

1981

A Personal Guideline for the Use of Correction in the Classroom

Carol Ann Wilson

School for International Training

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection

 Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), and the [Linguistics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wilson, Carol Ann, "A Personal Guideline for the Use of Correction in the Classroom" (1981). *MA TESOL Collection*. 317.
https://digitalcollections.sit.edu/ipp_collection/317

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the SIT Graduate Institute at SIT Digital Collections. It has been accepted for inclusion in MA TESOL Collection by an authorized administrator of SIT Digital Collections. For more information, please contact digitalcollections@sit.edu.

A PERSONAL GUIDELINE FOR THE USE OF CORRECTION IN THE ESL CLASSROOM

by

CAROL ANN WILSON
B.A. University of Oregon 1979

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Master of Arts in teaching degree at the School
For International Training, Brattleboro, Vermont.

July 1981



This Project by Carol Ann Wilson is accepted in its present form.

Date 19 August 1981

Principal Advisor Patrick Moran

Patrick Moran

Project Reader/Advisor: Eugene H. Bressler

Eugene Bressler



Correction is an important aspect of teaching, one that ESL teachers face daily. At issue is the ability to match the teacher's goals or priorities with what is supposed to be taught or learned, and the specific teaching-learning environment.

The study presents my original definition of correction, the beginning reference point for this work, which is eventually compared to a new definition of correction. The evolution of the new definition is based upon documentation and analysis of five case studies and the systematic generation and development of a model for correction use.

The model is adaptable for use by any teacher, but is necessarily different depending upon that teacher's goals and priorities. The model is flexible and therefore able to accommodate individual teaching-learning environments as well as any changes in personal priorities and goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION I	3
SECTION II	6
SECTION III	7
SECTION IV	15
SECTION V	19
SECTION VI	27

INTRODUCTION

Development of an approach to teaching is a personal process that varies according to the goals of each teacher. This means that clarification of specific aspects of teaching is an individual task. My efforts to clarify one aspect of teaching, the use of oral correction in the ESL classroom, reflect these assumptions. The result of those efforts, represented in this paper, is a personal guideline for the use of oral correction. It outlines a procedure for correction use based on my experience and my beliefs, which are not necessarily shared by any other teacher. The guideline is, therefore, a statement of my position with regards to correction at this time, rather than a prescriptive outline for other teachers, or even a final clarification for me.

Although this guideline is highly personal, the general process involved in its application can be adapted for use by other teachers. The contents may be, therefore, of use to any teacher interested in correction and the issues that surround it.

Material for this study was gathered in four ways:

1. My observations of my own work kept in a teaching journal.
2. My observations of other teachers' work.
3. Other teachers' observations of my work.
4. Student feedback.

This paper is organized into seven sections as follows:

SECTION I explains my interests in correction and describes some

general correction problems I've encountered.

SECTION II prescribes a working definition of correction, based upon prior experiences. It is significant to mention that formulating this definition was the starting point for my examination of correction use.

SECTION III documents an analysis of correction based upon five case studies from my two student teaching internships. The first internship took place in Toluca, Mexico, where I taught two classes of beginning-level junior high students, and two classes of beginning-level adults. The second internship took place in Eugene, Oregon, where I taught all levels of students at a community college ESL program. Each situation is described along with my use of correction. This description is followed by an analysis of each situation.

SECTION IV describes a dynamic model for correction, developed in response to issues and/or situations I've encountered. The model is based upon the existence of teaching priorities. From this model and these priorities I will also describe a new definition of correction.

SECTION V re-examines the previous five case studies in light of the correction model and personal teaching priorities. This section also indicates how the new correction definition applies in each case.

SECTION VI concludes the study with a comparison of the original definition and the new definition of correction then discusses the process I have undergone in order to produce this guideline.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND JUSTIFICATION FOR THIS STUDY

The need and desire to study correction, in terms of its use in oral production, became obvious early in my first student teaching internship. As was the case in many areas of my teaching, I found myself abruptly faced with issues related to correction that could not be dealt with by intellectual notions alone. Because my attention during the months of academic preparation before the internship were spent on larger teaching issues--methodology, techniques, sequencing--I had given little thought to correction as anything more than telling a student when a mistake was made, then offering the right answer in its place. My sense of what correction involved, or at least what it could involve, was a one-dimensional intellectual concept based only on improved assumptions and almost no experience.

What little I had thought about correction was pitted against what was actually happening in my classes. My vaguely conceived notions of making mistakes right simply did not provide me with a useful, workable approach to this aspect of teaching. I was continually faced with situations in which a student made a mistake that it seemed better not to correct. The reasons for my inclination to overlook mistakes varied. Sometimes it was because I was more interested in the fact that the student was actually producing orally or communicating a particular idea rather than the fact that he/she made some sort of error in the process. In other situations the student may have made a mistake in an area that we had not yet studied, thus making correction difficult and seemingly

unwarranted. Yet, I was plagued by a certain guilt for allowing students to produce incorrect forms.

Deciding when and when not to correct became a difficult process and one that I did not approach with consistency. I corrected without rhyme or reason in a scared-rabbit fashion that made my problems worse.

Coupled with my indecision over when and when not to correct was my indecision over who should do the correcting when I did decide correcting was necessary. Having given this issue almost no thought beforehand, I started out doing all the correcting myself. While I recognized this approach was certainly one I could continue with easily enough, I also recognized my own discomfort with such a singular method. On one hand I was working to develop a teaching approach that was sensitive to student needs and eclectic in nature, while on the other hand I used correction rigidly without much variation. In an effort to repair the situation I ran the gamut of who actually does the correcting. I tried having students self-correct, having one student correct another and having a group of students correct one student. The effectiveness of these methods of correction varied. Sometimes one method worked and sometimes it didn't. This experimental period developed my awareness of correction possibilities and some of the ways to handle them. But, I did little in this period that helped me to maintain any consistency. When one method of correction worked, I was never exactly sure why, and was therefore not always able to repeat the success in a similar situation.

Because I had no ground rules for correction, my use of it throughout the first internship was entirely inconsistent in two senses. It was inconsistent in terms of use on a day-to-day basis and it was

inconsistent with my personal teaching approach (even though that too was in developmental stages).

However, these inconsistencies were less important than the fact that my correction methods usually did not work. It was obvious that I could not ignore correction or treat it in such a haphazard fashion if I wanted a teaching approach that was effective and parallel to my beliefs about teaching.

This paper is, then, a direct result of these observations on my use of correction in the ESL classroom. It also represents an attempt to arrive at a personal definition of correction use.

SECTION II: MY ORIGINAL DEFINITION OF CORRECTION

Before conducting this study, I wrote a personal definition of correction based on previous teaching experience and observations in the ESL classroom. That definition was:

Correction is making what is wrong right. It assumes that since there is an ideal model for speaking English, there is the need to pinpoint mistakes and provide the appropriate solutions.

This definition was the starting point for an analysis of correction use and for the eventual creation of a personal correction guideline. The definition is a beginning reference for the development of my work in correction. Aspects of this definition were expanded as a result of my look at correction use. The following case studies help to illustrate why the definition expanded.

SECTION III: CASE STUDIES

The following case studies, taken from both my student teaching internships, describe situations exemplary of my first correction problems. Each case study addresses a different problem--when to correct and when not to; when the teacher should correct; when students should self-correct, and when they should correct one another. Although each case study describes a specific instance, they should all be viewed as representative of many similar situations.

Case Study #1

Description

My night class in Mexico, a group of nine beginning-level adults, had spent several hours working with different aspects of a household theme. We had practiced related vocabulary such as rooms, things found in the rooms, and actions performed in the rooms, many times in many different ways. The students would, for instance, combine vocabulary to produce sentences like "I'm baking a cake in the kitchen," or "I'm watching television in the living room." As in many of my lessons, I had worked a great deal on pronunciation, stress, and intonation of the household vocabulary within the context of whatever lesson was at hand. Most of the students could produce the material we had covered with accuracy in these areas.

At one point, I introduced the future tense which was entirely new

for them. This was the first time I had introduced a new grammatical structure within the household theme. In their efforts to learn and practice this tense, they paid less attention to the vocabulary already studied. Their resulting pronunciation was, therefore, not nearly as accurate as it had been. For instance, before introduction of the future tense, the students had worked on the pronunciation of two particularly difficult words--"refrigerator" and "bathroom." Before work with these words the students said "refrigter" and "batroom." After pronunciation work they were able to articulate all five syllables in "refrigerator" and place the stress on the second syllable as well as to articulate the "th" sound in "bathroom." However, they reverted to their former pronunciation errors with introduction of the future tense.

My view of correction at that time was basically to right the wrong. In spite of an inclination to ignore their mistakes on this occasion, I continued to correct their pronunciation, stress, and intonation.

Analysis

The result of my choice to correct, as my supervising teacher who observed the class pointed out, was that my correction of material which the students were not directly focused on at the moment interfered with their acquisition of new material. The students were unable to focus properly on the new material because I forced them to pay too much attention to an area they were already practiced in. Their ability to communicate their ideas using the new form was hindered.

Case Study #2

Description

The class consisted of ten students. With the exception of two, all students were at the beginning level with little or no previous study in English. One of the two students who had studied English before was well into the intermediate level, and way beyond the others in the class. This experience gap alone would probably not have presented any major problems in the class if there had not been a complicated hierarchy of combined sex and job roles that created interpersonal conflicts.

All members of the class worked at the very building in which we met to study, the local State Teachers' Union in Toluca, Mexico. Four of the ten students were male. The six female students were the secretaries working under the four male members of the class, who were teachers and officials in the Union. The two male students who had studied English before were the employers of the other students. Lauro, the intermediate-level student who was more advanced than the rest, was the head of the Union and therefore the boss of all students in the class.

Because Lauro was more advanced, he was often familiar with the material I was teaching the rest of the class. He therefore often took it upon himself to provide a correct answer or point out a mistake to the other students. The students he corrected, of course, were usually the female secretaries. At one point we were working with the conjugation of regular verbs such as "want" and "like." One woman in the class made

consistent errors when using the third person. Instead of saying "She likes," or "He wants," she would say "She like," and "He want." Lauro began to tell the woman the correct form as soon as she made the mistakes. She would repeat the correct form, but continued to make the same mistake later. Eventually she would look to Lauro before even attempting to produce the verbs. He would give her the correct form and she would repeat it but could never remember it alone.

In an attempt to encourage student-student correction and less dependence on me, I allowed Lauro to correct at his leisure. This wasn't the only form of correction used in the class but, as frequent references in my teaching journal indicate, it occurred on a regular basis.

Analysis

The result was often a shift from dependence on me for the right answer to dependence on Lauro for the right answer. Instead of trying to do it themselves, they began looking to their boss for a correct model. He intimidated the others with his knowledge to a point where they could not or would not work for themselves. This intimidation broke down the security of the classroom environment and therefore the security of the other students. It also interfered with the development of the others' ability to communicate independently.

Case Study #3

Description

Carlos was a very good student. He worked hard to practice what

he learned in class and was very enthusiastic about English. His one difficulty occurred with the introduction of entirely new material. He needed to repeat the new material over and over to really learn it. He always learned the material. But, he was usually slower than the others in recalling correct forms just after their introduction.

Because of this aspect of Carlo's learning process, he was often caught in situations similar to the following: We had spent several class hours working on the past tense of regular verbs. I then introduced a few irregular verbs and we began to work on them exclusively. Carlos used the past tense of the regular verbs we had studied almost perfectly but had his usual initial difficulty with the new irregular forms. He continued to use the irregular verbs like the regular verbs. "Go" became "goed," "run" became "runned," and so on. The other students were having less difficulty at this opening stage of irregulars.

At one point I called on Carlos for a sentence which he produced as "She goed to the window." Immediately two or three members of the class began saying "went, went!" Still in the experimental stages of using student-student correction I allowed the other students to correct Carlos. I felt that it was better for them to correct than for me to correct in order to encourage their independence as learners.

Analysis

Carlos did eventually produce "She went to the window." But, he did not do so because the other students actually had helped him. In fact, the confusion created by several people simply telling him one word kept him from producing the correct form much earlier. He was not

sure where his mistake was (let alone how to fix it) as his first attempts at producing the right answer indicate: "She goed to the window went." As Carlos later told me, he managed to correct himself only when he closed his eyes and blocked the inflow of information in order to concentrate on what he knew. In retrospect, it was obvious that I needed to manage class energy more efficiently so Carlos' security was not threatened and his communicative attempts were not hindered.

Case Study #4

Description

John was much more advanced than the other students but had not studied English in quite some time. The result was that he almost always knew the correct form or answer if he had made a mistake, but took a great deal of time jogging his memory to find what he needed once the mistake was pointed out.

In a typical instance we were working with prepositions of place. I had a pile of cuisinaire rods which I manipulated and asked questions about so that the students could practice the prepositions. For instance, I would ask "Where's the yellow rod?" The students would then answer "The yellow rod is on the green book." John, who had missed the previous class in which I had introduced the prepositions, had to rely on memory of his previous preposition study for our work. When I called on John during our oral practice he spent from thirty seconds to a full minute concentrating in order to come up with a short sentence with the correct preposition. He would often repeat the part he did know over and over, sometimes trying the wrong preposition, then another wrong preposition

and another until he could remember how to complete the sentence. While John was concentrating, the rest of the class was waiting along with me. In this instance and many others, they became restless and talked among themselves. I prevented them from correcting him in the interest of implementing self-correction, so their talk was usually not focused upon the class material.

Analysis

The other students talking made it more difficult for John to concentrate, thereby increasing the time it took for him to remember. My teaching journal made particular note of the fact that frustration and restlessness increased while attention and focus decreased for the entire class.

Case Study #5

Description

According to the curriculum at the community college where my second internship took place, the upper-level students I was teaching had been introduced to the present progressive tense early in their instruction at this particular program. This meant they had been exposed to the tense in all aspects of language study including conversation, listening comprehension, reading and writing. I had heard them use the tense correctly on many occasions in class so I assumed they understood its use. However, in a vocabulary exercise that required the use of this tense, my students were not using it to express only ongoing action. We were practicing new vocabulary by giving and taking different articles

they had not known the names for. Sometimes a student would say "I'm giving him a wine glass," while actually performing this action. This was, according to my expectations, the correct use of the form. But, just as often a student would perform the action and then say "I'm giving him a corkscrew," where the past tense "I gave him a corkscrew," would normally be. At first I attributed their mistakes to poor coordination of timing between physical action and oral production. As the lesson progressed, they also used the progressive tense where only the future tense was appropriate. It was obvious that they did not completely understand the use of the progressive tense.

Although I considered their use to be incorrect, I did nothing to correct the students. I wanted them to overcome any fear or shyness in trying to communicate through English. I feared my correction would intimidate them so I chose not to illuminate their mistakes.

Analysis

The effect of my choice at that time was that they continued to use the progressive tense incorrectly and their ability to communicate was hindered. Their confusion later multiplied along with a reduction of their security when I attempted to reintroduce the same material which they thought they already understood.

SECTION IV: THE CORRECTION MODEL

Having reviewed the case studies I will now describe and analyze the correction model on which my new approach to correction is based. This description focuses upon the establishment of personal teaching priorities which are the foundation of the model. Maintenance of these priorities is then discussed in terms of classroom variables and the choice of when to correct along with who should do the correcting. Delineation of my personal teaching priorities follows. My new definition of correction, which resulted from the development of this correction model, comprises the last part of this section.

My new approach to correction is not arbitrary. Its basis, the correction model, was developed after a systematic look at my own use, as well as the use by others, of correction in all its forms in the ESL classroom. In general, this model provides a process for maintaining personal teaching priorities by balancing classroom variables with choice of correction methodology.

The development of this model is in direct contrast to the original intent of this project. I assumed, in my proposal and even at the beginning of my work, that my final output would be a set of absolute rules telling exactly when and when not to correct and identifying the person best suited for the corrector's role under specific circumstances. I expected to be able to say "If a student makes a certain kind of mistake, I will correct it in this way... ."

What I discovered was that I could not operate by such rigid

regulations. Every correction situation is different and therefore demands an appropriate adjustment in methodology. My initial difficulties with correction stemmed from my attempts to use various forms of correction without first examining factors unique to the situation that directly effected the outcome of my attempt. Although I had no rules for correction use, I operated as if they existed and I simply needed to find them.

My examination of correction use reveals the inappropriateness of such rules for my own purposes. Yet, in view of my own personal experiences I believe a guideline for correction use would be helpful in developing effective and constructive teaching methods. Therefore, instead of proclaiming an absolute or static model, I am proposing a purposefully flexible approach predicated upon an assumption that the teacher has a set of teaching goals and priorities coming into the situation. This model consists of three parts. The first part, sizing up the situation, expects the teacher to perceive the variables which potentially affect the teaching-learning environment. These may include factors such as student age, maturity levels, relationships between the students (workers and bosses, men and women), nationalities of the students or level of class ability. The second part of the model, responding to the situation, requires the teacher to prescribe and implement a correction approach that enables the students to learn what is being taught without being hindered by the teaching-learning environment. This correction approach might be group or teacher correction, student-student correction, self-correction or no correction. The third part of the model, assessing or evaluating the correcting method,

encourages the teacher (and students) to consider the viability of the particular correction method employed in a given situation. Undoubtedly, this analysis would be an extremely useful resource when responding to future situations.

The following briefly summarizes several teaching priorities that I recognize as important at this moment in my teaching career:

- * To provide students with an accurate model for speaking English; to make sure they understand and are aware that there are, in the descriptive sense, correct ways to use English.
- * To facilitate communication in English in two senses:
 - The students' ability to communicate ideas, thoughts, feelings and desires to both native and non-native speakers.
 - The students' ability to understand the communicative attempts of others in English.
- * To focus and maintain the attention of all class members; to manage students' energy in the most efficient and productive way.
- * To maintain a secure classroom environment and trusting student-teacher relationship.

Finally, while evolving my proposed model for correction and thinking about my personal teaching priorities, I've redefined correction as follows:

Correction is part of the teaching and learning process. It involves making what is wrong right, and it assumes that there is

an ideal model for speaking English. But it also involves analysis of what is wrong and why, besides a determination of how the mistakes can be eliminated according to the situation without upsetting the teacher's priorities and goals. It is a teaching tool that tells the learner when something in the communicative process is amiss. It is also a learning tool that gives the student a chance to understand why something is wrong and how it can be improved.

Having generated a correction model, teaching priorities and a revised definition, I will now re-examine the five case studies.

SECTION V: RE-EXAMINATION OF THE CASE STUDIES

In this section I will first review each study, then evaluate the method of correction in terms of its effect. Next I will identify the variables that affect each situation. This is followed by a description of my new approach to the situation given the variables. I will then discuss how the new approach maintains my teaching priorities and reflects my new definition of correction.

Case Study #1

Description

In their efforts to learn and practice a new grammatical form, my students paid less attention to pronunciation of material they had already studied. Their resulting pronunciation was not nearly as accurate as it had been. I continued to correct their pronunciation of old material.

Analysis

The result of my choice to correct pronunciation was that a personal teaching priority--to facilitate communication--was violated. Their attempts to communicate using the new grammatical form were thwarted by my correction of material they were not directly focused on at the moment. Now I would choose not to correct their pronunciation mistakes given that:

- The students could pronounce the old material accurately.
- In order to acquire the new grammatical form they needed to shift concentration away from pronunciation.
- Their lag in pronunciation was apparently temporary.

Instead, I would work to help them acquire the new material. If their former pronunciation ability did not return after a greater degree of familiarity with the new material, I would return to pronunciation for more practice and review.

The change from correcting to not correcting is designed to encourage only acquisition of the new material, and therefore to encourage basic attempts to communicate with it. Remember, the cause of the mistakes wasn't that they did not know how or could not pronounce the vocabulary with accuracy, but that their energy was focused on the new material and they weren't attempting to pronounce with their former degree of perfection. They had shifted their concentration away from pronunciation temporarily in order to understand and use the material correctly. The change in correction methodology takes this into account, placing more value on their attempt to understand and communicate with the new grammatical point. My priority for the facilitation of communication is maintained with this methodology.

The application of my new definition of correction to this new approach to the situation is simple. An analysis of what was wrong and why led to the conclusion that the mistakes could not be eliminated without overlooking one of my teaching priorities. The students also already knew the difference between what was wrong and what was right. They had been presented with the correct model of pronunciation and were

able to assimilate it accurately, but weren't doing so in the interest of learning something new.

Case Study #2

Description

The most advanced student in the class, who also happened to be the employer of the other students, insisted on correcting the mistakes of his classmates. I allowed him the freedom to correct when he wanted to.

Analysis

My choice to allow this student the freedom to correct others resulted in a direct conflict with two of my teaching priorities. Lauro's continual correction introduced an element of intimidation and upset the secure class environment I strove to maintain. This element of intimidation also interfered with the communicative processes of the other students by stunting the growth of their independent communicative abilities. My priority to facilitate communication was, therefore, lost. I would now choose to keep Lauro from correcting the others while encouraging them to self-correct given that:

- Lauro was much more advanced than the others.
- A rigidly defined class hierarchy existed.

I would focus Lauro's attention on the same material as the other students, but at a different level. For instance, while the other students worked on the formation of WH questions, Lauro could work on the intonation

of questions.

This new approach is designed to eliminate the element of intimidation by giving Lauro, its source, a focus appropriate with his level of ability. Before, he knew the material being covered so well, in terms of grammar, that the only way he could work with it was to tell others when they were incorrect. With the new approach he is provided with work in an area he hasn't perfected. He therefore has no need to concentrate almost exclusively on the work of other students. The security of the classroom can therefore be maintained because Lauro's intimidating sort of correction is removed. The communicative abilities of all are then free to progress independently.

My new definition of correction is reflected in the fact that I changed my approach in order to accommodate formerly lost priorities. The new approach also works to really eliminate mistakes. The old approach merely eliminated mistakes at the moment they were made. It did not prevent them from occurring later. While both approaches tell students when something is wrong, only the new approach gives them the chance to understand their mistakes.

Case Study #3

Description

Several students offered the correct answer at the same time to a student who usually had difficulty with new material. I allowed the group correction to continue.

Analysis

Two of my teaching priorities were lost with regards to one student by allowing several students to repeat the answer at once. Having several students talk simultaneously to Carlos made him lose his security concerning the ability to use the new material. This lack of security interfered with his ability to communicate successfully because he could not recall the correct form that was necessary at the time. I would now stop mass production of the answer and have each of the students produce the entire correct sentence one at a time given that:

- Carlos usually had difficulty with new material.
- The ability of others in the class to grasp new material was greater.
- Confusion was created by several students saying the correct form at the same time.

I would then have Carlos repeat the correct form modeled by several of the other students in order to make sure he could use the form for himself.

The change in approach is designed to maintain Carlos' security and encourage his communicative attempts by redirecting the energy of the other students. In their zeal to correct, Carlos' classmates only threatened and confused him. Production of the correct answer (used in an entire sentence rather than by itself) by several students individually gives Carlos a chance to hear the form repeated several times as he needs and gives the other students a chance to practice what they already know. The students who know the correct form can practice it to the benefit of another who doesn't know it. Carlos' security can then be

maintained because he is no longer under the attack of several people correcting him at once. The confusion created by the group correcting simultaneously is cleared and Carlos can learn the form correctly for use in actual communication.

My new definition of correction can again be seen in the fact that the new approach strives to eliminate mistakes while maintaining teaching priorities. These priorities--a secure classroom environment and the facilitation of communication--are not sacrificed as they were in the original approach. The new approach also provides Carlos with the opportunity to understand what his mistake is and how he can correct it.

Case Study #4

Description

A student who was more advanced than the rest of the class, and who could almost always remember a right answer, was nevertheless very slow to correct himself. I allowed him to self-correct in spite of the amount of time it took.

Analysis

Because it took John such a long time to self-correct, the focus and attention of the rest of the class disintegrated. Their restlessness resulted in conversation which interfered with John's concentration and prolonged his discovery of the correct form. The extension of time it took John to remember made the class even more restless and increased their frustration. I would now simply correct him myself given that:

- John usually knew the correct form or answer.
- John always corrected himself slowly.
- His slowness usually spurred inattentiveness on the part of the others.

This new approach keeps the attention of the group and focuses their otherwise dispersed energy. The importance of maintaining interest and attention outweighs the benefits John receives from correcting himself.

My new definition of correction is reflected in the analysis of John's mistakes. His mistakes were not caused by misunderstanding or lack of knowledge. They were caused by a slow memory. Giving him the correct form or answer simply speeds up his memory process. This approach, as my new correction definition requires, maintains my priority for focused class attention.

Case Study #5

Description

According to their level of placement, my students should have been able to use the present progressive tense. In a lesson that required use of the progressive I discovered that they did not consistently use it correctly. I chose not to correct them.

Analysis

My original choice to not correct seemed at the time like a choice to sacrifice one priority for the sake of another. I thought I was sacrificing my priority to provide students with an accurate model of

English for encouraging their ability to communicate. What actually happened is that their ability to communicate was impaired because they did not understand the correct form. Even their security was eventually reduced when they had to spend time relearning what they thought they had used correctly. I would now choose to correct their mistakes immediately given that:

- They had not learned the material correctly in the first place.
- They were high-level students who would be expected to use the tense correctly.

I would give them a basic lesson on use of the progressive and repeat it or try alternative presentations until they used the material correctly.

Without understanding the proper use of the grammatical form, students cannot communicate with it effectively. By making sure of their ability to use the progressive tense correctly, I would increase their ability to communicate. Frustration and insecurity caused by having to relearn material they were falsely confident with would no longer exist.

This approach reflects my new definition of correction in two ways:

- a) it provides the correct model of use for students to assimilate;
- b) it facilitates communication, one of my teaching priorities, by insuring appropriate use of the material in question.

SECTION VI: COMPARISON OF THE OLD DEFINITION WITH THE NEW DEFINITION

This section analyzes the differences and similarities between my old and new definition of correction and discusses the process I evolved to generate the new definition and this guide.

In order to understand what I have gone through in this study, it is helpful to compare my original definition with my new definition of correction. The original definition is:

Correction is making what is wrong right. It assumes that since there is an ideal model for speaking English, there is the need to pinpoint mistakes and provide the appropriate solutions.

The new definition is:

Correction is part of the teaching and learning process. It involves making what is wrong right, and it assumes that there is an ideal model for speaking English. But it also involves analysis of what is wrong and why, besides a determination of how the mistakes can be eliminated according to the situation without upsetting the teacher's priorities and goals. It is a teaching tool that tells the learner when something in the communicative process is amiss. It is also a learning tool that gives the student a chance to understand why something is wrong and how it can be improved.

The original definition views correction as a static entity; as something separate and unrelated to anything else. If something was wrong the teacher made it right without regard for the situation. How



The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that every entry should be supported by a valid receipt or invoice. This ensures transparency and allows for easy verification of the data.

In the second section, the author outlines the various methods used to collect and analyze the data. This includes both primary and secondary data collection techniques. The primary data was gathered through direct observation and interviews, while secondary data was obtained from existing reports and databases.

The third section details the statistical analysis performed on the collected data. This involves the use of descriptive statistics to summarize the data and inferential statistics to test hypotheses. The results of these analyses are presented in a clear and concise manner, highlighting the key findings of the study.

Finally, the document concludes with a discussion of the implications of the findings. It suggests that the results have significant implications for the field of study and provides recommendations for further research. The author also acknowledges the limitations of the study and offers suggestions for how these can be addressed in future work.



and why this was done were not necessarily considered.

The new definition agrees with the old in that correction involves making what is wrong right, and that there is an ideal model for speaking English. But the new definition is broader because it views correction as a dynamic entity, as something that works in context with other factors.

The new definition evolved as I thought about, generated, and rehearsed a flexible model. At issue is a manner of teaching that encourages people to learn, rather than discourages them. Correction, a vital component of teaching English, in my judgement needs to be conceived as a context-specific learning tool. And, as such, the ultimate test is human experience; that is, how well the students learn what the teacher is trying to teach.