TEACHER DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF STUDENT ERROR

Ilana Salem

Errors are an integral part of language learners' output. Therefore, language teachers need to be equipped with principles to guide them in their error evaluation (Bartram and Walton 1994, Ferris 1999). In addition to a general feedback policy that many teachers adopt, there are other, less obvious factors determining the teachers' viewpoint on error. Various underlying motives surface, for example, in moderation meetings, where communal decisions are to be taken regarding the severity (and penalization) of the testees' linguistic inaccuracies. Diverse opinions voiced at such gatherings reveal significant differences in teachers' attitude to error. Why should teachers become 'irritated' (James 1998) by certain errors more than by others? Moreover, why should one teacher consider a particular error as 'mild', while another teacher feels that it is 'very bad'? These were the questions which initiated my interest in teachers' attitude to error.

The research reported on here focused on two factors potentially affecting teachers' error judgment[1]:

- the teacher's native language: is she[2] a native speaker of English (TL), or Hebrew (in my context, the students' native language)?
- the teacher's current professional setting: what proficiency level classes does she teach – lower or higher? Is she employed in an elementary school, high school, or tertiary institution?

Initially I will describe the educational context under investigation, and discuss other researchers' findings in related research fields. The report of the study and its findings will be followed by suggestions for a teacher development programme.

This study analyzes gravity scores assigned by English teachers to grammatical errors found in 12th graders' classroom written compositions. Both the

---

[1] This article is based on one of the themes developed in my MA dissertation, which was submitted to the University of Leicester in January 2003. I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Angela Creese, Dr. Julie Norton and Dr. Pamela Rogerson-Revell for their invaluable support and encouragement throughout the MA programme.

[2] Since all the participants in this research study were female, the teacher is referred to as 'she'.

error-assessors and the composition-writers belong to the educational context I am closely familiar with; namely, a particular chain of Israeli schools (called here 'CHAIN' schools), catering for all age-groups: elementary schools to tertiary educational institutions. In most schools the classes are split into two or three proficiency groups. English is taught as a foreign language (EFL); the students are mostly Israeli born and their native language is Hebrew. For the majority of students, English classes provide the only opportunity for exposure to the English language.

In the CHAIN schools, as with the general Israeli school system, English is a compulsory subject from grade 4 elementary school to grade 12 high school. CHAIN students would not normally spend their vacations abroad. Nor are they encouraged to seek work or study opportunities in other countries after graduation. It could, therefore, be claimed that English is taught in the CHAIN classroom 'for no obvious reasons' (Medgyes 1986: 108), except perhaps the school leaving exam, which the students are required to sit at the end of the 12th grade.

This exam mostly consists of discrete-item grammar and reading comprehension questions, and has a powerful 'washback effect' (Wall and Alderson 1993) on the English curriculum in the CHAIN schools. Here, grammar instruction enjoys a high status, and regular grammar lessons are a common phenomenon. This is welcomed by the school management as well as the students, both of whom appreciate having some structured material incorporated in the English curriculum. Other lessons focus on improving reading comprehension skills, vocabulary enrichment, or free oral self-expression. It must be pointed out that the above system differs to some extent from the mainstream Israeli school system in its general orientation. The latter has now become geared to content-based instruction through project work, which involves authentic communication, cooperative learning, collaboration and problem solving (Stoller 2002).

English teachers working in the CHAIN institutions are both native and non-native speakers of English. In the higher grades of high school, and in tertiary institutions, native or near-native English language proficiency is normally a pre-requisite for employment. Thus, the HL1 (native speakers of Hebrew) teachers mostly have a near-native command of English. Their native speaker colleagues, on the other hand, have been living in Israel for several years (or even decades) and have therefore a near-native command of Hebrew. In this sense, these two groups of teachers form a 'middle ground' between what might be termed 'typical' native speakers (NS) and

non-native speakers (NNS) with respect to their own command of English and Hebrew.

Such 'middle ground' language users have been the center of interest of several grammaticality judgment studies. Coppieters (1987) found that although near-native speakers' output closely mirrored that of NSs, the two groups did not necessarily interpret a given sentence in the same way. The extent of the gap between NSs and near-native speakers, particularly in the interpretation of basic grammatical contrasts, he claimed, pointed to qualitative differences between the two groups. Contrary to Coppieters' findings, Birdsong (1992) and White and Genesee (1996) argued that the near-native speakers did not diverge dramatically in their judgments from NSs.

While these studies, which deal with the 'middle ground' NS/NNS population, discuss near-native speakers' linguistic competence, I choose to focus here on native speakers of English who live in the target-language country and have only limited contact with their country of origin; these are teachers who were born in an English-speaking country but who have been living in Israel for a long time. The attitude to error of these teachers (who will be referred to as 'local EL1 teachers') will be compared with the attitude of their HL1 colleagues, and with the error judgments of overseas TESOL/Linguistics lecturers (termed henceforth 'overseas EL1 teachers') who are not familiar with the Hebrew language.

The methodology for the present research was drawn from other error gravity studies in which NS-NNS attitude to error was investigated (James 1977; Hughes and Lascaratou 1982; Davies 1983; McCretton and Rider 1993). In these studies, the assessors were presented with errors in their context, and asked to score the gravity of these errors on a 0–5 scale. The main finding of these researchers of relevance to the present discussion is that native speakers of the target language are more lenient towards learner error than non-native assessors. In the present study, I also found the overseas EL1 teachers (those who live abroad and have no knowledge of the Hebrew language) to be the least severe markers. What is interesting, though, is the difference between their lenient scoring and the much more severe scoring of the local EL1 teachers (those NS teachers of English who live in Israel and know Hebrew).

The present research addresses the following questions: Is a teacher's judgment of error gravity affected primarily by her own language background, or by her expectations derived from the proficiency level of her students? What is the

interrelationship between these two factors? Moreover, is there a difference in attitude to error between native speakers of English living in Israel and those living in an English-speaking country?

Before presenting and discussing the research-design and the findings, it will be appropriate to provide definitions of 'error' and 'error gravity'. In this study, Lennon's (1991) definition of error has been adopted. In his view, error is 'a linguistic form or combination of forms which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts' (p. 181). Consequently, 'error gravity' could be defined as the extent to which the erroneous piece of language deviates from the native speakers' output.

The Study

Errors used in this study

The errors used in this study were selected from students' written classroom compositions. The students are from 12th grade top-level classes in the CHAIN schools (see Introduction), and their L1 (native language) is Hebrew. This study focuses on advanced-grammar errors, and excludes two types of errors: inappropriate word choice (such as *light* instead of *easy*), and errors in tense morphology and usage (such as *She had gone just now*). Care was taken to balance the number of various error types; for example, the number of errors that could be attributed to language transfer (using Hebrew grammar rules, or word for word translation) was balanced with those that bore no obvious similarity to Hebrew; or the number of errors caused by infringement of a grammar rule such as relative clause formation was balanced with errors caused by violation of collocational restrictions.

Assessors

The assessors (all female) fall into the following groups:

- 22 EFL teachers living and working in Israel (see Introduction). All these teachers, who will be referred to as local teachers, have good command of Hebrew. They fall into two categories:
    - 11 native speakers of Hebrew (‘HL1 teachers’)
    - 11 native speakers of English or other languages: 9 NSs of English (‘local EL1 teachers’), 1 Romanian and 1 Slovak
- 11 non-Hebrew-speaking native speakers of English; these participants live outside Israel (7 in the USA, the rest in Australia, Italy, Spain, and the UK), where they are affiliated with academic institutions as TESOL and Linguistics teachers, lecturers and/or researchers. These will be referred to as ‘overseas EL1 teachers’.

Altogether the participants have experienced teaching English at all levels of formal instruction. The local teachers work in elementary, junior high or high schools (grades 1–12), as well as teacher training programmes. 10 of these teachers teach lower grades (1st –12th grade middle-proficiency level), and 12 teach in higher grades (12th grade top-proficiency level and teacher training). 5 overseas EL1 teachers have taught or are teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) to speakers of other languages in non-English speaking countries; and 6 overseas assessors have taught or are teaching English as a second language (ESL) to speakers of other languages in the USA.

The following table summarizes the grouping of the participants according to their native language and professional setting (the proficiency level of their students). The figures indicate the number of teachers belonging to each group.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th colspan="3">Native language</th><th colspan="2">professional setting</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Local 22</td><td colspan="2">Hebrew 11</td><td colspan="2" rowspan="3">lower grades 10
higher grades 12</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">English or other 11</td><td>English 9</td></tr>
<tr><td>Other 2</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Overseas 11</td><td colspan="3" rowspan="2">English 11</td><td>EFL 5</td></tr>
<tr><td>ESL 6</td></tr>
</table>

Figure 1: Teachers' native language and their professional setting

Data collection and computation

The errors were presented to the assessors in a questionnaire that included the context in which each error had appeared, and a marking scale ranging from 0 to 5 (see *Appendix 1*). The instructions preceding the list of errors indicated that 0 was to be assigned if the underlined item was not considered erroneous by the assessor, and 5 should be assigned to what were considered the most serious errors. Scores 1–4 referred to intermediate levels of gravity. The assessors were asked to view each error in its context. They were informed that these errors were made by 12th grade EFL learners, and were requested to judge the errors in terms of how seriously ('badly'), in their opinion, they deviated from normative ('good') English. The instructions were meant to be concise and uncomplicated; hence no more detail was provided as to what sort of deviation the assessors should focus on.

The numerical data (scores) were computed into mean averages (X) and standard deviations (SD). The averages and standard deviations of various teacher groups were then compared, and these comparisons led to generalizations regarding teachers' attitude to error.

Results

Teachers divided according to their native language

The following table presents the average scores assigned by the teacher groups (as specified above) to the 20 errors.

	Native language	**average score**	**native language**	**average score**
Local Teachers	Hebrew (HL1)	2.7		
	English or other (EOL1)	3.0	local EL1	2.9
			OL1	3.3
Overseas Teachers	English	2.6		

Figure 2: Mean average scores assigned by the teachers divided into three native-language groups
Key: local EL1 – native speakers of English living in Israel; OL1 – native speakers of a language which is neither English nor Hebrew.

The above table (*Figure 2*) shows that:

The highest average score (X=3.0) among the three native language groups was received from the EOL1 group – local teachers whose native language is other than Hebrew.

The local EL1 teachers marked these errors higher (X=2.9) than the overseas teachers (X=2.6). This is an interesting result, for two reasons. First of all, it is not clear why NS teachers of English living in Israel should mark advanced-grammar errors distinctly more severely than other groups of teachers, namely their HL1 colleagues, and overseas native speakers of English. Secondly, local EL1 teachers' high scoring fine-tunes the results of other error-gravity researchers (James 1977; Hughes and Lascaratou 1982; Davies 1983; McCretton and Rider 1993), who found NS assessors to be less severe error-scorers than NNS ones. The present results distinguish between native speakers of English who speak the students' L1 (and live in the country where this L1 is spoken) and those who do not. The former (local EL1 teachers) turned out to be stricter markers than other teacher groups.

OL1 teachers were the strictest markers. These two teachers, whose native language is neither the target language nor the students' L1, merit further attention; it

would be worth studying such teachers' responses to student error on a larger scale and perhaps addressing the following question: Are such speakers particularly critical towards learner-error because they tend to 'overmonitor' (this term refers to the language user's excessive conscious application of explicitly learned rules [Krashen 1988]), due to their own need to cope with several non-native languages simultaneously?

This section has revealed different attitudes of various teacher groups, depending on L1 background. Now we can focus on the teachers' professional setting (the proficiency level of their classes) as a factor affecting their error judgment.

Teachers divided according to the proficiency-level of their classes

From this point of view, the teachers could be divided into the following groups:

- bottom group teachers: teaching grade 1 to grade 12 (up to middle-proficiency-level);
- top group teachers: teaching 12th grade top-level-proficiency-groups, or teacher trainees;
- overseas teachers: TESOL/ Linguistics staff with present or past EFL or ESL teaching experience (see 'Assessors').

The results show that the local top-group teachers score higher (X=3.1) than other teachers (local bottom group teachers X=2.5, overseas teachers X=2.6). The high scoring of the local top-level teachers could be tentatively attributed to their involvement with advanced-grammar instruction in their top-level classes; perhaps these top-level teachers are disturbed by the kind of errors their own students make, or errors in grammatical structures their students are expected to have mastered.

The above results, which are based on scores received from all the 33 teachers, point to the connection between teachers' gravity scoring and the level of their classes. Such a link becomes clearer from error scoring of one of the teacher-subgroups, namely the 12th grade teachers. These teachers will be divided according to the proficiency level of their students into two groups:

- the top-12th grade teachers: these are nine teachers of the 12th grade top-groups (most of these teachers teach also in lower grades or lower-level proficiency groups);
- the bottom-12th grade teachers: these are five teachers who teach the bottom or middle-level 12th grade groups (but not higher level groups).

The top-12th-grade teachers scored 3.2 on average, as opposed to the bottom-12th-grade teachers' score of 2.2. This one point gap between the average scores of the top and the bottom group 12th grade teachers indicates a noticeable difference between the viewpoint of the two groups of teachers regarding error gravity. This result further supports the above claim that teachers' error gravity judgment is to a great extent affected by their anticipation of the quality of their students' output.

So far we have observed pronounced differences in scoring of various groups of teachers. To conclude, the internal consistency of the teacher groups will be examined.

Intragroup variability

After establishing the differences in error-gravity scoring of various teacher groups, we might wish to ask: Do the members in each group agree with each other in their judgment, or do the average scores of the groups result from highly dispersed scores (Brown 1988)? To obtain the answer to this question, the standard deviations of group-scores were calculated, and it turned out that the 12th grade teachers of the top-proficiency level groups exhibited the highest diversity of opinion (SD =1.26), as opposed to the overseas teachers, whose scoring revealed the highest intragroup agreement (SD = 0.83). What causes such significant disagreement among the top-level 12th grade teachers?

Detailed observation of individual teachers' scores assigned to four highly controversial errors (see *Appendix 2*) revealed that the top-level 12th grade teachers form two distinct groups with respect to marking these items: EL1 teachers and non-EL1 teachers. Two patterns emerge with regard to the scoring of the two groups:

- The EL1 teachers scored much lower (X=1.6) than their non-EL1 colleagues (X=3.05).

- The EL1 teachers agreed among themselves with regard to the relative gravity of each item (they all scored between 0 and 3), while the non-EL1 teachers scored between 1 and 5, which is a wider range of scores, indicating considerable disagreement among the non-EL1 teachers regarding the error gravity of these items.

These two differences between the local EL1 and non-EL1 teachers of the top 12th grade classes demonstrate again (as in *'Teachers divided according to their native language'* above) the effect the teacher's L1 has on her error judgment. Furthermore, these results point to a rather complex interrelationship between the teacher's language background and her current professional setting, as factors affecting grammaticality judgment. On the one hand, it was shown above (*'Teachers divided according to the proficiency-level of their classes'*) that the top-level 12th grade teachers marked advanced-grammar errors much more strictly than their bottom-level colleagues (1 point apart), which suggested that professional setting, rather than language background, may be the primary factor affecting teachers' attitude to error. On the other hand, a closer look at the top 12th grade group reveals (see *'Intragroup variability'* above) that this group seems to consist of two distinct subgroups of markers – those who grew up and received their schooling in an English speaking country, as opposed to other teachers, who acquired their linguistic awareness of English in other contexts. This, then, points back again to the assessor's native language as a leading factor in her error judgment. Now let us turn our attention to the local EL1 teachers, who comprise a major part of teaching staff working with advanced-proficiency level classes.

How native is native?

In *'Teachers divided according to their native language'* above, it was revealed that the local EL1 teachers are more severe markers than the overseas NS assessors. In order to further demonstrate the differences between the two NS groups, this section contrasts the local and the overseas EL1 teachers' scoring of *'destroy'* in: *Friendship can built the personality but can destroy so we should to be careful when we choose friend*.

The overseas assessors viewed this as a severe error (3.6 on average), while the local EL1 teachers gave it only 1 point, which means that they hardly considered it deviant from normative English. This is quite a surprising result, bearing in mind that the local EL1 teachers generally scored higher (X= 2.9) than the overseas teachers (X= 2.6).

Perhaps such extremely different attitudes of the two native-speaker groups of teachers to this error can be attributed to L2 transfer (influence of one's second language on the native language); the local EL1 teachers have been living in Israel for several years and have a near-native command of Hebrew. It is therefore plausible to assume that their lenient judgment of this error stems from their everyday exposure to the Hebrew intransitive *laharos*, as in *ze yachol laharos* – 'it can be destructive'. In other words, many teachers have got used to this form to such an extent that they do not recognize it as deviant.

Although such extreme differences in scoring of the two EL1 groups (local and overseas) did not repeat themselves with other errors, the above result could lead us to believe that the geographical separation of the local EL1 teachers from their native English speaking community, and their exposure to the local L1 has\ve affected their grammaticality judgment of Hebrew transfer errors. It would, therefore, be worthwhile to conduct further investigation of such 'middle-ground' language users (see Introduction), who have neither received attention in previous grammaticality judgment studies (Coppieters 1987; Birdsong 1992; White and Genesee 1996) nor have they been studied by the error gravity researchers (James 1977; Hughes and Lascaratou 1982; Davies 1983; McCretton and Rider 1993). Further research into local EL1 teachers' attitude to language transfer errors would probably shed additional light on the linguistic intuitions of these 'detached' (in the sense of being distanced from their English speech community) native speakers.

Moreover, some questions arise regarding these teachers' classrooms encounters with grammar: How do the 'detached' EL1 teachers cope with students' queries regarding the appropriateness of grammatically questionable pieces of language? Are they equipped with an efficient and updated approach to language that would help them diagnose and analyze learners' linguistic problem areas? Clearly, these questions are equally relevant to the HL1 teachers working with advanced proficiency level groups. I tend to believe that these teacher groups could benefit from a teacher development programme geared to their specific needs. In the following

section I will try to outline several basic components of such a programme, bearing in mind some relevant theoretical issues as they are discussed in the current teacher development literature, and the specific requirements of the advanced-proficiency-level teachers' professional context.

Implications for teacher training

In the schools where the participants of this survey work (called here 'CHAIN schools') the EFL teacher is expected to be able to explain grammar rules clearly and to provide additional clarification when she is challenged by ambitious and/or high proficiency learners. This could occur during the 'grammar' lesson, when a particular structure is presented, practiced, or reviewed. The teacher might also be approached with a clarification request after she has marked, or commented on, a student-produced utterance as incorrect or questionable. Such requests might be unwelcome by the teacher, if she is not equipped with an ability to analyze language, and lacks proper knowledge or NS intuitions that would help her distinguish between possible and unacceptable forms. The teacher might be at a loss when she is unable to provide a relevant 'rule' that would account for a particular language form, or justify her judgment of the error.

This kind of situation seems to be familiar to language teachers worldwide; it has been observed (Arndt, Harvey, and Nuttall 2000; Leech 1994; Roberts and Harden 1997) that in the majority of teaching environments learners expect their teachers to have a more thorough knowledge of grammar than they, the learners, do. Knowledge of the language system is essential when it comes to making decisions about a learner's performance, in terms of providing useful feedback on errors, or measuring progress through tests. It follows that the deeper the understanding on the part of the teacher, the greater the likelihood of making the wisest choices (Thornbury 1997).

If we were to propose a teacher development programme for the advanced-proficiency-level teachers (local EL1 and HL1 teachers working with advanced students), what should such a programme offer? It seems that the programme should assist these teachers in sharpening their language awareness, update them about recent

developments in approaches to language study, and, last but not least, offer opportunities for improvement of their own language skills.

These three components have received attention in the teacher development literature, and will be discussed here bearing in mind the specific needs of the CHAIN advanced-proficiency-level teachers. In recent years these teachers have participated in methodology refreshment courses where varied kinds of communicative (and task-based) activities were introduced. Many of them have also been exposed to occasional guest-lectures, in which various aspects of language teaching were presented. What they seem to lack, however, is a unified, well-planned series of lectures and workshops, which would have a stronger and longer-lasting effect on their approach to language and language teaching. In the following paragraphs I will try to outline such a programme, which could be 'language awareness' oriented.

What is language awareness? 'Language awareness work relies on noticing the language around us, and examining it in a critical manner' (Van Lier 1995: 10). This 'basic skill', which involves practical analysis and interpretation of linguistic systems, 'is particularly helpful for teachers unfamiliar with linguistic concepts and for non-native speakers who need to develop a working vocabulary about English in English' (Roberts 1998: 175). Research indicates that language awareness feeds into teachers' professional practices, potentially exerting a powerful influence upon their ability to teach effectively (Andrews 1999; Arndt, Harvey, and Nuttall 2000). For example, grammar rules can change and appear in various guises depending on the underlying linguistic theory, the pedagogic objectives or the context in which the language is used. Deepened awareness of how the language works would enable CHAIN teachers to rephrase the rules found in textbooks and other resources, to suit their current instructional objectives.

My experience as a 12th grade teacher shows that the teacher's explicit knowledge (knowledge that is available to the language user as conscious representation of rules) and her sharpened language awareness are well utilized with analytic-type advanced learners, who might demand clear justification of why some of their output is considered deviant. The advanced-proficiency-level teacher should be prepared to analyze (often on the spot) the piece of language, and try to make plausible linguistic generalizations wherever applicable (Leech 1994). At the same time, the CHAIN teacher should also be able to tell when grammatical generalizations are not relevant or efficient and she should be informed about alternative approaches

to language analysis, such as the lexical approach (Lewis 1993), which recognizes the centrality of the word in grammatical generalizations, arguing that words have their own grammar. A topic such as verb transitivity could provide a good starter for discussion; for example, should various aspects of verb transitivity (e.g. the above mentioned '*destroy'* error) be dealt with as a grammar topic, or rather a lexical one (Willis 1993)? Introducing teachers to a lexical approach to language teaching (Willis 1990) could be another potential incentive, stimulating CHAIN teachers' interest in approaches to language pedagogy.

The programme should present language, and language study, as a dynamic domain; knowledge of language is constantly being added to, revised and re-shaped (Arndt, Harvey, and Nuttall 2000). Acquaintance with the relevant issues in current TESOL and Applied Linguistics research would provide the CHAIN advanced-proficiency-level teachers with an opportunity to realize that attitudes to grammar and other language components keep changing; and this could guide them towards a more independent and flexible approach to language and language study.

Furthermore, most advanced-proficiency-level teachers, and particularly the HL1 ones, would probably benefit from language proficiency enrichment courses. Participation in these courses would be most relevant for those CHAIN teachers who do not normally travel abroad, and whose opportunities to be exposed to English in a natural encounter with native speakers are very limited. Drawing upon my own learning-by-distance experience I tend to believe that the teachers would also profit from a high-level process-oriented writing course; this would help them in identifying their occasional language inaccuracies, and refresh their language resources.

On the whole, such professional enrichment programmes could modify the teachers' reactions to error and converge their opinions about its severity in various contexts. This, in turn, might bear beneficial effects on discussions in moderation meetings, and presumably also enhance the teachers' capability to make efficient and informed higher-level decisions concerning issues such as teaching objectives, or appropriate testing style.

Conclusion

This study has dealt with teachers' attitudes to student error. Two factors affecting teachers' judgment of error were studied: the teachers' native language and the proficiency level of their classes. It was found that these two factors are closely interrelated. The study focused on NS teachers who have been away from an English-speaking country for several years, and who know the students' native language – Hebrew. These teachers' judgment of student error differs from other native speakers', who are not familiar with the Hebrew language. Thus, the local EL1 teachers are also referred to as 'detached' EL1 teachers, due to their separation from their native English speaking speech-community. These teachers judge errors made by HL1 learners differently from other native speakers of English on the one hand and from their HL1 colleagues on the other. In the later part of this paper, a teacher enrichment programme for the local (HL1 and EL1) teachers dealing with advanced level students was outlined.

Although this research dealt with a teacher population affiliated with a specific school chain within the Israeli education system, the findings could be applicable for other contexts. It would be feasible to assume that other schools, in Israel or worldwide, where English is taught as a foreign language, employ 'detached' EL1 teachers, who grew up in an English-speaking country, but who now live and teach in a non-English speaking country. These teachers' grammaticality judgment could differ from other native speakers' judgment, and therefore my suggestions for further professional development might be equally applicable to them.

In general, NS teachers who have become proficient in their students' native language should be aware of a possible impact this newly acquired language has on their judgment of student output. Even though nowadays the learner's overall ability to communicate, rather than his/her grammatical accuracy, is normally the primary objective of language instruction (or is officially declared to be so), teachers still need to be able to make generalizations about what is wrong with a particular erroneous piece of language, and should generally understand how language works. Teachers' sharpened linguistic awareness, and their conscious knowledge about grammar and other aspects of language, potentially provide a sound basis for well-informed error evaluation, and professionally grounded feedback on student error.

References

Andrews, S. 1999. '"All these like little name things": A comparative study of language teachers' explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology'. *Language Awareness* 8/3–4: 143-159.

Arndt, V., P. Harvey, and J. Nuttall. 2000. *Alive to Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bartram, M. and R. Walton 1991. *Correction.* Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

Birdsong, D. 1992. 'Ultimate attainment in second language acquisition' *Language* 68: 706-755.

Brown, J.D. 1988. *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coppieters, R. 1987. 'Competence differences between native and near-native speakers'. *Language* 63/3: 544-573.

Davies, E.E. 1983. 'Error evaluation: the importance of viewpoint'. *ELT Journal* 37: 304-311.

Ferris, D. 1999. 'The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: a response to Truscott 1996.' *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8/1: 1-11.

Hughes, A. and C. Lascaratou 1982. 'Competing criteria for error gravity'. *ELT Journal* 36/3: 175-82.

James C. 1977. 'Judgments of error gravities'. *ELT Journal* 31/2: 116-124.

James, C. 1998. *Errors in Language Learning and Use* London: Longman.

Krashen, D.S. 1988. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

Leech, G. 1994. 'Students' grammar – teachers' grammar – learners' grammar'. In Bygate, M., A. Tonkyn, and E. Williams (eds). 1994. *Grammar and the Language Teacher*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International.

Lennon, P. 1991. 'Error: Some problems of definition, identification, and distinction' *Applied Linguistics* 12/2: 180-196.

Lewis, M. 1993. *The Lexical Approach* Hove: Language Teaching Publications.

McCretton, E. and N. Rider 1993. 'Error gravity and error hierarchies'. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 31/3: 177-88.

Medgyes, P. 1986. 'Queries from a communicative teacher'. *ELT Journal* 40/2:107 -112.

Roberts, J. 1998. *Language Teacher Education.* London: Arnold.

Roberts, J.T. and T. Harden. 1997. 'Native or non-native speaker teachers of foreign languages? Old and new perspectives on the debate.' *Teanga* 17: 1-28.

Stoller, F.L. 2002. 'Project work: a means to promote language content'. *English Teachers' Journal* 2002: 9-39.

Thornbury, S. 1997. *About Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Lier, L. 1995. *Introducing Language Awareness.* London: Penguin Books.

Wall, D. and J.C. Alderson 1993. 'Examining washback: the Sri Lankan impact study'. *Language Testing* 10: 41-69.

White, L. and F. Genesee 1996. 'How native is near-native? The issue of ultimate attainment in adult second language acquisition'. *Second Language Research* 12/3: 233-265.

Willis, D. 1990. *The Lexical Syllabus* London: Collins ELT.

Willis, D. *1993.* 'Grammar and lexis: some pedagogical implications'. In Sinclair,

Appendix 1

- We were friends very much. … Even we studied in other seminaries, we kept connection.
- Friendship can built the personality but can destroy so we should to be careful when we choose friend.
- A close friend it is very good…but on the other side sometimes the friend is too close, and it causes that the friend don't want to have connection with other people. This is for sure very bad, and that doesn't call a good friend ship.
- … I had a good friend who lived in front of me.
- I want to be like her, but I think that anyone can't be so special like her.
- I decided not to do it at the future when I would be an old girl and when I would have an own house.
- I enjoy to speak with her because that she spoke to the point.
- They drink coffee, call to the children and go again to sleep.
- The organization helps sick children and does them summer camps.
- They help other people without received money or reward for this.
- I go to deliver the food to families need.
- I help them to tidy the all cakes which women make them, many women make them beautifully cakes, and also make meals for the sicks.
- I go once a week to Keren Hayeled, to be a company for a girl who live there.
- In our days when there are so many terrible things happen, every day is worse than the day before…
- A car injured her seriously.
- When she was a young student in school, one year came in a teacher with a strict look on her face.
- She pretends as one who wants to hear and understand, it gives to the pupils a good feeling.

very much	0…1…2…3…4…5
we kept connection	0…1…2…3…4…5
Destroy	0…1…2…3…4…5
A close friend it is very good	0…1…2…3…4…5
that doesn't call	0…1…2…3…4…5
in front of me	0…1…2…3…4…5
anyone can't be	0…1…2…3…4…5
an own house	0…1…2…3…4…5
enjoy to speak	0…1…2…3…4…5
call to	0…1…2…3…4…5
does them summer camps	0…1…2…3…4…5
without received	0…1…2…3…4…5
families need.	0…1…2…3…4…5
which women make them	0…1…2…3…4…5
Beautifully cakes	0…1…2…3…4…5
to be a company	0…1…2…3…4…5
there are so many terrible things happen	0…1…2…3…4…5
A car injured	0…1…2…3…4…5
came in a teacher	0…1…2…3…4…5
Pretends as one	0…1…2…3…4…5

Appendix 2

Errors with the highest SD scores:

Error	Correct form	12th top SD
It can destroy	*Destroy **NP***	1.62
Enjoy to speak	*Enjoy speak**ing***	1.64
A car injured her	*She was injured / hit by a passing car*	1.67
A close friend it is very good	*It is very good to have*	1.69