: What?

T: I thought I heard greedy.

P: Greedy.

T: Perhaps a little proud, a little vain that's the word. Making much of herself. Let's keep an open mind. READS PARAGRAPH 7

T: What do you think happens now? She has this beautiful necklace, she has a dress, she goes off to the ball. Does the night turn out to be a success for her?

P: She loses it.

T: Yes she loses it at first but she lends her. How would you think the friend will react, if she loses the necklace?

T: Okay what do you think is the reaction of her friend towards all these jewels? She takes them out and says "choose".

What does that reveal about this friend, about her belongings and feelings towards her jewellery?

P: She doesn't really mind.

T: Yes she doesn't really mind.

P: She wouldn't miss it, she has enough. She doesn't seem to bother. T. READS FROM TEXT

T: So everything she ever dreamt of was now happening to her.

T. READS

P: Sorry Sir, what's enthusiasm?

T: Enthusiasm, what's the meaning?

P: Excitement. She was very excited.

T. READS

- T: And finally she had achieved over the situation. It was a moment of victory. A moment she had been dreaming of.
- T. READS
- T: What fairy tale does the story remind you of?
- P: Cinderella
- T: Cinderella, yes
- T: Do you think the same fate would befall her that befell Cinderella, that some magical powers time something would happen and all her dream would vanish? What indications are there perhaps in the story. How is the writer setting her up as a target for this to happen?
- P: Enjoyment
- T: Okay, but I think it's like putting away on a pedestal such a beautiful perfect evening as if nothing can go wrong and one always has some kind of expectation. She's going to fall very hard. T. READS
- T: What does it mean, older by five years in just one week? What does aging in one week mean?
- P: Time
- T: Yes, effort, anxiety, the worry
- T. READS
- T: Frigid, what is frigid. What word derives from frigid?
- P: Freezing
- T: Yes, freezer, fridge, cold
- T. READS
- T: She's now become the exact opposite of what she had wanted. She now has to work to get money. She has lost all her vanities, that pride that she had. She has become just a simple worker. T. READS
- T: The people that learnt her money she had to pay interest. So it took her that long to pay all that money. T. READS
- T: Do you think at this stage that she has made up for the mistake that she has made having sacrificed ten years of her life to pay back for this necklace? Do you think that it was fair that she took this punishment upon herself? Do you think this punishment was fair or not?

PS: Yes, No

T: Why not?

P: It was fair

T: Why was this fair? Yes, but she wanted also to retain friendship and respect and respect of her friend. So----

P: (Question posed inaudible)

T: (Responding) Let's see T. READS
A world famous avenue in Paris.

T: Remember they were of the same age. T. READS

T: Remember, Madame Forestier doesn't know anything about this. She just received the necklace back. She doesn't know the ----(inaudible) T. READS

T: So the punch line comes at the end of the story where we've gone through all the suffering and the dreams and the misery of this woman and the ten years that she sacrificed and in that one line "she smiled with a proud a simple joy" this woman has now made up for the ten years simply by being able to tell this woman that she had been able to make up for the mistake she had made, and then comes the punch line, the shock of the story when she finds that it had all been for nothing. That the one who had actually gotten advantage out of this was her rich friend who had ----- (inaudible). Now, where do our sympathies lie? With the rich friend or Louisel?

P: Louisel

T: Why? We started off thinking that she was proud, she was vain, stupid and greedy and now we suddenly sympathise with her.

P: Ten years

T: Okay, ten years. How could she have know that she could have wasted her life? How does one call this type of shock effect?

P: Climax, is called the climax.

T: Yes, but this device that is used (writes on the board: Irony) is called irony. I told you initially that it is difficult to define this word. This is how it is demonstrated. It is ironic that she had to spend all this time suffering-ten years of her life to make up for something that was not actually genuine.

APPLICATION

- T: On the next page, 202, there you have a discussion or explanation on irony. READS ON IRONY OF SITUATION FROM THE TEXT AND EXPLAINS DIFFICULT WORDS IN THIS PROCESS. That's also ironic. Such a rich woman would have a false necklace. What does that imply about this woman and her work and her lifestyle?(silence)
- T: That it's a fake, it's all front that's it's not genuine therefore if she is so rich why would she have fake jewellery. Okay, that's another example of irony. Then the second example of irony. Matilda is excited at the party therefore it is her first glimpse of a lifestyle that she earnestly desired for herself. This is the type of life that she wants but the price she had to pay for it
- P: Exclamation
- T: For something that she did not expect, that is also irony. Alright, she was more accustomed to the hard life. And the third one, Matilda tells a story of replacing the lost necklace with dignity and pride. Matilda had gotten back the pride and dignity therefore she had been able to make up for something she feels was almost an impossible task-something that this woman, this rich friend wouldn't have been able to manage. That is also ironic therefore it was all unnecessary. This woman had a faked necklace anyway. She never did any effort for her wealth. Whereas Matilda had to work so hard for the wealth that she didn't possess. She actually contributed to the wealth of her rich friend who is better off than she is. That is an example of irony. But then what is irony? If we had to try and sort of find some kind of a definition. At the back of the book on page 630-there we find irony(TEACHER READS OUT DEFINITION OF IRONY FROM PAGE 630)Irony is a _____(inaudible)The given example in the following extract, an incident from this textbook. Washington Ebing, an early nineteenth century, American author, that is 1820 explains the reasons for visit to Europe and England, he wanted to go and see great men and he says "for I've written words of _____(inaudible)
- T: Degenerates means to _____?(expects a response) (silence)TEACHER READS FROM THE TEXT

- T: Degenerates means to go backwards, not to progress, to go to a worse state, to go to a lower state. T. READS FROM THE TEXT.
- T: (explains)He actually is told that in England there were great men , but the men of America had actually gone down and there but the descendants from these great men . He wanted to go back to England to see this great men that he is supposedly a descendant form, but I don't know at what lower level. READS FROM THE TEXT. Does Ebing really think that the English are superior to Americans. TEACHER EXPLAINS. He doesn't really believe that

APPENDIX 4 - POETRY : THE PARTING

The Parting: M. Drayton

The Parting

Michael Drayton

Since there's no help, come let us kiss and part
 Nay, I have done: you get no more of me,
 and I am glad, yea, glad with all my heart,
 That thus so cleanly, I myself can free:
 Shake hands for ever, cancel all our vows,
 And when we meet at any time again,
 Be it not seen in either of our brows
 That we one jot of former love retain
 Now at the last gasp of Love's latest breath,
 When, his pulse failing, Passion speechless lies,
 When Faith is kneeling by his bed of death,
 And Innocence is closing up his eyes,
 Now if thou wouldst, when all have given him over,
 From death to life thou mightst him yet recover.

T: Now, are there any words that you don't understand/or any lines?

T: What is your brow?

P: (P. Points at his forehead)

T: Yes, your forehead.

P: What is a jot? How much is a jot of love? (Silence)

T: Speck of love/ drop of love

Okay, before we go look at the content of the poem. What kind of poem is that?

If you look at the structure, count the lines and look at the rhyme at the same time and tell me what kind of a poem it is.

P: Sonnet

T: A sonnet! Was that a lucky guess?

P: Sonnet

T: A sonnet

What is the rhyme?

P: ab ab cd cd ef

T: No, no something went wrong somewhere.

T+P ab ab cd cd ef ef

T: Okay, if you break up the poem into it's greatest parts, what will it be? What does the consist of? You wrote it down didn't you?

P: Ya

T: Yes

P: Conclusion

T: Yes I hear some con --- at the end that I'm looking for.

P: Concord

T: What I

P: Couples

T: What is the couplet? Where is the couplet?

P: At the end.

T: What does the couplet?

P: Conclude

T: Ja, there are two lines in the couplet. So there's a rhyming couplet and what happens in the rhyming couplet in terms of the content / argument?

P: (silence, no response)

T: In the couplet the conclusion is drawn. The argument is drawn to a conclusion. Alright, what about the rest, you said something about those, yes.

P: Quatrain

T: Where is the quatrain? What is the quatrain?

P: ab ab

T: What? (With rising intonation)

P: ab ab

T: ab ab, four lines, okay those are your quatrain. What happens in the quatrain? I'm sure I gave these notes (T. Writes on the board)

P: Yes you did

T: The argument is presented

P: You gave us the of the book (inaudible)

T: The argument is presented, okay

P: The idea is presented

T: The idea is presented, thank you. The idea is presented in the quatrain and the argument is drawn to conclusion. (T. Gives out books to the pupils) So we now know that the quatrain presents three ideas, so one of the ideas that are presented ---- What is the talking about?

P: Parting

T: What is the parting?

P: The ending

T: The ending of the relationship, the parting of two lovers. Alright, the one is giving the message to the other and saying "This is it, we break up, we're finished". Let's see what it says, "Since there's no help, come let us kiss and part". Now I've done, sorry you get no more of me. Why does she say, "Now I've done you get no more of me?"

P: Tired

T: It's a response to what he says, "No don't stop me I've had enough". Perhaps she was protesting. Perhaps she was trying to say please ---- and he says No, no, I've

had enough. Okay, this is why he presents offers, that's what his intention is since he knows there's no help. "Come let us kiss and part, nay I've done, you get no more of me. And I'm glad, yea glad for the whole of my heart that I so clearly, I myself can free". Okay, "I'm glad, yea glad for the whole of my heart". He's trying to convince her and himself and the reader that he is glad inside, glad that they can break so cleanly that there can be no longing for the other one. It's that the clean break is over. He is very convinced that this is finished. "Shake hands forever, cancel our vows". What are the vows that you make? (Silence). Just like your wedding vows/ promises that you make with each other or cancel all what we say to each other and promise to each other. "And when meet at any time again be it not seen in either of our brows that we one jot of former love retain". Should we meet again it must not show on our faces that there's still a little bit of love/ emotion between the two of us. We must be like total strangers. Our expressions must not reveal that maybe there's still some kind of feeling there. What does starts off by using I, I can free myself. I (T, underlines text) but then he says, "when we meet again ---- He draws her into it. Now it's his decision but slowly he draws her into it ---- Yes I'm glad- when we meet again let us not show that we have any feelings left. He's not even consulting his lover in this decision and he draws the other one into it. One has the feeling that it was his decision all along.

T: (READS OUT THE THIRD QUATRAIN)

T: These last four lines (of the third quatrain) present a metaphor, a metaphor of what? He's describing the death of love but in terms of a description that reminds us of what? (Silence) (T. Underlines text)

He talks about last gasp of breath, he talks about pulse failing, kneeling at his bed of death, closing his eyes.

P: Death

T: Yes, a patient dying, alright.

You're at his bedside, this patient is dying, pulse is failing, he's breathing out his last breath, speechless, they're speech is going and now you're kneeling thee in faith at the bed of death and you're praying for the soul of this nearly parted one and this

person is close so as to close his eyes. The metaphor is of a patient dying. So love is presented as a person slowly dying but the language that is used is that of love. "Love breathes its last breath --- is speechless, and Faith is kneeling at the bedside --- innocence is closing on its eyes. All of these are aspects of love. Right, Love, Passion, Faith and Innocence.

It shows that love is slowly dying, bit by bit. This love has slowly been dying. There are no reasons for this. He doesn't say why this happens. He simply says this is it we're done. He presents his arguments by saying don't ask any questions of me, I'm happy that this is over. In the rhyming couplet when he ends off he says, "Now if Thou to life recover".

If it was your wish, now that everyone has decided this patient is dying, there's nothing more that can be done. "From death life recover". You might still be able to save him. It seems almost as if he's changing his mind in the last two lines. He says this is it, I'm happy with it, you can save it if you want to but, if you want to continue it's up to you. He doesn't sound so sure of himself now anymore because he's giving her the choice of continuing, binding that love if she wants - reviving that love if she wants to.

Do you think she's giving him the choice?

P: Yes

T: Mhmm ----- she could be giving him the choice.

The poem is written by Drayton but this doesn't mean that he's speaking in the poem. Right, in any poem there's normally the speaker who's not always the poet, so it could be the woman talking from her point of view. If you feel that this is a woman speaking to a man there's enough evidence from the poem to suggest that. So he gives her the prerogative, he gives her the choice. Does one get the feeling that he wants it, he wants this love to be saved?

P: No

T: Why not?

P: After all that?

T: But that's exactly the point. Is he as convincing as he sounds?

P: No

T: How can you tell? Besides the last four lines he's making too much of a job trying to convince himself that this is what he wants but, it is not really. It's almost like he's trying to be

T: The arguments are that strong just to convince himself more than the lover. He starts to convince himself that it's over. Okay, let's see if this poem is written in iambic pentameter. Do you still remember that? How does iambic pentameter go? Yes, how does it sound?

T: Da, da da da da da da. There are ten of those beats, five syllables. Let's see if it happens that way here.

Okay

Since there's no help ----- and part".

It's written in iambic pentameter.

I'm not going to spend too much time on iambic pentameter. I spent too much time on that last time. So, okay. I am not going to deal with the poem anymore. One example of a sonnet I wanted to choose was to show you that not only Shakespeare had written a poem like that but also other poets. What I want you to do now that you've gone through the poem is that perhaps speculate at this point why you think that he decided he wants to break up with her ----- maybe she

P: - cheated.

P: She cheated on him.

T: Would he give her a chance to come back if she had cheated on him?

PS: She cannot keep her promises? He says maybe she cannot keep her promises. But would he also give her a chance to come back if she had cheated on him as he does in the last two lines.

P: Yes - if she loves her,

NO

T: How does he feel about her? Does he really love her that much if he gives her that opportunity to come back?

P: Yes

T: Alright

P: What if she doesn't come back?

T: I suppose he would write her another Sonnet in which he laments the fact that he wants her to come back.

T: Siphiwe in our situation/experiences under what conditions let's say a man acting in this way tells his girlfriend that it's over but if you want to you can still come back to me. What would that girl have done for him to make her that offer?

P: (inaudible)

 Pupils break into laughter

T: Alright, okay if that's how you felt the last time?

PS: ----- the last time. (Laughter)

T: Now the girls- under which conditions would you tell a guy it's over? For what reasons would you break up with a guy?

T: If he's

P: Unfaithful

P: (boys in protest) No, no, no

T: It's a very good reason if he's unfaithful

P: (boys protest loudly)

T: Why are you protesting? You would do the same thing if your girl was unfaithful.

Boys: No, No, No

T: No --- we're talking

Boys: She's ours

T: She's ours

Boys: Yes, Yes

T: Is that a cultural thing or is it just the way you feel?

Girl: (defends her position) That's the way you feel

Boy: The reason is one, there are so many girls! If the boy has one girl the other girls would suffer.

T: Your argument is, If there's 1:1 then you'd expect the couple to remain faithful but, the fact that there are more girls/women than men means you'd expect the girls or the guys to move around?

Boys: Guys

Boys: It's not possible

T: That's not sexist!!!

Girl: NO, no, no,

T: Why can't both go around?

Boy: That's a serious danger, that's one thing that should curb you from going around.

Boy: There's no AIDS, then you won't have Aids. There's no Aids. It's in the mind. There's no Aids.

T: Are you not convinced on your argument?

P: No

T: I feel very sorry for you if that's the way you gonna go through life.

Girls: (dismissing the boys' argument) Wooh, wooh
What about cancer?

T: It's a very controversial thing because guys have totally different expectations from relationships and girls/women are becoming more and more ---- let's say not modern in terms of expecting a guy to be a one man woman and sticking to her only and if we can't offer her that, that's what's going to happen. That's it. Off you go ----- but without the last two lines ----- he's not going to tell her to come back if she wants to.

P: Sir, we're not sure.

T: What? You guys are so sexist!!

PS: No we're not being sexist, we are being realistic

Boys: We are only realistic

T: I want you for ----- for next week first of all ----- I want you to write a letter to a lover in which you propose a parting stating reasons.
Why has it become necessary for the two of you to break up? And please keep it clean.

End of the lesson.

APPENDIX 5 - DRAMATISATION - A SCENE FROM TWELFTH NIGHT

(*The following text is unedited)

1ST PAIR

VIOLA When the chief master told me the story about Orsino I went to the town to find a job and there I worked for Orsino and I was a servant for Orsino on Olivia.

(Meeting between a young man and Viola)

Young man: Viola, where have you. (laughter) (they embrace each other).

Viola: I was working for a king and I had to send messages back from the king to Olivia and when I was doing that Olivia fell in love with Viola because she thought that I was a guy.

Young man: Olivia, that's the one. Oh! she asked me to marry her.

Viola: Yes, I think the reason why she asked you is that she thought I was you and when I was just going to the king sending some messages I also met other guys and they fought me.

Young man: I also met those, (pause) who are those guys, can you tell me about them?

Viola: I don't even know them.

Young man: I'm glad to see you Viola.

2ND PAIR

P₁: I've been looking for you, I thought you were dead on that shipwreck.

Teacher: He's not ready. Come on. I don't expect you to remember the script. Just say what comes to mind. [T. offers encouragement and is concerned with promoting communication.]

P₂: Me, I thought you were dead also. Tell me, what were you doing all this time?

P₁: Oh! it's a long story. I was working for Orsino. What I was doing I was taking messages to Olivia and there I met guys who were strange to me. They even wanted to kill me. And what happened to you?

P₂: No wonder. I also met these strange guys. They wanted to fight. I couldn't understand why. (pause) I understand they thought I was you. (laughter).
Anyway, I spent most of my time looking for you and I'm glad to see you.

T: Okay, Alright.

3rd PAIR

P₁: I thought you were dead in that shipwrecking !

P₂: I also thought you were dead.

P₁: I've missed you a lot. I was saved by a captain and then I disguised myself as a guy and people here do not know me as Viola. They know me as Ceasario, and then I've been sending messages from Orsino to Olivia.
Orsino wants to be in love with Olivia and Olivia is refusing to be in love with him. A strange thing happened, Olivia has fallen in love with me. I don't know how that can happen. And (pause) there were these people, Olivia's servants, they wanted to beat me and then one time I was helped by a man, I don't even know his name (pause) and then he told me about his purse. I don't know.
And I met you.

P₂: I was also sent by a captain and I met u - Antonio who gave me a purse and money and I went to Orsino's place where people thought I was u - Caesario. I had a fight with Sir Toby, he thought I was Caesario.

P₁: Ok, that's why the guy wanted my purse. He mixed up us. He thought I was you.

P₂: Okay.

T: Okay, Thank you.

4th PAIR Meeting between Viola and "his" brother Sebastian.

P₁: Who are you? [Surprise registered on her face].

P₂: What?

P₁: Who are you?

P₂: Sebastian, and you?

P₁: I'm Viola, how did you enter in this house?

P₂: (Sebastian) I thought you were a man.
P₁: I disguised myself as a boy because I wanted a mail job of sending messages from the king to Olivia.
P₂: But, I thought you were dead.
How did you manage in the sea?
P₁: It was easy because when I was sending messages, this Olivia fell in love with me and on the other side I was in love with a Duke.
P₂: Ok. (inaudible on tape)
I fought some fools, I don't know them.
Viola: Oh! I know them, it's Mr Toby and Sir Andrew. They challenged you 'cause they thought I was going to marry Olivia, so they were jealous.
Sebastian: So, who was it you were working for?
Viola: It's a duke, Orsino.
Sebastian: How come, because I know you as a man?
Viola: Well, I disguised myself. . . (inaudible).
Sebastian: I'm glad to see you.
T: Thank you, that was very good.

5th PAIR

T: Let's see how it goes .
P₁: Who are you?
P₂: I'm Viola.
P₁: Viola, who?
Viola: I was working for Orsino but I'm using this name Caesario.
P₁: Oh! I'm Sebastian.
Viola: Who?
Sebastian: Sebastian.
Viola: Sebastian was my brother.
Sebastian: Oh! tell me what happened.
Viola: He died but I don't know how he died but, what I know is that he died when we were children.

Sebastian: Tell me. . . (inaudible).
Viola: I was working for a king sending messages from him.
Sebastian: Oh! do you know that I'm married to Olivia?
(They hug each other).
T: You see that wasn't so bad.
Okay, the only one left is Andile.

6th PAIR

P₁: Ah! my sister.
Where have you been?
P₂: I was sent by a captain and I heard about a job at Orsino's place so I disguised myself and went to look for a job there.
P₁: Tell me how, where have you been?
P₂: After that shipwrecking I was saved by a captain and he gave me his purse and I went to Elyria and there I met strange guys and they wanted to fight me. I don't know why.
P₁: They must have thought you were me.
I had a little misunderstanding with them
P₂: That's why they wanted to fight with me.
P₁: What were you doing at Orsino's court?
P₂: I was a messenger taking messages to Olivia
P₁: Olivia.
P₂: Yes.
P₁: She married me.
P₂: Oh! she also wants to marry me, you can't blame me.
T: Thank you, you two.
Let that be a lesson to you. It's no use playing it down now. Let's see, tomorrow we'll do some writing. We'll watch the video, bring the play with you tomorrow.

APPENDIX 6 - CLASS DISCUSSION : MIXED RELATIONSHIPS

- T: We're talking about mixed relationships since we are not qualified to talk about marriage yet.
- PS: (disagree with this statement)
- T: Okay, I want to read this quickly I did n't have time to correct. Listen to this it presents three case studies of two or three different couples and the problems they've had, and just listen to the type of things that they have difficulty with and then we will discuss about the difficulties afterwards.
- T: Reads from magazine article entitled Mixed Marriages. The people of the book. Whatbook is it they're referring to?
- P: The Koran.
- T: The Koran, so that means that they are only permitted to marry people from their own religion. (T. Reads from the text)
- PS: No! (laughter) (T. Reads)
- T: One thing that I want you to discuss is the formula in the white culture and formula in the black culture because in this, according to her . . .
- P: (laughter) T. Reads from the text)
- P: What's that?
- T: Do you know phuthu? Dolly, do you know what it is?
- P: Yes
(T. Reads from the text)
- T: Alright, the last couple (continues to read)
- T: Now there've been quite a few points that have been raised about the problems of a mixed relationship and it appears as if these problems were drawn from before the Group Areas Act and the Mixed Marriage Act could start. But today there is absolutely to restriction at all. What could be the problems if you were to go out with a white girl friend or boy friend.
- P: No problem

T: No problem, do you think so?

P: Yes

T: (pointing at one of the pupils and asks) Dolly, would it be a problem if you decided to go out with a white guy?

P: No political problem

T: (laughter) No political problems what about social problems?

P: (inaudible answer)

T: Yes, okay let's assume that people accept the two, but what about family life?

P: Yeah!

T: What are the problems at. . . (pause)

P: Home.

T: What are difficulties, Thabo what kind of . . . Would it be acceptable to the family? Just one Saturday if you were to bring out a white girlfriend from a big cosy white suburb in Durban, you go to Durban you meet some . . .

P: My mother

T: Okay, she comes up with you, now?

P: She undermines me.

T: She what?

P: Undermining me because of the way we're living.

T: Why?

P: (inaudible answer, laughter)

T: Would she just accept someone you bring in the house, somebody like . . .

P: In the end maybe

T: Okay, do you think there will be some difficulty that you will have with the way. . . , with your lifestyle, with your family's lifestyle?

P: My lifestyle is my family.

T: You family's?

P: Ja, I don't think she would like to go to the lalies, our homelands,

Others: He wouldn't like to go to my location.

T: Alright, let's assume that the love she has for you has far strong enough for her to want her to accept everything just as you accept anything by herself. What are some of these difficulties these people have, like the food?

P: They will discuss the food.

Another: She should describe the food she doesn't like (laughter).

T: But let's assume that the family is getting together for whatever occasion and there's going to be provision of food and there's going to be expected of her to partake in some of these activities.

P: She would bring her own food.

T: Bring their own food, but wouldn't that be an insult. What will your family think of her?

P1: (inaudible)

P2: He can't eat leaves.

T: Is there really such a big difference in the living habits or eating culture that . . .

PS: No/ Yes

T: Okay, In the case of Indians/ Moslems there would be a problem.

PS: (inaudible response) (laughter)

T: So would you go out with an Indian guy?

PS: No! No!

T: Why not? That sounds very close to discrimination.

PS: (chorus response)

T: Andile, you were saying it's not discrimination, What is it then?

P: I mean Sir, Indians have got funny things. (Laughter)

T: If you could just see yourself, the way you pull your face, "Indian". Isn't that a first step towards discrimination? (Jokingly)

PS: No, Sir, it's not it's their food, in that sense. I mean . . . ?

Another P: Date an Indian? [Gesticulating & code switching].

T: Don't, English. (T. Putting a stop to code switching) What? If you date an Indian, what?

P: They'll have to treat her as a normal person -

P: Who?

P: (response) The family.

T: (INAUDIBLE)

P: Inaudible on tape

T: INAUDIBLE

P: Inaudible

P: I think Sir, if you really love a person. . . . What if a child dies? Indians do not attend funerals.

T: Alright, let's go on with the topic, what if a child is born, let's go through the whole life cycle, a child is born, is the child baptised?

P: Yes, others: Of course.

T: Alright, the child is baptised right according to whose religion?

P: Both.

T: Is this possible? Does it happen in real life situations?
Okay I want you to make a compromise now the child goes to school, pre-school, what kind of pre-school? PS: Perhaps English,

Other: Black school

T: Now to school, which first language?

P: English

T: Which second language?

P: Xhosa, other: Afrikaans

T: You say Xhosa but what if the woman is Indian and speaks something different, a different language?

T: Then now, as the child grows up the child will have to be made aware of the traditions of the family, family tradition. Which one of the two is going to take precedence? Which one of the two is going to be more emphasised.

P: Father

T: Is that . . . ?

PS: No

P(girl): It's 50: 50

P(boy): No

T: (inaudible)

P(boy): The father should be the head of the family.

P(girl): So?

(boys) So you should listen to the father.

Others: Ja

P(girl): Even if he's wrong

- P(boy): Father can't be wrong (laughter) (T. Allows them to discuss for sometime)
- T: If you assume 50:50) how are you to practically do this. The child weekends with the one family then with the other one the following weekend, how is the child going to be exposed? (Good questioning skills, doesn't disagree with them openly but asks a leading question that forces the pupils to realise the problems/ challenges facing mixed couples.
- P: During June holidays he goes to . . . (laughter)
- T: Alright, okay
- P(boy): Stupid, only one thing to do is to go to the father.
- T: But this is unfair towards the child.
- P: (inaudible) The child should be exposed to both traditions.
- T: Both traditions? (Tone suggesting P. hasn't successfully addressed the question). What if the child starts dating what would you as a parent, what kind of a person do you like your child to come with?
- P: (inaudible) Plenty. except Ghanaians (laughter).
- T: Except what? (disbelief at the racial overtones/ Hasn't quite heard what has been said)
- P: Except Ghanaians
- T: Do you . . .
- T: Okay so we assume that okay the child can be able to (inaudible). Now let's say let's say now there's a mixed couple and they want to get married, what about . . . mentioned here, the question of lobola.
- P: (inaudible) I should not pay lobola.
- T: Okay if we were to go out with a guy from a different culture, do you expect them to pay lobola?
- PS(girls): Yes
- T: Why?
- P: (inaudible answer)
- T: Okay the girls feel that he will have to honour the tradition and pay lobola, the guys feel that. . .
- P(boy): Why should I pay?
- P(girl): The money doesn't go to the girl.

P(boy): But all that comes from one pocket, you should know that.

P(girl): From one pocket? You should go and work.

P(boy): Go and work, pay lobola.

T: The issue is . . . now, that is just incidental sh. . . Let's leave that. So if you say. . .

T: The guys feel that it's not necessary especially if they marry girls from a different culture. So that means it's easy for you. But then, "would you?"

P: (inaudible) But in India it's the other way round.

T: What?

P: The girls should pay lobola.

T: And you will be happy with that if you marry.

P: Yes.

Others: No, you won't, you can't

T: Would you, let's say whites got certain laws sort of liberal. , and your wife puts her foot down and says look. No! I'm not here to have babies, I'm not here to clean for you, I'm not here to serve you. Okay, what if she, as an individual, she, has rights also as a woman which are different from those of the traditional Xhosa woman.

P: What rights?

T: For example she would like to work. (Laughter) she has the right to own her property.

P(boy): Yhu!

T: That she's not going to work for you as a slave.

P(girls): Yes

T: Who's getting to work? Nobody

P(girl): (inaudible)

P:(boy): Ye man, who's going to work for the wife?

T: (inaudible)

P: (inaudible)

T: No matter whom you marry you'll still insist on cooking in the kitchen if the. . . In fact would you, both of you now, if you were married to someone else from a

different culture would you employ a nanny, a Xhosa nanny to raise your child and look after your house? (Laughter)

PS: Yes,

Others: No

T: Would you, girls would you employ a Xhosa nanny to look after your child?

P: Yes it doesn't matter, if you employ a black nanny and you are married to a white person.

P(girl): They are the same.

T: What's the difference? (Inaudible, laughter) What difference would that make to the raising of the child if a child is raised by a black nanny or white nanny? What difference will it make?

P: No difference.

Girl: If a child is raised by a Xhosa nanny a child would learn Xhosa and it's going to know Xhosa more than any other language.

T: Are there any values that the child might learn when you look at child's face, would you know what kind of a nanny has raised your child, and you'll all know this. So, the child learns and picks up things of value from the nanny. Would you prefer a child to pick up values from a black nanny or let's say in any other person that's looking after your child and cleaning the house?

P: Black nanny.

Others: It doesn't matter

T: What are the benefits besides.

P(girl): They know what values are

P(boy): No they know, what does that mean?

T: They know what also?

P(girl): The nanny is going to teach the child about traditions.

T: This is what I mean.

P(girl): So the child will have a lot of questions.

P: (inaudible)

T: Okay then what about living arrangements?, who decides the way you're going to be living?

PS: The man.

Others: Both

P(boy): Every decision in the family is made by the father.

P(other boys): Yes!!

T: Do you know what you are speaking? You are speaking from Xhosa tradition and you assume that (interrupted)

P: Even the whites Sir. . . .

Others: It's always the case.

P(girl): It's not (laughter)

T: What if you . . . marry an Indian woman and she is assertive that means she is aware of the rest that she's not going to be dominated by a man she loves even the man she marries. She wants to have a say in all the decisions that are taken.

P(boy): . . . suggestion

T: Would you seriously consider that situation?

P(boy): No, I don't want to consider it, it's a suggestion. [a lot of conversation going on between boys and girls]

T: Alright, let's come to a very contentious issue, a very controversial issue, what if the woman falls pregnant and she decides that ---- okay whose decision will it be whether the family is at the time able to afford to have the child or not?

P(boy): The man

P(girl): Both

P(boy): Both what? If I'm earning more money than you, then I should decide.

P: (inaudible)

T: Okay you decide for your wife.

P: Yeah

T: Okay before we go on, is that acceptable in your culture that a man will decide for the wife? Is it?

P: Yes it's up to the man.

P(girl): No, it's not allowed

T: Okay, next question, is it acceptable for a Xhosa woman to have an abortion... ?

P: No, not at all

T: Now is it something that the couple will discuss?

P(boy): No

T: The decision?

P(boy): We discuss it but

T: It's something that you would discuss with the husband.

P: Yes

T: It's decision that you will take and you'll decide it within but

P(girl): Sir, the thing is sir, if I have a child and my husband didn't want to have a child, my child is going to suffer because he's not going to get much love from my husband.

P(boy): you suggest

P(girl): And the same thing happens, if I have a child and I didn't want to have a child I'm not going to love that child as much I was supposed to.

P(boy): (inaudible)

T: Another sense of feeling for the guys, what about contraception, is it something that if your wife insists on it?

P(boy): Why?

T: Hold on if the culture she comes from sees it as a responsibility for both and she takes contraceptives.
. Is it something that you need?

P(boy): No

T: Will you come it is no more family for
. . . . ?

P: No

T: If your wife expects you to, would you?

P: No (laughter)

T: Okay in the tradition let's assume or let's make generalisation, the children are the wealth of the family, so having those children.

T: Okay in the tradition let's assume or let's make generalisation, the children are the wealth of the family, so having those children.

P(boy): No, not at all sir.

T: Okay, having children of the family but in your European culture having at least two children that's it, is that something which both would be satisfied with?

P: Two, Others: four

T: Whether it's twp girls or two boys.

P: At least three boys, Others: Two boys, two girls.

T: What the family have [inaudible]

P: (inaudible)

T: Would your family expect you to have more children?

P: No, Others: Yes, at least three

T: from your family or your group from where you come from to the children?

P: (inaudible, laughter)

T: What about illegitimate children, if you come to marriage it's quite a common thing or let's again generalise it's quite a common thing amongst black you will have illegitimate children heh? First of all would the white wife or Indian wife or coloured wife accept that?

P: No

T: Why not?

P: It depends if you love the person.

T: If you what?

P(girl): If you love the person.

T: You'll accept the child.

P: (inaudible)

T: Okay so, if you do accept that illegitimate child and you had let's say life insurance cover, would you cover both your own child and that child?

P: YES

P(boy): No, not me.

T: Aren't you selfish?

P: No

T: (inaudible)

P: (inaudible)

T: Does it happen that the Xhosa people get together and there's an illegitimate child Is the child accepted?

P: (inaudible, laughter)

T: What about church, which church does he belong to, Methodist, Protestant, Anglican, Catholic?

P(boy): No church (laughter)

T: Now, these are all for also for European introducing denomination churches' religions but if you were to marry to someone else, whose church would you be married in?

P: The closest church (laughter)

T: Thabo, what church do you belong to?

P(boy): Anglican.

T: Anglican, if your wife were a white Catholic, would you become Catholic?

P(boy): No, she must become Anglican.

P: It doesn't matter, I mean you can't say (Laughter).

T: Your church and your children?

P: My church.

T: Your church. Is that because you're a man or because you wouldn't change your faith for your church?

P: No, I wouldn't change my faith for my church.

T: How would you go girls, would you change your church for a particular husband?

P(girl): (inaudible) It doesn't matter.

T: It doesn't matter neh? Okay now let's when you approach this woman watch the formula he had in the formula for the culture, girls what is the formula?

P: (laughter)

T: If I, I'm living here in Umtata and see this woman. How would I approach her in the way that she would understand me?

P: (inaudible)

T: Is that does it work?

P: Ja, No it does (laughter)

T: Okay, let's say this is not

P: (laughter)

T: Let's say he wants to work on the relationship
. to slowly get into or in the favour of the family.

P: And asks her to go out with him

T: And I would allow her to go out alone.

P: Yes

T: Would you expect her to visit home

P: (no response)

T:

P: No (laughter)

T: I can just imagine to see Sivuyile comes and asks Mr let's say Mr
wants to see a doctor.

P: (laughter)

T: what other things
make a guy acceptable to the father or to the family?

P(girl): At least mother but not the father.

T: But something is going to (interrupted)

P(boy): You can do something ?

P(girl): No.

T: Is that general, I mean
.

P(girls): Yes, at some stage.

P(boys): when is the ending?

T: Okay, now what do you think if the guy approached you and or girl approached
you and will expect of you to follow this formula sort of a white formula like going
to the movies, sending flowers and calling from time to time, is that something

that you would be able to do? Mowande, would you be able to play that role . . .
. . . going to movies, sending flowers. ?

P(boy): No

Others: I would save my pocket (laughter).

T: But besides that if it is expected of you white friends and they all do that,
would you be able to easily?

P(boy): No

T: Expensive.

T: Isn't that something expensive to take a Xhosa girl out.

P: (laughter) not expensive

T: Wouldn't that girl be expected to be taken out and spoilt? Don't you want to be
spoilt.

P(girl): Yes

T: Okay guys

P: Romantic but not expensive.

T: Romantic but in cheap way.

P: (laughter)

T: What about psychologists from friends
of your group. If you were to go out with someone else from let's say different
areas in Transkei let's say predominantly white area. Would you get pressure
from your friends?

P: Ya, yes

T: But let's say Saturday you have your Mawande you have your programme . . .
. . . you don't have to stay Saturday morning. You have been a couple of weeks
with guys and in the evening you go to wherever, let's call it township or
wherever shebeen Now Sunday you have a girlfriend
let's say white girlfriend and she doesn't like to do that. So Saturday
night you spend you know going to watching T. V. Are you going to get
pressure from your friends.

P: Yes (laughter)

T: Are you going to be mocked by them or are you going to be you know made fun of (interrupted)

P: (girl) Yes, they are going to make fun of you.

T: Would that? And what if you were in that position? Would you get difficulty from let's say from Black guys if you went out with white girl?

P: (laughter)

T: Hold on guys if you white girl would you would you say anything if you knew her like this guy? Would you feel offended as a Xhosa man?

P: Yes (inaudible)

T: Would you speak to her about it? Would you ask her why she wants to (interrupted).

P: No problem.

P: We are not talking about that but would you if it were somebody you knew very well? Would you go and ask her why what's wrong?

P: No

T: You wouldn't talk back about

P(boys): You need to tell her.

P(girls): I mean sir, if you are confident enough you don't later accept it.

T: Okay, but what now if a guy that you like you haven't suddenly seen him with the Black woman. Would you feel insulted in any way.

P: Yes

T: Why?

P: To lose out

T: To lose out you don't like that, that's interesting. Doesn't make you feel as a person?

P: To lose out your what? (Laughter)

T: But do you feel there's a cultural, there's respect, there's sort of a cultural rule that has been transversed here by the fact that, let's say she would choose a white guy. you do you think she was wrong?

P: YES

T: Is that a culture? Is that cultural thing or what?

P(boy): Stupidity mh choose

T: Why?

P(boy): Just stupid.

T: Does it make choice?

P(boy): No, well of course it's a choice.

T: (inaudible)

P: Ja

T: Okay, are there any preferences if you would choose, which other type of a person would you love? Besides whites if you had to? (Pause)

P(boy): coloured.

T: White?

P(boy): Ja

T: What other would you choose, Mawande?

P(boy): Coloured

T: White

P: Ja

T: white person?

P(boy): coloureds have a lot of fusses.

T: So a Coloured person is not so fussy.

P: (laughter)

T: And then the girls?

P(boy): Ghanaian. (Laughter)

T: You have just said Indian guy is out.

P(girls): Indians and Ghanaians out.

T: (repeats pupils' suggestion) Indians and Ghanaians out (laughter) Okay, what about

P(boy): Shangaans

P(girl): No they are very short tempered.

P: Most of them

T: What about a white guy?

P(girl): I would

T: You would

P(boy): White guy!

T: You would, it is something you know where he comes from or something because of

P(girl): (inaudible) (laughter)

T: Why not? Okay Xhosa, Zulu, Sotho man?

P: Zulu other Sotho (laughter). Those hereto.

T: I want to know am I wrong to be interested in a Sotho girl, I want to know. What's the problem?

P: (no response)

T: What about English?

P: They gossip

T: They gossip[

P(boy): Girls gossip. Everyone gossips.

T: Are you trying to tell me that Xhosa girls don't gossip?

T: Let's get to culture differences, if you had a choice as a teenager would you want to go out with someone from different culture at this stage you are in now?

P: An African lady.

T: Why, what if I (inaudible)

P: They are cool.

T: They are cool, how do you know that? from TV they are cool.

P: No

T: So what makes an African man very cool? There are Americans, Egyptians or Zimbabweans.

P: It's the way he talks.

T: It's the way he talks? Isn't that to us. I mean does Okay (laughter) Give an example in the media of a person that you would like to go out with?

T: anyone, any problems at all, now?

P(girl): Denzil Washington.

T: Is there anyone with a choice at this stage in her life? Would you go out with

P(boy): Janet Jackson
(Others): Toni Braxton
T: (inaudible)
P: (laughter)
T: Andile you've not said much what is your choice?
P(boy): Coloured
T: Coloured, what should she look like? What feature?
P(boy): Uses hands to give us a picture of the structure he would like from his girl)
(laughter).
T: Don't you think that a Xhosa girl can also look like that?
P(girl): (inaudible)

This lesson did not come out clearly on tape. However, the discussion on this topic was vibrant and interesting.

E n d.

APPENDIX 7 - STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

K: Marc, What's your home language?

M: It's a little bit difficult because, although the first couple of years I grew up Afrikaans, we'd taken a decision at home for the two girls to be raised in English and the two boys in Afrikaans, so the school career had been in Afrikaans. When I went to varsity I switched to English. Of course, that means the mother tongue is still Afrikaans but everything I do, I do in English and we speak English as far as possible at home.

K: So you'd say you're bilingual?

M: Mhm, yes.

K: You speak the two languages equally well. How much experience do you have in English language teaching both as an L1 and as an L2?

M: It's difficult to make the distinction, because for all the teaching I've done, I've taught kids who were also bilingual and could speak both languages equally well, so I would say my experience is not solely based on actual second language teaching where I would have to concentrate on typical errors made by L2 speakers. I could always, revert to or explain in terms of L1 which was Afrikaans mother tongue.

K: Since you were teaching bilingual kids

M: Yes

K: What kind of training have you had in the teaching of English?

M: Just the normal teachers' diploma postgrad, at varsity. It didn't focus very much on first or second language teaching.

K: It was language education generally.

M: But also, more politically mh how shall I put it? You see, it was done during the 80's and at that time there were student boycotts and we were trained to respond to the teaching situation in class, so it was almost as if it was an emergency measure to respond to People's Education: so it wasn't based on purely theoretical second language teaching principles.

K: or first language principles. You had to respond to the needs of the pupils at that time.

M: of the moment

K: Yes

M: I do feel somewhat cheated. I feel not very confident when it comes to second language teaching 'cause I didn't have the necessary training to do the necessary kind of creative work that other students can do that graduated after me.

K: I see .

M: You see, I'm creative, but I was creative only in that context, although those principles you could apply, but we didn't get much training in that.

K: How do you feel about teaching L1 pupils?

M: I would prefer teaching L1 pupils because I can deal with them on a higher level, I can take more things for granted and I can teach much more efficiently, I'd say. I can actually refer to things out there that I know an L1 pupil should know, not

only linguistic aspects, but just any topic I want to talk about. I know it's not a problem because

K: They have the necessary linguistic skills to deal with the topic.

M: Not only that, I found that L1 speakers are much more outspoken and much more open-minded about things, than L2 speakers, perhaps it's only been the case where I've been teaching. I don't know whether it's the same all over, so it's easy to deal with L1 pupils. They're much more outspoken and open-minded about things.

K: What is your attitude towards oral errors that second language learners commit during classroom interaction? I'm referring here specifically to second language speakers.

M: I must honestly admit it's not something that I consciously thought about until you came and sort of said "This is what I'm looking at".

K: Mh .

M: So I haven't so much adapted my teaching but am more aware of it now, and at times when I have had time to think about (pause). When somebody is reading a text and I hear that somebody is committing an error then my response would have been different from what it would have been before I knew the significance of that kind of correction, but otherwise when I'm not thinking and am doing fast oral work with them, reading and discussing, I correct it right at that moment when I think it's necessary, otherwise most things I just let go.

K: Oh, you just disregard them, I see.

M: Ja, because I don't want to expose the kids. It's difficult for them to speak up in the first place, so I don't want to make it even more difficult for them by

highlighting their errors because I won't get much in the form of a response the next time.

K: So - you feel if you become over-corrective they're likely to . . .

M: Well, not even over-corrective, if I just correct every time they make a mistake they'll be reticent to speak up the next time.

K: Which errors do you consider serious, which ones do you consider less serious? which type of errors do you consider serious?

M: If it was a basic language error, grammar error, like concord, or tense or pronunciation, especially in this situation, then I would deal with that at that moment.

K: You'd correct

M: I would correct that at that moment and I would even explain on the board if it becomes necessary. For example with the Std 8's live and leave. "I leave in Umtata" if somebody says that I would explain the phonemic difference, come to the board and explain the difference between the two for the whole class' attention and then I would continue because that I would find, is a basic mistake which could affect meaning.

K: So if an error affects meaning intelligibility and comprehension you'd correct it right away.

M: If it could lead to ambiguity, yes I do.

K: And which errors do you consider less serious, and what do you normally do with the errors that you consider less serious?

M: Let's see, "less serious" errors? What is "less serious"? I know there's a lot of things that I let go that I don't even respond to. I don't know what's "less serious". Those are the only three that I would consider more serious, anything else I would consider less serious. There's a fine line between making a linguistic error and making a comprehension error, do you understand? If I ask a question and they answer the question wrongly that I would obviously concentrate on and respond 'no. no' and I would sort of fish for the right answer, but grammar only. On these three I would concentrate pronunciation, basic grammar and concord, otherwise I would let the rest go, because I know I can pick that up later in their written work.

K: So you take note of the errors they make. Those you feel need correction, you do the correction in the follow up lesson.

M: Yes, ja.

K: Do you think it is of any benefit to second language learners?

M: Oral correction?

K: Do you think it is of any benefit to the L2 learners?

M: I think perhaps of more benefit than any kind of written corrections because I've noticed that in their essays. I don't let them do spelling or remedial work afterwards because I found in my experience it's a waste of time, because it's done out of context. I would mark it in the book and write the correct version there but I would draw up a worksheet of all their mistakes then deal with it but orally I think it's important for this kind of pupil where they have difficulty with pronunciation, that it's done within the context and not only corrected and said "No, you must say this. The whole class repeat after me", not only that but to give an explanation, even on the board if necessary, around that so that they

understand why it's wrong and can apply the same principle to other situations, if you understand what I mean.

K: They should know where the error lies so that they can avoid it next time.

M: Yes.

K: How do you usually deal with errors in fluency focussed lessons? I'm thinking here of the dramatisation lesson.

M: and reading aloud

K: individual oral presentations.

M: fluency - focused lessons, (pause) when it comes to reading it's difficult because I don't like loud reading but unfortunately it's something that one has to also evaluate in terms of the syllabus, you know, giving each one a chance to read. Some of them are very good readers, no problem, others are exposed. When they do read you actually realise that they are very weak readers and the others make fun of them. For this reason I don't like it. There, unfortunately, I can't do much because the more I correct them, especially in reading, pronunciation and fluency, the more exposed they are to ridicule by the rest of the group, but I can't let it go unnoticed either, because that means I'm not addressing that specific pupil's problems. I just let them go on and their reading skills will never improve. That's something very difficult to deal with in a class of like 6 to 24 pupils where there are 23 others waiting their turns and listening (pause) so, that one is very difficult to deal with. When it comes to oral

K: so what do you do? Do you let the good readers do the reading?

M: No. I give all of them a chance but, the weak reader, only in serious cases would I correct their reading, interrupt their reading and correct but otherwise I would

let it go if I think it's not serious, and if feel guilty about it because I know that somewhere along the line it's not going to be taken up again, the reading will maybe never improve because they won't read an English book by choice. In oral presentations I normally listen to them, I let the whole thing run through and I make note of their mistakes and then afterwards I would refer back to their mistakes and . . .

K: you find this helpful.

M: Yes, I think so because of the response I've got. It's helpful, it teaches them skills because oral presentation is a . . . (pause)

K: an exercise in listening skills as well.

M: Yes, but an oral situation is practice for a real life situation out there so is I correct certain things it does teach them certain skills for that real life situation out there.

K: And how do you deal with errors in form focussed lessons? I'm thinking of the lesson you gave the other day on concord, tense and sentence types. How do you deal with errors in such lessons, accuracy-based lessons.

M: Yes, if somebody makes a mistake, I would very politely say 'No. . . . ' and find the answer somewhere else, but you'll have noticed that if the atmosphere is playful, relaxed, jovial yet attentive I wouldn't just say straight out 'No', but I would make silly little comments like, " 'Ah! Come on, don't be silly, it can't be that. Think about it again".

K: So, you want the student to restructure his response.

M: Yes, I also want to give them a chance to think again about it, but if I know that they won't be able to and I see that someone else has the answer I go to someone else, but I normally avoid the fast ones. For the first three answers, I would ask

three weak students first and then I would go to the fast ones, otherwise the others would just sit back and depend on the fast ones for answers.

K: So, you want to give everybody a chance?

M: Yes, but more so the weaker ones, but I must say that my attitude is more one sort of a playful joking attitude so that it doesn't become too serious when I say, 'No, that's not what I'm looking for'. I would try and correct in a way that they would be able to accept. A lot of it goes with body language too, you know, I would sort of touch them, and say 'No man, think about it again, don't be silly or that's a stupid answer but I wouldn't mean it seriously because I know that with certain pupils I wouldn't say 'That's a stupid answer', certainly not, because I can see they could take it very seriously.

K: So, it all depends on the kind of student you've called upon to answer a question.

M: Yes.

K: comprehension focused lessons? How do you deal with errors in such lessons? I'm thinking here of reading comprehension lesson.

M: We've covered some of that so far, it's basically the same for reading when it comes to comprehension, answering the questions orally first, what do I do? If I can't find the correct answer from the class I would go back to the text and read the part in which the answer is contained and then ask them to reconsider the question, and that happens very often with texts that are difficult or questions that are set in a very complicated way. Very often they wouldn't grasp the meaning and I would have to, (pause) or they would have overlooked the subtleties of the question. The question would be perhaps suitable for L1 pupils and involves interpretation and I would involve subtleties, so I would have to go back to the text, read that part again and ask them to reconsider the question before I gave

them the actual and even if I gave them the answer I would go back to the text to show them exactly how I arrived at the answer.

K: So, you'd also simplify the language and make it more accessible to them so that they can be in a position to answer your question?

M: I would make them interpret the text first and then reconsider the question.

K: In which kinds of lessons do you find yourself correcting the most and why?

M: I'll start off with the least, the least is oral discussions because I want the discussion to flow, the most, (pause). Intermediary would be language lessons because there I would sit and read, do oral exercises with them, the most, let's see . . .

K: or perhaps you don't have that category.

M: I don't particularly concentrate on one lesson where I know this is where I'm going to be more active than in the others. I base it on the lesson actually, it depends on how fast I want the lesson to go. What I'm trying to get to is, if I was reading a short story and I have one hour to finish the short story, I would have less interruptions than if we were discussing an oral topic for tomorrow, then I would obviously do more intensive discussion because I know that any mistakes that are not cleared up now will occur in the written form, so there perhaps I would be more particular about correction.

K: How do you regard code - switching?

M: Another thing that I became more aware of when you came onto the scene, because teaching Afrikaans and English pupils is not a problem you know, because in the Western Cape the two languages are so intermixed that you don't even think of code - switching. But here it's more obvious and expressed. I feel

it more because I don't understand Xhosa - now I feel very left out when they do have their little humours, jokes and remarks and I can see how it goes around and I can see what's happening although I can't understand. Normally, I let it pass because know eventually it will pass. Once they have had their laugh and I can go back to the lesson or if I know that it disturbs or embarrasses one, that one is the focus of fun then I simply continue the lesson regardless of who listens or who doesn't because I know that there will be a group that will be listening to me and I work with them and the rest will catch up. This is a way of trying to shield the other person from embarrassment. Look, I could obviously stop the lesson and say 'Hold it, hold it guys, none of this', but then by doing that I'll artificially stop the dynamic that's going on, and I think I would be exposing the person more because I'm now stepping in on behalf of that person or between that person on and the group that's making fun of him and protecting him, you understand? And I see that as my way of putting my arms around him and protecting him and that would expose him to more ridicule, so I just continue and not pay attention and by showing them that I'm not paying attention and dragging off class with me, it might just fizzle. It happens quite often. That's when it focuses on one student when it focuses on simply having little conversation I allow it to happen especially in oral discussion when it becomes very heated then, I know that they are angry, they are excited, it's difficult for them to express these feelings in the second language. Perhaps management would like that to happen in a second language perhaps because that's their focus, their purpose, their goal but when I tell them from time to time "No, English, I want to know what you are talking about". Immediately it puts a damper on the discussion and because they have difficulty expressing themselves the ideas come out wrong, so I let them do the discussion in the mother tongue, then the ideas are clearer for them to transmit to me.

K: So you see code - switching as an aid to learning at times.

M: Well, it's not an aid for me but for them it definitely is. It doesn't benefits me much but it does them.

- K: Okay, you wouldn't penalise them for code - switching.
- M: No, no.
- K: How do you regard non-standard varieties of English?
- M: It is a lesson I'm gonna pick up in the third term. I don't know how to approach it because I don't know what kind of varieties they have been exposed to, but I know . . . mhm . . . it's not going to be an easy approach.
- K: Do you condone the use of township lingo for example in an English lesson?
- M: Well, I haven't heard it yet, but I would accept it but as long as it is not part of any formal presentation or discussion you know, or any formal . . . How shall I put it? Again if it were a general discussion and it came out then it's okay . . .
- K: But it would be unacceptable when?
- M: If they have to do oral unless it has to do with the topic. During oral presentation I would allow it to a certain extent because I'm here to teach them standard English. For example, . . . the kind of English which they hear on T. V. , I would allow it but not in a formal context like a composition or a dialogue or whatever. I would explain to them what is appropriate and what is not, make them understand when to use it, not that it is wrong.
- K: How do you regard reduction - communication strategies. I'm thinking here of attempts to do away with a communication problem - compensation for breakdown in communication. Would you encourage them to use such strategies?

M: I'm not sure I understand what . . . I understand the situation, when they cannot express themselves the way I want them to, that they would employ other strategies to . . . but I can't think of any examples right now.

K: If for example a student doesn't know what to call a duster but explains to you "I want what you normally use to clean the board"

M: 'Ah! Okay, a duster!' that would be my response, and then if the word is foreign to them I would write it on the board so that they can see the spelling, but if it's something they have forgotten if for a moment, I accept that they have just forgotten it but if it's new to them, a new concept I explain it, perhaps even the origin. It's something I do very often. If I give them a term I try to do the origin so that they understand where it comes from or that if there are any other related words then they know they have a broader field than just having learnt just one word, they have learnt a family of words.

K: This means you'd accept reduction communication strategies.

M: Yes, of course as long as they don't explain to me in Xhosa.

K: How frequently do you think oral errors should be dealt with during classroom interaction? I'm aware I've asked this question before in another form.

M: I don't think it should hamper the actual teaching. I mean it's something I make a mental note of all the time but it's not something that I draw the class' attention to all the time because it's going to bog down teaching, it's going to make the teaching boring to them because if they are going to be aware of the fact that every word that they speak I'm listening to, and gonna pick up and use against them, I'm going to end the communication. I try not to interfere as little . . . as possible and there are many errors which I think are not so serious - even I make mistakes when I'm speaking out there and it's not so serious. I wouldn't concentrate on the actual mistake, but more on what causes the mistake, a

misunderstanding perhaps of a term or concept. I would explain that to them. But I wouldn't insist that 'next time you don't speak that way anymore'.

K: You'd explain first so that they can re-formulate their argument.

M: Yes, and so that they can understand why they are saying whatever it is they are saying wrongly and I make a mental note because I know that in their written work it will come up and I can perhaps deal with it.

K: How desirable is it to correct discourse errors? I'm thinking here of pupils who speak out of turn, those who don't know much about floor - holding strategies, don't know when to butt in and how long to wait. I mean this is very difficult for us second language speakers. How do you deal with that?

M: You've seen the dynamics in my classroom, you've seen how chaotic it appears sometimes - you've seen people shouting from all sides. It's very difficult.

K: not waiting for their turns.

M: It's very difficult, especially in this class because there's a strong contingent of boys with very deep voices, right and they actually dominate the class. I don't shut anyone up unless they are making silly comments then I would shut them up.

K: that I've noticed.

M: That makes it look chaotic. When they make silly comments I would shut them up in a very polite way. Otherwise I would let them speak unless I see it disturbs someone, like the girls for example, then I would stop them if I see it becomes serious. But, otherwise I either ignore it or try to concentrate on those who hardly ever speak in class, I concentrate on them because I know the others are just making a lot of noise, so I concentrate on those that are normally quiet because I

know they are using that as a defence. If everyone shouts I can shout in too without exposing myself and then I would actually concentrate on them but I don't I try not to steer them into holding back. When I came here for an interview I told the management that the school is very quiet, I am not a quiet teacher because language you can't do that, you have to allow them to be vociferous, to sort of whatever comes I tell them, you can speak about anything in my class, as long as it is in English. Okay, it's not very successful here but

K: You making them feel they can say whatever they feel like talking about.

M: Yes, as long as it is English because essentially I'm teaching communication.

K: what about content errors? The actual answer is inappropriate, incorrect, but the expression is good.

M: Again I'm very polite. I'd say "yes that's an interesting way of looking at it". If it offers an alternative, even if it's wrong I follow the train of thought you know, I'd allow let the class follow me on that train of thought, we get to a cul-de-sac, then I'd say no, it does not work let's stand back and consider. .

K: and consider other alternatives.

M: Yes, yes, but if it's one word answers which is wrong then I as I said before I'd say 'No no, that's not right, " and then I'd go to someone else. I'd let them reconsider their answer first then go to someone else.

K: What factors would you say you'd have to take into account if and when you have to correct during classroom interaction?

M: When a pupil gives me a wrong answer to something that I think is fairly simple, I think first of what about the student from their written work, what kind of errors

they normally make especially from their essays, what understanding they have, what skills they have in expressing themselves in English and what level of intellectual maturity they have, so . . .

K: plus their level of proficiency.

M: Yes, so if a weaker student were to give me a wrong answer I would be more informative and more guiding in my answer in my response. But if someone like Mawande gives me a wrong answer I'd chop him off like that because I don't expect that from him - I know what he's lazy, not thinking .

K: So for the more confident student your approach would be different.

M: Yes, definitely, because I know they can deal with criticism - because some of them fight back, like Mawande, he would argue and I like that because then I know I can have a verbal dispute here. He is confident enough to do that, but for the quiet ones I would actually guide them towards . . . because I know what's going on in their minds, I can see them sitting grappling with this because I know from their written work how they are going through the process of getting to that answer. I would not just say "That's wrong", and leave them dangling or just leave them within that cul-de-sac and not lead them out again.

K: Now the last question, Marc, if you were teaching L1 pupils would your correction policy differ from what you've outlined above?

M: Yes, definitely I wouldn't be such a polite teacher. Let's see, when I was teaching first language I was much more open, there was much less structure to my lessons, I would wander off the point more often because essentially I wasn't dealing with language but with understanding because in first language, as I said there are certain minimums that I expect and if they're not up to that, then either they have no business being in an L1 class or they have a lot of catching up to do, for which there is no place within the formal classroom situation . . . context.

This is my own opinion , so my corrections are then more abrupt and less informative and less guiding, it's something that I'd say "no no, you'd better just go and think about it, because as an L1 speaker you're supposed to know that". We have other things to deal with here especially in the matric level. I try to go beyond the syllabus. The syllabus has its goals, I finish that within the first term - that done, I'm not going to get back to that, I'm going to do my thing teaching them critical reading, thinking critically.

K: Thanks a lot, Marc.

End of interview.

After the interview (unrecorded personal conversation with the teacher)

K: What in your opinion should be done with fossilised learner errors which crop up during classroom interaction?

M: I usually construct a worksheet and offer an explanation on why this type of error occurs and design more follow-up examples involving the same structure. The problem structure(s) are set in a cycle test to find out whether they have mastered the structures.

APPENDIX 8 - QUESTIONNAIR RESPONSES

[*The following text is unedited]

1. How does your English teacher usually respond to oral errors that you make when expressing yourself in English?
 - a) I haven't done any mistakes yet 'cause I don't usually talk in class to other students. He doesn't make them feel embarrassed. He discusses the problem with the students and also corrects that person.
 - b) He rephrases the question for me so that I can notify my mistake.
 - c) He sometimes corrects them in front of the class so that no one can't make the same mistake again.
 - d) He corrects me when I have said something the wrong way. He provides me with the correct answer.
 - e) He usually discusses the problem in class so that if other students have the same problem they are made aware of it.
 - f) He usually responds by correcting your error immediately or sometimes he just says what you wanted to say in a correct way.
 - g) He does not correct us while we are talking, instead he prepares a lesson teaching us about the mistakes we usually make in class, but sometimes if the mistake is bad then he corrects it in class.
 - h) He corrects the sentence or word and gives me a chance to say it the correct way.
 - I) He corrects me when I say something wrong.
 - j) He corrects my errors when I say something wrong.
 - k) He corrects them, whether you are mistaken grammatically or just generally.
 - l) He usually corrects oral errors.
 - m) He responds to oral errors by correcting me and tells me the right way.
 - n) He corrects them on the spot but sometimes he ignores oral errors.
 - o) He usually first listens to what I say, then he corrects my errors.
 - p) He hasn't corrected me yet. He usually tells them the right thing to say.

2. Would you like your teacher to correct

- a) all of your spoken errors
- b) some of your spoken errors
- c) none of your spoken errors

a) 2a

b) 2a

c) 2b

d) 2a

e) 2b

f) 2a

g) 2a

h) 2a

I) 2a

j) 2b

k) 2a

l) 2a

m) 2a

n) 2a

o) 2a

p) 2b

3. Explain why you have chosen a, b, or c in no. 2 above.

- a) I want to know where I've gone wrong so that I can improve my English.
- b) To increase my knowledge of English
- c) If you are not corrected then you will keep on making the same mistakes and no one will correct you.
- d) I chose A because when my errors are corrected I will not repeat them again and at least I know how to speak English the right way.
- e) I have chosen B because it is only a few mistakes that I make in speaking the English language.

- f) It is wise to accept the correction because that actually helps in improving your English. It helps me a lot because the more I'm corrected the more I'm learning and improving my English.
- g) I've chosen A. because if he corrects all my mistakes in English that will help me to speak it better and I will not make the same mistake again.
- h) To improve my way of speaking, if I'm not corrected all errors then the uncorrected error will never be noticed.
- i) I want him to correct all my errors so that I can be able to communicate with Europeans or any other tribe . I would also like to know English better because it is a communicating language.
- j) I have chosen B because I don't like to be always corrected, sometimes I would like to see the mistake I've done and correct it myself.
- k) You need to be corrected when you are wrong and if he doesn't correct you how will you know if you're right or wrong?
- l) Because if he corrects all the errors that I make in class chances of making the same errors are limited.
- m) I've chosen A because I know that English is not my first language so correcting me makes me learn better.
- n) I think it is the best way to learn if the error is corrected now the chances of making that same error again are slim.
- o) I chose A. because I want to know when I have made a mistake so that I do not do it again.
- p) I want him to correct some of the ones which are serious, but I want to be able to correct myself when making errors.

4. Which methods of correction do you prefer, and why?

- a) He can use any method he prefers if it's not embarrassing me. I think talking to me alone is better. He can correct a few while I'm talking.
- b) To increase my knowledge of English.
- c) Corrected in class in front of other students so that they also don't make the same mistakes in the future.

- d) By telling me in front of other students. He is also going to those who didn't know the right answer, at least they will benefit from that. I prefer that he should tell me immediately like when I say something in the wrong way he should tell me whether it is in front of other pupils so that I may know that I'm wrong.
- e) I like the method that my teacher is using because he discusses my problems with me.
- f) I prefer a teacher to call me and tell me that I've made an error there and then and then correct me. I really appreciate it that way.
- g) I prefer to be corrected whilst I make the mistake because I know I will not make the same mistake again because I will be afraid that I will be embarrassed again.
- h) The teacher should correct all of my spoken errors so that I know about them and take notice of them.
- I) I prefer him to correct me immediately I make an error so that next time I won't make it again. If it's a composition error I would like him to correct me and write the right thing I should have written.
- j) I prefer that he tells me where I'm wrong sometimes and leave me when I'm doing something like oral work because after he has corrected me maybe I can lose my attention and stop concentrating on what I was saying.
- k) I prefer correction of all errors because you get to have more knowledge and self awareness of correction methods.
- l) To be corrected in a nice manner, to be shown where I've made a mistake, not to be made a joke out of my mistake.
- m) Correcting every error that I make.
- n) I believe the teacher shouldn't leave any errors uncorrected. The teacher should explain clearly what the right answer is and how one arrives at the right answer.
- o) I like it when he tells me where I've gone wrong and why. After that he should tell me the correct answer.
- p) I prefer that he should tell me how a word is said, I would like him to tell me the right way of saying things.

5. Would you say that your teacher's methods of correction often

- a) confuse
- b) intimidate
- c) enlighten you

- a) enlighten
- b) confuse , enlighten
- c) confuse , enlighten
- d) confuse , enlighten
- e) enlighten
- f) confuse , enlighten
- g) intimidate , enlighten
- h) intimidate
- I) enlighten
- j) enlighten
- k) intimidate , enlighten
- l) enlighten
- m) intimidate , enlighten
- n) confuse , enlighten
- o) enlighten
- p) intimidate, enlighten

6. Whose correction do you prefer? Your teacher's or your fellow classmates? Explain your choice.

- a) I prefer my teacher's. He knows how to correct a student better than classmates.
- b) Students are silly, they may say the wrong thing intentionally.
- c) The teacher's, because he is educated and knows what he is saying and the classmates are just as poor in the language as I am.
- d) I prefer a teacher's , correction because he knows what is really right. The teacher always wants what's best for you.
- e) I prefer my teacher's correction because it is less embarrassing.

- f) My teacher's correction is the one I can regard as right because he is qualified for doing so. The ones that my classmates correct are done in order to embarrass me.
- g) My teacher's, because if my classmates correct me I will not listen to them. I will just think they think better of themselves and I will not listen to the correction.
- h) I prefer my teacher's. The other students can make fun of you but, I wouldn't mind if they do it correctly.
- I) I prefer my teacher's correction because he was chosen to teach me, not my classmates because they are also here to learn like me.
- j) My teacher's, because he's the one who knows and he will be doing this job. The student is also here to learn, not to be a teacher. Another thing, the student may know something better but they tend to correct the person in a rude way.
- k) The teacher's correction is the best because I believe that he knows more than my classmates and is even more qualified than them.
- l) My teacher's, because a teacher's knowledge is obviously beyond the student's knowledge.
- m) My teacher's, because when corrected by another student you feel small. As a student you should know the same amount of English, so I see no reason for a student to correct you.
- n) I prefer my teacher's method of correction because I trust that he knows better. I would only ask my classmates to explain what was said if I didn't quite understand.
- o) I prefer my teacher's, because he knows better and because my classmates are doing English Second Language.
- p) My teacher's. My classmates would laugh and make fun of me. They don't know that we make mistakes.

7. Do you think you benefit from having your spoken errors corrected in class? Explain fully.

- a) Yes I benefit but, I prefer to be corrected alone.
- b) Yes I will because it is good for the sake of my vocabulary and to be fluent in English.

- c) Yes, because even in English there is a saying which goes "Once beaten twice shy, "so if you are corrected you don't always make the same mistakes. You just improve your performance.
- d) Yes I do. When I'm corrected I'm told the right thing. I'm not only told that what I'm saying or what I've said is wrong. I'm also told how to say it the right way.
- e) Yes, because another pupil or other pupils may have the same problem so it would be of great importance that we are corrected.
- f) Yes, I prefer having all my spoken errors corrected.
- g) Yes, I benefit a lot because if I'm corrected every mistake I make in class then my English can improve because I will no more make the same mistakes.
- h) Yes, you will be able to improve your way of speaking English. If I'm corrected I always make sure I don't repeat the same mistake again.
- I) I don't think I benefit from being corrected in class. I think he should call me and tell me where I made a mistake because if he corrects me in the class they will just laugh at me.
- j) I benefit from having them by the teacher not the whole of the class because when you make an error they have a tendency of thinking they know better than you whereas, they just had an opportunity of private schools at an early age.
- k) Yes, because I get to understand and have a clear understanding of the other language, and speak it well after my corrected errors.
- l) Yes, because I also benefit from other students that corrected in class.
- m) Yes, because you learn from your mistakes.
- n) I think I benefit because I end up not making the same errors again.
- o) Yes I do, because it improves my English and I do not make the same errors again.
- p) Yes, because someone else would have made the same mistake and he/she also benefits. It helps also because I also learn not to make many errors when speaking with people outside the school.