

Error Types and Feedback of NNS-NNS Interactions

On-Soon Lee

Korea University

This paper presents a study of error types and learners' feedbacks in the NNS-NNS interaction. Also, the study shows relationship of error types and feedback types. The database is drawn from transcripts of dyadic conversation between Korean and Japanese students on the KWCCDLP (Korea University Waseda University Cross-Cultural Distance Learning Project). It is coded error types as discourse error, factual error, word choice errors, syntactic errors, or omissions (Chun et al, 1982) and feedback types as elicitation, metalinguistic clues, clarification requests, repetition of errors, recasts, or explicit correction (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). Findings indicate the frequency of error types and feedback types, and that different error types invite different feedback types. Overall, the study proves the interaction between L2 learners as NNS is helpful for the language learning.

1. The Purpose of the Research

In the second language acquisition researches, the investigations of interaction have focused on corrective feedback over the negotiation of meaning on the conversation between teachers and students. The research will present the relationship between types of errors and types of feedback on the conversation of L2 learners as non-native speakers. This study also will prove that the interaction between L2 learners as non-native speakers is helpful for the second acquisition.

2. Background Studies

Recent researchers have focused on the errors and feedback for enhancing English learners' language skills, especially, grammar features on the interaction between teachers and students. There are some researches related to errors and feedback. Under these researches are based on

face to face to interactions and the interaction between teachers and students about correcting errors.

In 1977, Chaudron, researched which strategies were successful in correcting different types of errors. Chun (1982), also, investigated the types and frequencies of the errors which NSs of English corrected during conversations with their friends who were learning English as second language. The discussion is that the significance of these types of error correction for the second language classroom. These studies showed error correction in NS-NNS discourse.

In 1997, Lyster and Ranta researched the corrective feedback and learner uptake in four immersion classrooms. They classified the types of feedback as explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, and elicitation. Depending on what kinds of feedback, learners could response such different corrections as repetition, incorporation, self-repair, and peer-repair. The findings indicate the frequency and distribution of different types of learner uptake following each feedback types.

Also, in 1998, Lyster presented that the relationship among error types, feedback types, and immediate learner repair in 4 French immersion classrooms at the elementary level. The findings indicate that lexical error favoured the negotiation of form; grammatical and phonological error invited recast, but with differential effect in terms of learner repair. Two previous studies presented what types of feedback is effective for learners to perceive their errors on the interaction, and then how learners response each feedback. Based on these papers, teachers can get the way to give feedback students' errors.

In contrast, some researches showed the importance of learners' perception about feedback. One article of Mackey, Gass, and McDonough (2000) showed learners' perception about feedback provided to them through task-based interaction. Learners received feedback focused on a range of morphosyntactic, lexical, and phonological forms.

Mackey, Oliver, and Leeman (2003) studied that the effects of interlocutor types on the provision and incorporation of feedback in task-based interaction. Findings indicate that significant differences for amount, nature, and response to feedback according to dyad types. Therefore, students' perception for teachers' feedback is a very significant factor on language learning.

These studies showed how teachers gave students feedback in making errors in the classroom. On the other hand, this paper present how students give feedback students on the interaction between learners and learners as NNSs. This paper generated the following research questions.

3. Research Questions

- 1) What types of errors and what types of feedbacks do L2 learners usually make on the interaction with L2 learners?
- 2) What types of errors do lead what types of feedbacks on the interaction between L2 learners?
- 3) How are the distribution of L2 learners' uptake (the response of the feedback) responded by corrective feedback?

4 Method

4.1. Subjects

Subjects are Korean and Japanese college students joined in the class, "Global English." Korean and Japanese students had a interaction once a week for 6 weeks from November, 2003 to December, 2003. Interaction type is the on-line chatting through the KWCCDLP, and the the data of on-line chatting are recorded. The data is based on KWCCDLP (Korea-Waseda Cross-Cultural Distance Learning Project) transcripts.. The transcription is based on 6 pairs, Korean and Japanese college students of NNSs participated in KWCCDLP.

4.2 Data Analysis

From the transcription of chatting data, KWCCDL, it is analyzed by the types of feedback and the types of errors. We investigated the relationship between types of feedbacks and the types of feedbacks. The examples of types of errors are the following.

4.2.1. the types of errors revised errors type of Chun et al. (1982)

- 1) Discourse errors : Errors beyond the sentence level, for example, inappropriate refusal and incorrect topic

Example 1

NNS: and how do you feel the-uh-Taiwan New Year?

NS: you didn't let me finish my question.

- 2) Factual errors: Errors made by learners concerning the factual knowledge or truth value of an utterance.

Example 2

NS: we have five people. I'm the only girl, I'm the oldest=

NNS:=oh, you're the oldest=

NS:=and two-I have two yeauger borthers

NNS: I see, so the other two will be sisters

NS: no

NNS: on, including your parents, on I see

NS: only three kids

3) Word errors: incorrect choice or addition of words and wrong spelling

Example 3

NNS: DID somebody give you money-uh-put in the re bud=

NS:=red packet

NNS: yeah, red packet

4) Syntactic errors : the common errors of syntax, for example, tense, word order, agreement, and so on.

Example 4

NNS: and four angle is same

NS:four angles

NNS: angles are same

We don't check the phonological errors because of the transcription of chatting data.

4.2.2. the types of feedback revised feedback types of Lyster and Ranta (1997)

- 1) *Explicit correction* refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. (e.g. "Oh, you mean," " You should say").
- 2) *Recasts* involve reformulation of all or part of the utterance, minus the errors
- 3) *Elicitation*: phrases and a repetition of error such as " Pardon me" and "What do you mean by X?"
- 4) *Repetition*: repeating ill-form or good form

5. Result and Discussion

5.1.Korean and Japanese college students' errors

The study is classified four errors as discourse errors, factual error, word errors, and syntactic errors. On the Table 1, The most of frequency of errors is word errors (69%), and syntactic

errors is 18%, factual errors is 9%, and discourse errors is 4%

Table 1. The Frequency of Learners' errors

Errors types	Frequency (%)
Discourse errors	4%
Factual errors	9%
Word errors	69%
Syntactic errors	18%

5.2. Korean and Japanese students' correction to errors

Learners usually don't make a correction without interrupting their interactions. Figure 1 shows that if there are factual errors, students made a correction more frequent than other errors. The reason is that factual errors make an interruption to their communication.




Figure 1. Distribution of Errors and Corrections

5.3. Korean and Japanese students' feedback to errors

On the interaction between students, they don't usually give the feedback to their partners' errors. However, they give a few feedbacks to errors as factual errors and word errors. Table 3. shows that factual errors invited clarification requests, and word errors invited repetition as a feedback to their partners' errors. As the table 3 showed, discourse errors and syntactic errors don't invite the feedback. Even though there are corrections to errors on Figure 1, the correction of errors seems to be a self-correction on the interaction without getting the sign of feedback.

Table 3.the frequency of feedback to each errors

	Discourse errors	Factual errors	Word errors	Syntactic errors
Explicit correction	0	0	0	0
Recast	0	7%	15%	0
Clarification requests	0	75%	4%	0
Repetition	0	18%	81%	0

** It isn't mentioned the number of each of errors and the number of each of feedback.*

5.4. Korean and Japanese students' response to the feedback

Figure 2. Distribution of feedback and response




Figure2 shows the distribution of feedback to errors, students' repair to feedback. The percentage of feedback to errors is 28%, and the percentage of repair to feedback is 12%. As a result, students give half of partners' error the feedback, and also students can perceive the half of partners' feedback. According to Figure2, students can repair to partners' feedback. Of course, there are some not-repairs to errors even though students give the feedback to partners' errors.

6. Conclusion

These are findings for this study unlike previous studies based on the classroom between teachers and students. We First of all, EFL learners usually make word errors, factual errors, syntactic errors, and discourse errors in order in the NNS-NNS interaction as learners. Also, EFL learners give their partners such feedback as repetition (57%), clarification requests (31%), recasts (9%), and explicit corrections (3%). They are using repetition as feedback, and then students can perceive their errors while interacting with their partners. This paper gives other research why students use the repetition as a feedback to their partners frequently.

Secondly, according to the types of errors, factual errors usually invite clarification request, and word errors usually invite repetition. For the pedagogical implication, the findings show that teachers notify students different strategies about the feedback, and then teachers should teach students various types of feedback.

The third, the percentage of corrections on the interaction of NNSs (27%) means that EFL learners usually do self-repair (self-correction). The findings suggested that the self-correction is a significant factor for language learning. Therefore, teachers should consider the importance of peer-repair as a training students' self-correction.

Finally, we can think about the further research related to these findings such as why students frequently don't give the feedback to their partners.

References

- Ayoun, D. (2001). The role of negative and positive feedback in the second language acquisition of the passé composé and imparfait. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 226-243.
- August, D. (1987). Effects of peer tutoring on the second language acquisition of Mexican American children in elementary school. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 717-736.
- Basturkmen, H., Ellis, R., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51, 281-318.
- Branden, K. V. (1997). Effects of negotiation on language learners' output. *Language Learning*, 47, 589-636.
- Iwashita, N. (2003). Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects on L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 25, 1-36.
- Chun, A. E., Day, R. R., Chenoweth, N.A., & Luppescue, S. (1982). Errors, interaction, and corrections: A study of native-nonnative conversation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 537-547.
- Ellis, R. & He, X. (1999). The roles of modified input and output in the incidental acquisition of word meanings. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 285-301.
- Gass, S., Mackey, A., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 22, 471-497.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M.H. (1991) *An interaction to second language acquisition research*. London: Longman.
- Leeman, J., Mackey, A., & Oliver, R. (2003). Interactional input and the incorporation of feedback: An exploration of NS-NNS and NNS-NNS adult and child dyads. *Language Learning* 53, 35-66.
- Lyster, R. (1994). Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.
- Lyster, R. (1998). Negotiation of form, recasts, and explicit correction in relation to error types and learners repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48, 183-218.
- Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development: An empirical study of question formation in ESL. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21, 557-587.
- Mackey, A. & Oliver, R. (2003). Interactional context and feedback in child ESL classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87, 519-533.
- Macoarty, M. & Zhu, W. (1997). Triangulation in classroom research: A study of peer revision. *Language Learning*, 47, 1-43.
- Morgan-Short, K. & Sanz, C. Positive evidence versus explicit rule presentation and explicit

- negative feedback: A computer-assisted study. *Language Learning*, 54, 35-78.
- Morris, F. & Tarone, E. (2003). Impact of classroom dynamics on effectiveness of recasts in second language acquisition. *Language Learning*, 53, 325-368.
- Muranoi, H. (2000). Focus on form through interaction enhancement: Intergrating formal instruction into a communicative task in EFL classrooms. *Language Learning*, 50, 617-673.
- Nicholas, H., Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (2001). Recasts as feedback to language learners. *Language Learning*, 51, 719-758.
- Oliver, R. (2000). Age differences in negotiation and feedback in classroom and pairwork. *Language Learning* 50, 119-151.
- Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J., (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 59-84.
- Park, K. J., Nakano, M., & Lee, H.K. (2003). *Cross-cultural distance learning and language acquisition*. Seoul: Hankook Publishing Co.
- Storch, N. (2002). Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52, 119-158.