Reflective Teaching

ALCIA CABRERO
Universidad Autónoma San Luis de Potosí, México
aliciacl@uaslp.mx

Most English teachers, while teaching a lesson, are so involved in the process of teaching to meet expected objectives that they can hardly detect weaknesses in their teaching behavior. The results from an investigation, based on reflective observation, aim to provide evidence that action research may be an excellent tool for self-assessment.

Key words: Reflexive observation, observee, observer, error correction

La mayoría de los maestros, cuando imparten una clase, están tan inmersos en el proceso de transmisión de conocimientos para alcanzar objetivos, que difícilmente pueden detectar debilidades en su forma de enseñar. Los resultados de una investigación, basada en la observación reflexiva, intentan probar evidencia de que la Investigación-Acción puede ser una excelente herramienta para el desarrollo personal.

Palabras Clave: Observación reflexiva, observado, observador, corrección de errores

Introduction

An investigation was carried out to analyze the way in which language instructors are able to develop their behavior towards error correction. This was done through a case study of three EFL Mexican teachers who had difficulties in error correction in spite of the feedback provided by the coordinator after being observed.

The author based the investigation on Wajnryb's idea (1992) that observation in the classroom can become a learning experience. The project was developed within a three week period as an attempt to analyze the following two types of observation: the effect of feedback provided by an observer in contrast to the self assessment provided by the teacher after watching a video recorded lesson. The process was carried out by teaching and re-teaching the same lesson to allow the investigator to analyze the effect of feedback in both cases to get to a conclusion.

Background

The investigation was developed at a Mexican school in San Luis Potosi that educates children and young adults. The school, in the curricula, includes English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at all levels. The program, based on the Communicative approach, aims to help students communicate in the new language. This process, which is not simple, requires well-trained teachers to help students develop this skill.

The language learning process could be considered a ladder that requires mastering the first step before proceeding to the next one. In each step students, with the help of the teacher, develop language and communication.

The EFL staff of the school has a coordinator who makes sure program results are being achieved. She supervises teaching. The coordinator has implemented drop-in monthly observations while the course is in process to evaluate the teacher's work. According to Maingay (1988), to assess a teacher's performance, observations have to be accomplished during a course and not just at the end of it. The reason is that observations play an important role in the teachers' development since the coordinator can encourage teachers to modify their behavior when necessary during the feedback stage, which may contribute to meet the school objectives.

Observation System

The schoolteachers are observed once a month. The observations which are not announced to the teachers, as well as being self explorative, provide the coordinator knowledge as to how well the teachers are following the school program.

An observation schedule is used as a "framework for directing the attention of an observer of a lesson and for recording the results of this observation in a systematic way" (Parrot, 1993, p.19).

While the observation is in progress, the coordinator checks that the lesson of the day is well-prepared. In this plan, she checks the lesson objectives and the series of tasks that reflects a balance of the four skills expected to reach the communicative objective.

When the observation is complete, the observer provides the chance for self-assessment by offering a series of motivating questions to be answered orally. This feedback is also provided in a written form to allow future reflection.

The researcher, defining the problem or reason for the investigation, found that teachers persist in overcorrecting or ignoring students' errors, in spite of the feedback provided by the coordinator every time they are observed. Therefore, she will attempt to suggest the best manner in which teachers can be aware of the need for error correction in oral production. The investigation was based on the hypothesis that self-assessment can provide more benefit than an external observer's feedback. Thus classroom observations might become an opportunity for teachers to become more analytical regarding their own performance instead of providing a list of correct or incorrect behaviors during the lesson.

The study

Action research, which may be understood as the process of "trying out ideas in practice as a means of improvement and as a means of increasing knowledge about teaching and learning" (Richards and Nunan, 1990:86) was carried out in the school. I realized that it was very important for a teacher to become involved in classroom action research, since the problems that exist can be solved by analyzing the reason the difficulties exist and the manner in which a solution may be implemented.

The action research was accomplished by three experienced teachers, who were earning an ELT Certificate and their coordinator. They analyzed the manner in which errors were corrected while a lesson was in progress. The foundation of the investigation was based on an adapted version of the Stanford Microteaching Model, which envisaged the following six-stage cycle: Plan - Teach - Observe - Critique, Re-plan -Re-teach Re-observe (Crípwell and Geddes, 1979, p.4). This helped the coordinator see how well teachers were able to modify their behavior after receiving feedback.

The research, in which the teaching and re-teaching model was accomplished, required groups of students with similar characteristics for the three teachers

previously mentioned, who were teaching three groups of students from the same level: fourth, sixth and eighth grade. The groups had from 40 to 45 students. These similarities were required for the investigation to be reliable.

Observation helps teachers detect their weaknesses. In this school, for example, when teaching a lesson, the teachers were so involved in following a chain of tasks to accomplish the lesson objective that they could not easily notice their teaching weaknesses, either because they do not have the necessary background regarding the best way to teach, or because they are so concentrated on their performance and what is happening in the class that they forget to use suitable techniques. In such cases, an external observer may help the teachers self-explore their behavior.

Error Correction

The role of observations may be used as a tool for teacher development. For that reason the observer, who adopted Wajnryb's (1992) idea that paying attention to every detail that occurs while the lesson is in progress might be very difficult, focused her attention on error correction. This provided reliable results on a specific aspect of her performance instead of a general idea of the teacher's performance.

The schoolteachers were encouraged to work on error correction for a two-month period. Before the study, the basic concept that they were encouraged to apply to daily teaching was to consider that errors are part of the learning process and not a sign of failure either on the students' or on the teacher's part. According to Norrish (1983), making errors can be regarded as an essential part of the language-learning process.

In EFL learning, the most common sources of error are lack of knowledge or carelessness on the part of the students, grammar interference, sound system or other features involving the mother tongue. Errors can also occur by the main input sources such as a teacher's poor English knowledge, errors in teaching materials, and defective English knowledge/response produced during student – student interaction. However, errors occur naturally in the learning process and are, in fact, evidence that learning is taking place (Norrish, 1983).

According to Hubbard (1990), instead of directly correcting students, teacher should provide suitable feedback to allow them to correct themselves or each other. However, error correction implies decision-making (Larsen – Freeman D. 1986) about whether or not to intervene when an error occurs. If teachers corrected every language error made in their class, far too much classroom time would be given over to correction (Wajnryb, 1992).

"Correction would rarely be appropriate where the emphasis is on communication, as the correction would probably distract from the purpose of the

activity" (Parrot, 1993, p.77). However, some teachers may feel uncomfortable about letting serious errors go without any feedback. It is recommended during a fluency activity that the teacher take note of major errors. If these are general class errors, the teacher can later give students an accuracy activity as remedial work. If individual errors have occurred, they can be treated with individual students separately after class.

When the teacher considers it necessary to intervene in accuracy activities, there are at least three types of intervention., namely, "Challenging", when the teacher lets the students know that something is wrong, without indicating what it is; "Marking", when the teacher lets the student know that something is wrong and also indicates what type of error occurred and where it occurred; and "Correcting", when the teacher simply supplies the correct answer.

In oral activities teachers generally should challenge an error that occurs during accuracy work or challenge it and mark it at the same time (Hubbard et al, 1990). The reason is that marking an error gives the student more information to help her/him correct her/himself, or encourage peers to provide the correct response. Teachers only correct an error and provide the right response as a last resort. Also, error correction has to be provided in a friendly manner, taking into consideration that feedback is thought of as a normal part of the learning process, not as a reflection of the students' abilities.

Observation by Co-coordinator

The three teachers that participated in the study were asked to plan a regular class to be observed. Therefore, the drop-in observation process that the EFL program from the school generally follows, in this occasion, was modified in the expectation of well-planned lessons that could provide good support for the investigation. In addition, the same date was assigned to the three observees to elude intercommunication, which may have affected the reliability of the results; and five minutes before the lessons started, the observer told the observee what the main focus of the observation was going to be.

The observer used a chart (Appendix 1) to note the teacher's error correction patterns by simply marking in the box that corresponded either to corrected or ignored errors. When an error was corrected, the observer was able to specify if the observee either challenged, marked or corrected that error as well as who correctly rephrased the error. When ignored, the observer drew a mark in a box that corresponded to the activity's objective, which was specified as accuracy or fluency, which could provide hints about the reason the teacher preferred not to intervene. In the

last section of the chart, the observer wrote the most relevant errors that were produced during the lesson, which might be used as support for the feedback session. In the chart, the observer had to consider the number of errors that were produced either during fluency or accuracy objective task (Appendix 1).

The amount of errors provided a number from which a percentage was estimated (Fig 1).

Oral error correction / teaching lesson 1

After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	2%	4%	8%	
Marked an error	1%	2%	2%	
Corrected an error			10%	71%

Fig 1. *Observees error correction average in the teaching stage*

In addition to filling in the chart (Appendix 1), the observer wrote on a piece of paper positive feedback first (Vincent, 1992) to help the observee increase self-esteem and be prepared to listen to her weaknesses (Appendix 3). According to Wragg (1982), some observees accept strong direction while others resist. For this reason, the observer, instead of providing negative feedback, wrote a series of questions (Appendix 3) to invite the observee to reflect on her/his performance instead of only listening to the observer's comments. Questioning an observee about her/his performance gives her/him an opportunity to explain the reason for her/his actions and to ponder the best manner in which the lesson should have been implemented.

The author's experience in observation suggests that for most in-service observees it is hard to accept that in spite of the effort and amount of time spent in planning the lesson, it does not always come out well. Therefore, when an observer provides negative feedback, the observees either feel attacked and adopt a defensive attitude or decide to change their actions. However, if the external observer asks the observees questions about their teaching performance, instead of providing negative comments, the observees will be guided toward a self-analysis.

Therefore, during the feedback session, the observees were critically able to examine their areas of possible improvement, from which two of them recalled feeling frustrated when realizing that their lessons were not as good as they initially had thought (Appendix 3). As this was the first stage in the process, however, observees still had a second opportunity to modify their behavior according to self-evaluation of a videotaped lesson, as we shall see later.

Coordinator Observation Analysis

According to the first round of observations, it was found that teachers still had serious problems dealing with error correction. From the errors produced by the groups of students, there was an average of 39% of the errors that were corrected, while 71% remained ignored (Appendix 2). The high amount of ignored errors should be considered to be significant when taking into account that only 40% of the errors were produced in activities with a fluency objective. This means that almost half of the errors that had to be corrected were unattended.

When the observees were asked during the feedback session (Appendix 3) if they felt satisfied with the error correction system they used while the lesson was in progress, they all responded that they did, which could signify that the teachers did not consider their intervention necessary when specific problems arose. However, when asked how many errors were ignored in the lesson, two of the observees responded that they believed that most of the errors were corrected while another responded that all of the errors were corrected. This confirms that the observees, in spite of the feedback that the observer provided on previous observation, did not integrate the suggestions for error correction.

The study also showed evidences that teachers took little advantage of the strategy of letting students know that something was incorrect without telling them exactly what the problem was. Figure 1 shows that only 6% of the errors corrected in the lesson were challenged, from which 2% were self-corrected. As Krashen (1987) argues, self-correction provides the highest benefit, since the student her/himself has to reflect on the best manner in which the incorrect utterance has to be rephrased. This permits the student to store the information in her/his mind and perhaps move the learned error to long-term memory if they see such a need to do so. In case the student is unable to correct her/his own error, the teacher should encourage peer correction, leaving teacher correction as the last option.

The observation chart also shows that from the challenged errors, 4% were peer corrected. This indicates that students have not been trained to correct their own errors or those of their peers. It has to be the teacher who either corrects the

errors or ignores them. Only 5% of the errors were marked, which is very helpful for students because the teacher specifically marks what error was produced, which allows students' reflection on re-phrasing the utterance. These results show that teachers unaware of the benefits this system provides do not use it.

Finally, the observees did give the students some opportunities to correct themselves, but the lack of time on the part of the observee or motivation on part of the students contributed to having the teacher correct the errors her/himself most of the time. These facts permitted the coordinator to infer that observees have problems dealing with error correction. There seems to be a gap between theory and practice. Hence, observees were requested to go over their error correction notes before being observed a second time.

Re-teaching and Feedback

The second step consisted of re-teaching a modified version of the original lesson plan according to the observee's reflection of her/his performance. The reason to re-teach is to enable the observees gradually to approximate to the model provided of the skill through reinforcement of desirable behavior (Stoddart, 1979).

Through the evaluation of the re-taught lesson, the observer was able to find out what changes emerged and to summarize what was learned with the same feedback resources. The first observation provided feedback that helped observees reflect on the manner in which errors were corrected and only 49% were ignored, meaning that the obsevees corrected more errors than on the first stage (Appendix 4). However, observees in general over-corrected; every error that was detected was treated in one form or another without paying attention to the focus of the task.

After the second observation, during the feedback session, observees were asked if they had corrected all the errors students produced during the session (Appendix 5). Two members of the group responded affirmatively, mentioning that the errors that were not corrected were not detected. The third observee responded that she did not correct a lot of the errors because she did not want to intimidate students with over-correction, but she felt insecure leaving errors unattended. Therefore, since observees were advised that error correction was going to be the main focus of the observation, it seems to have persuaded them to correct all the errors they were able to perceive.

Observees accepted that the feedback provided in the first stage contributed to helping them reflect on the best way errors needed to be corrected. According to the observation forms, observees challenged, marked and encouraged self or peer

correction. They even corrected errors themselves when they considered it convenient, or when students were unable to correct the utterance, which means that at this point, observees were aware of the different forms in which an error could be corrected but still had difficulties applying theory to practice.

The observer asked the observees if they liked reworking a lesson, to which one of them responded negatively since she considered her interest in being observed decreased despite being an improved version of the original lesson. She mentioned that it could be better to apply the feedback reflection to a new lesson, which could be more challenging than following nearly the same routine a second time. The other two observees mentioned that reworking the same lesson contributed to their professional development, since it gave them the opportunity to improve the lesson plan and correct errors properly and according to the feedback.

Finally, the observer asked the observees what method of correction they suggested. Two participants suggested reflecting on the objective of each task when planning a lesson to correct errors properly. The third observee proposed using the observee's error correction format, used for this investigation (Appendix 1), to analyze his performance every week, which would help in detecting improvement. In addition, the three observees asked the observer to check their error correction method during their monthly observations to detect how well they are improving their error correction system. The observer, after listening to the observees, provided positive oral feedback and questions to invite observees to reflect on their behavior (Appendix 5). "When we observe others to gain self knowledge and self insight and when we generate alternatives based on what we see others do, we construct our knowledge" (Richards and Nunan, 1990, p.164).

Oral error correction / teaching lesson 1

After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	2% - 6%	4% - 9%	8% - 16%	
Marked an error	1% - 4%	2% - 6%	2% - 8%	
Corrected an error			10% - 2%	71% - 49%

Fig.2. *Observees error correction average when teaching (step 1) and re-teaching a lesson (step 2)*

Teacher Self-Observation

The investigation to this point had followed an observation guided development system, in which the questions the observer asked observees during the feedback session contributed to having them reflect (Richards and Lockhart, 1994) on the behavior they had to follow during the reworking stage.

In the next part of the study, which was accomplished a week after having provided re-teaching feedback, the researcher, in an attempt to encourage observees to be self reflective and increase awareness of a particular way of teaching, changed the observation routine (Maingay, 1992). The observees had to plan a regular lesson in which participants were given a questionnaire on error correction (Fig. 3) ten minutes before video recording the lesson (Williams, 1988), which, according to the researcher, was sufficient time for the reflection. The questionnaire, in addition to focusing the teacher's mind on certain aspects of teaching (Swan, 1992), provided an idea on what was going to be the observation's focal point.

The questionnaire was as follows:

> What is the lesson's objective?
> Why do errors occur in a lesson?
> Who has to correct errors in class? Why?
> When is it convenient not to interfere, correcting errors?
> How do you suggest error correction feedback be provided?

Fig 3. *Pre-teaching reflective questionnaire*

The participants' lesson was video recorded. The video recorded lesson, which is "the most neutral technique for observation" (Richards and Nunan 1990, p.46), helped to capture the essence of the classroom and permitted the teacher to listen or view the tape as many times as it was necessary to interpret it properly.

The recorded lesson permitted the observee to see himself as the students see him. However, the experience presented limitations since the observer was able to perceive that the camera intimidated both students and teachers. Two of the participant teachers, in spite of having been told that the video was going to be used exclusively for the investigation, mentioned having experienced a feeling of anxiety, stress, or fear of being watched and criticized by others. Another characteristic that made the video recorded lesson unnatural was that it was carefully planned in detail, which does not always happen in a regular lesson and the tasks were performed only by the best students.

Oral error correction / teaching lesson 2

After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	14%	5%	3%	
Marked an error	11%	4%	2%	
Corrected an error			26%	35%

Fig. 4. *Observees error correction average in the video recorded lesson*

In two groups, the anxiety, nervousness, and excitement students displayed encouraged them to participate actively in all the tasks and try to produce correct utterances. The third group, which was very quiet for the first ten minutes, changed their attitude as they developed self-confidence to perform in front of a camera. After the session, when all the students were asked about their hesitancy, 90% mentioned to have been relaxed after the first ten minutes of class. The remaining 10% were nervous throughout the lesson and mentioned that they would prefer not to be video recorded again since it produces a sense of intimacy and fear, which does not permit natural participation.

After the lesson, the teachers were given their corresponding video and invited to watch the lesson and reflect on their performance in written form. "The experience of supervising their own teaching in the privacy of their own homes is a unique and powerful experience" (Swan, 1992, p.124). This process permitted participant teachers to watch each segment of the video as many times as they considered necessary to detect their strengths and weaknesses. However, to facilitate the self-assessment process and to provide consistency to the investigation, the researcher gave the participants five questions (Fig. 5) to guide the analysis (Williams, 1988).

- Do you feel satisfied with the method you used to correct errors?
- Did you consider the task objective when correcting errors?
- Did you give students enough time to reproduce an utterance when incorrectly produced?
- Did you follow a special strategy to provide feedback? Why?
- Will this video contribute to modifying your attitude towards error correction? How?

Fig.5. *Error correction self-assessment questionnaire*

These questions (Williams, 1988) were presented to the teacher at the end of the lesson. The reason was that the observee, who felt stressed at being video recorded, would have had to reflect on the questions before the lesson and the questionnaire to support self-assessment given at this period could have added stress and diminished her attention towards the reflection. The questionnaire, in spite of soliciting open-ended responses, was reliable as all the participants had to concentrate on the same problems. The lessons from the three participant teachers were recorded the same day, as in steps one and two, to achieve reliable results. The observees were asked to present the written self-assessment (Appendix 7) the following day to allow them to remember all the details of the lesson plan.

Self-Observation Analysis
In the three participants' self-assessment papers, it was found that all of them were very analytical, emphasizing negative points while only briefly considering positive ones. This led one of the participants to feel dissatisfied about her performance and about the manner in which she had planned the lesson. Another teacher mentioned feeling frustrated regarding her error correction, considering that she had mastered the method.

There was only one observee who considered that she had taught satisfactorily, though with some inconveniences. One was that she believed she didn't have serious problems in the way she organized the lesson, but rather in her attitude towards correcting errors.

The three participants mentioned that they had accomplished the objective of the lesson. However, only one of them achieved the goal in a satisfactory way. They all believed that they had given sufficient time to the students to allow for self-correction and had encouraged peer correction when a student was not able to correct himself. In addition, they all provided feedback according to the situations in which the error was produced.

One participant mentioned that challenging an error helped the student reflect on his mistake in a similar manner as to how she was able to reflect while watching the video, thus creating an enormous benefit to the learning process. Another participant mentioned that while watching the video, she noticed the enormous benefit of relating her fingers to the amount of words in an utterance. She believed that this allowed students to notice exactly where the problem was in order to be able to take corrective action. In addition, on the negative side, the three participants mentioned that despite using the teacher's correction as the last option to correct errors, a lack of time often made this option necessary to use.

The three participants detected that among the negative side effects the most significant problem was the incorrect behavior of providing the questionnaire before the lesson, which led them to over-correct students. This finding contradicts Williams' idea (1988) that a series of questions should be provided before observing a lesson to make teachers aware of what the focus of the observation is. However, in spite of this finding, the researcher considers that the observees have to know in advance the observation focal point for the observation to be reliable.

Re-teaching and Feedback

The final step focused on re-teaching Lesson Two by using the error correction criteria detected on each participant's self-assessment to re-teach the lesson to a different group of students one day after the video recording. The lesson was re-taught with a different group of students that shared similar characteristics to the first one. At this stage, a relaxed attitude on part of all the observees was noticed. The participants self-confidence with the task they had to develop and their knowledge about several ways errors can be corrected contributed to their comfort while teaching the lesson.

At this stage, the observer did not apply any questionnaires as it was unnecessary to follow the same procedures as in the previous stage. When the observer arrived at each classroom she collected the participant's self-evaluation and modified lesson plan in order for a comparison to be made with the error correction notes taken during the video recording (fig.6). The observer, after analyzing if the teacher' reflections were in alignment with her new behavior, summarized findings in a written form to generate support for the feedback session after class. Similar to step one, the observer first noted down positive comments (Vincent, 1991) in order to increase the observee's self-esteem and criticism to prompt reflective questions (Williams, 1988).

Oral error correction / teaching and re-teaching lesson 2

After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	14% - 9%	5% - 6%	3% - 4%	
Marked an error	11- 8%	4% - 6%	2% - 5%	
Corrected an error			26% - 19%	35% - 43%

Fig.6. *Observees error correction average while teaching and re-teaching a video recorded lesson*

Students produced as many errors as they might have produced in any other lesson (fig.6) since the production of errors is recognized as being a critical part of the learning process (Norrish, 1983). The difference between the initial lesson and the re-taught one was that the observees improved their behavior. However, it cannot be said that errors were treated properly 100% (Appendix 8) since teachers lacked sufficient practice to have modified their own behavior at this point.

Despite the good results that were achieved, two participants commented that this stage was demotivating and tedious. The fact that the same lesson had to be taught and re-taught reduced their interest as many of the students' behaviors became predictable. The same observees pointed out that if the focus of the observation was error correction, it would have been a better idea to apply their findings to a new lesson. There was only one participant who found it useful to have had the opportunity to be observed teaching the same lesson after discovering her weaknesses.

Nonetheless, the two participants who found the re-teaching exercise tedious mentioned that they enjoyed participating in the research, which will benefit their future teaching. One of them mentioned that every time she had been previously observed, she had adopted a defensive attitude to the observer's feedback. She said that self-assessing her own performance has let her consider that there are teaching routines that are incorrectly used that may provide incorrect learning results. Another participant mentioned that she has always thought it necessary to have an expert's opinion about her performance in order to improve her teaching performance and now she has realized that she can guide herself towards improvement when self reflecting on her routines. The third participant mentioned that she enjoyed participating in this project, but she perceived that her motivation decreased for the first stage due to the fact that the project required four lessons to be observed in a period of three weeks. However, this same participant observed that she is now aware of the need to reflect when teaching a lesson to modify her behavior.

Conclusion

EFL coordinators do not need to limit their job to supervising teachers' behavior and monitoring the achievement of the assigned curriculum. This paper provides evidence of the opportunities any coordinator has to encourage teachers to develop action research in their own classroom, which can provide enormous benefits.

The investigation that was carried out by a group of teachers and their coordinator shows that observation provided by an external observer allows the observee to perceive her strengths and weaknesses from the observer's perspective.

This may result in a change of behavior when sharing the observer's point of view, or the persistence in the incorrect attitude if there is disagreement. However, when teachers manage to reflect on their behavior by self-observing their performance through video, it may have a greater positive effect since teachers aware of their problems will modify their attitude when looking for self-development. "One of the main purposes of observation should be to make teachers at all stages more aware of alternatives and more conscious of how teaching can set into unquestioned ritual" (Maingay, 1992, p.194).

It is better, for any teacher, to self-analyze his performance than to receive an external observer's feedback. This investigation, which provided teachers the opportunity to re-teach the same lesson after being observed, in addition to have modified the behavior towards error correction, contributed toward changing some of the feelings of frustration experienced during the teaching stage. Teachers throughout the study found that, despite having teaching strengths, their weaknesses have to be modified or overcome in order to be successful when teaching a lesson.

References

Allright, D. and Bailey, K. (1991) *Focus on the Language Classroom*: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breen, M. (1984) Process Syllabuses for the Language Classroom, in Brunfit, G. 1984.

Brunfit, G. and Yule, G. (1984) *General English Syllabus Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Candlin, C. (1984) Syllabus Design as a Critical Process, in Brunfit, G. 1984.

Cripwell, K. and Geddes, M. (1979) *Microteaching and EFL TT*, London: University of London, Institute of Education.

Cohen, L. and Marion, L. (1989) *A Guide to Teaching Practice*. London: Routledge.

Fanselow, J. (1977) *Beyond Rashmon*: conceptualizing and observing the teaching act. TESOL Quarterly 11, 1, p. 17-41.

Harmer, J. (1991) *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman.

Hazman, M. (1994) *English as the International Language* ANDUI vol 1, May 1994, San Luis Potosí: Mexico.

Hubbard, P. et al. (1983) *A Training Course for TEFL*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hubbard, P. et al. (1990) *Errors and effective feedback*. CEILE handout. México: U. de G. México.

Krashen, S. (1987) *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986) *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press. In Hubbard, P. et al, 1990.

Maingay, P. (1988) Observation for Training, Development or Assessment? In Duff, T. (Ed.). *Explorations in Teacher Training - Problems and Issues.* Harlow, UK: Longman.

Medley, D.(1979) The effectiveness of teachers, in Richards, J. and Nunan, D. *Second Language Teacher Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ninne, P (1979) Experiments relating teachers' use of higher cognitive questions to students' achievements. Review of Education Research 49, p. 13-50. In Richards, J. and Nunan, D. *Second Language Teacher Education.* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Norrish, J.(1983) *Language Learners and their Errors.* Hong Kong: Macmillan.

Nunan, D.(1988) *Syllabus Design.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Parrot, M. (1993) *Tasks for Language Teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pescador, J.(1994) *Curriculum Básico Nacional.* Programa de Estudios para Bachillerato, México, Secretaria de Educación Pública.

Richards J. and Nunan D. (1990) *Second Language Teacher Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. and Lockhart, C. (1994) *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schratz, M. (1992) Researching while teaching: an action research in higher education. Studies in *Higher Education* 17, 1, p. 81-95. in Richards, J. and Lockhart, C. 1994.

SEP (Secretaria de Educación Pública) (1995) *Programa de Estudios por Asignatura.* Secretaria de Educación Pública, México: Fernandez Ed.

Sloane, R. (1994) *Pyramid: An EFL course for Adolescents.* México: MacMillan (Ed).

Stoddart, J.(1979) *Microteaching:* Working document 3, Current Practice in Britain with Special Reference to ESOL. London: University of London, Institute of Education.

Swan, J.(1992)   Metaphor in action: The observation schedule in a reflective approach to teacher education. *ELT Journal* Vol. 47. p.3, July 1993. Oxford University Press.

Vincent, M. (1991) *Classroom Observation.* Mexico Advanced Practical Diploma Handout. London: University of London.

Vincent, M. (1993) *Planning.* Mexico MATESOL handout. London: University of London.

Widdowson, H. (1984) *Educational and Pedagogic Factors in Syllabus Design,* in Brunfit, 1984.

Williams, M. (1988) A developmental review of classroom observation. *ELT Journal* Vol. 43, p.2, April, 1989.

Wajnryb, R.(1992) *Classroom Observation Tasks.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wragg, E. (1983) *A review of research in Teacher Education.* Windsor, Berks, NFER-Nelson.

Zeichner, K. and Liston, D. (1985) Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review,* 57, 1, 23-48. in Wallace, 1991.

The author

Alicia Cabrero holds an M.A in TESOL from the University of London, has 38 years of experience as a teacher and teacher trainer. She has presented at international conferences in Central America, South America and the Caribbean Islands. She is also the founder of 'Enlace', a Mexican Academic ELT Journal.

Appendixes

Appendix 1
Teaching lesson
Student' s level **Beginners** _Average age 12
Date: 06-03-2006
Observer's general comments_____

Sample of an error correction observation format

Oral error correction / teaching lesson 2						
After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Accuracy objective task	Fluency objective task	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error				******	*********** ***	
Marked an error				*************	*******	
Corrected an error					********	

Error	**Given treatment**
1. My father is **oldest** than my mother	1. T. corrected
2. The children **has** a new car	2. Ignored
3. The highest **building.** (Pronunciation)	3. Ignored
4. He **live** in Guadalajara	4. Self corrected
5. **Would** like some coffee (Pronoun)	5. Ignored
6. How many children **were** there?	6. T. corrected

Appendix 2
Teaching lesson 1
Student' s level **Beginners** _Average age 12
Date: 06-03-2006 _ Lesson: 1

Oral error correction / teaching lesson 1				
After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	2%	4%	8%	
Marked an error	1%	2%	2%	
Corrected an error			10%	71%

Error correction average in the teaching stage

Appendix 3
Feedback
Teaching Stage

Rapport	T. easily establishes rapport adapting his language and teaching strategies to the Ss. Age and needs.
Visual	Well designed and well exploited visuals
Questioning	Graded according to Ss. age and language knowledge.
Lesson Organization	Well organized with a progressive level of difficulty
Objective	Well defined and well accomplished.
Students	Student learner centered lesson
Pair/group work	Well organized

The students were interested in all the activities, accomplishing the expected goals, however:

• What did I (the observer) tell you, I was going to focus my attention on, while the lesson was in progress?
• Do you feel satisfied with the error correction system you used while teaching the lesson?
• How many errors did you decide not to correct?
• Did you notice that students several times used auxiliary did in sentences where "ed" was already added to the verbs? Why didn't you correct them?
• What strategy can you use to remember that you have to give students feedback at the end of the lesson?
• Why do you think students have problems applying the past tense?
• Why do you think most of the students in the group over generalized the "ed" past tense rule?
• Do you remember in what kind of activities is it recommended not to correct students?
• What was the last task objective?
• Did you correct errors properly in this task?
•Do you feel satisfied with the way you corrected errors in this lesson? How can you improve your system?

Feedback sample from the teaching stage

Appendix 4

Oral error correction / teaching lesson 1				
After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	2% - 6%	4% - 9%	8% - 16%	
Marked an error	1% - 4%	2% - 6%	2% - 8%	
Corrected an error			10% - 2%	71% - 49%

Observees error correction average when teaching (step 1) and re-teaching a lesson (step 2)

Appendix 5
Feedback
Re-teaching Stage

Warm up colors,this stage	Nice way to introduce a lesson with a game to reinforce is an easy task that prepares students for the presentation
English Language time.	It can easily be perceived that Ss. are spiking in English all the Well done.
Discipline of	Excellent way to correct discipline, asking individual questions Ss. that were distracted.
Written work vocabulary	It was a good idea to present the written form of the new when Ss. were familiar with the correct pronunciation.
Error correction of	Good way to ask individual students the correct pronunciation individual words, followed by choral repetition.
Sequence is	Nice sequence of the Lesson where a progressive level of difficulty reflected.
Skills	Good variety of tasks with a balance of the four skills.
Self-awareness	Excellent way to encourage students to notice the difference between singular and plural.

• Did you modify the lesson plan after you were observed the first time?
• Was it easier to correct errors after reflecting on the way you did during the first observation?
• Did you feel, after the first feedback, you had to correct every error students produced?

• What do you think provides more benefit: ignored or corrected errors in an accuracy-oriented task?

• Do you feel the way you corrected errors the second time was better than the first one?

• What benefits do you think re-teaching a lesson provide? Why?

• Did the feedback provided by the observer the first time you were observed contribute to change your behavior towards error correction?

• What method can you implement to improve error correction?

Feedback sample form, from the re-teaching stage (Step 2).

Appendix 6
Pre-teaching reflective questionnaire

• What is the lesson's objective?
• Who has to correct errors in class? Why?
• Why do errors occur in a lesson?
• When is it convenient not to interfere, correcting errors?
• How do you suggest error correction feedback has to be provided?

Responded version provided by one of the observees

Lesson's objective	By the end of this lesson students are going to be able to understand the difference between can and can't.
Errors occur because	a) Students lack of vocabulary.
	b) Students lack of accuracy.
	c) Lack of sufficient drilling.
	d) Teacher does not explain in a clear way.
	e) Student lack of attention when the teacher is explaining.

In class errors have to be corrected by the same student, by peers or by the teacher because she is a model for students

It is not convenient to interfere correcting errors when fluency is expected from students.

I can give error correction feedback
a) Recording the class and playing the tape with the students.
b) Writing down errors to reinforce the structure at the end of the class.

c) Developing exercises to reduce the students' problems.
d) Talk to individual students to reduce particular problems.

Questionnaire provided before video recording the planned lesson

Appendix 7
Self-assessment reflective questionaire

* Do you feel satisfied with the method you used to correct errors?
* Did you consider the task objective when correcting errors?
* Did you give students enough time to reproduce an utterance when incorrectly produced?
* Did you follow a special strategy to provide feedback? Why?
* Will this video contribute to modify your attitude towards error correction? How?

- I feel satisfied with the method 1 used to correct errors, but sometimes I interrupted students when asking for fluency. 1 have to pay more attention to that point.
- Students accomplished the objective in a very poor way. They were expected, by the end of the lesson to be able to use the present continuous form in a functional way. They learned the structure but they were not able to use it properly. The lesson plan was incorrectly designed, because the students lacked sufficient practice before asked to use the new structure in a communicative situation.
- I gave students enough time to reproduce an utterance when incorrectly produced, but students are used to teacher correction, therefore the method did not work out well.
- I did not follow a special strategy to provide feedback. I used whatever came to my mind at that moment. Feedback has to be given at the right time to provide the benefit, otherwise it may be a waste of time.
- I have to consider the task objective when correcting errors. In some tasks it is necessary not to correct them. Overcorrecting may intimidate students.
- The video recorded lesson will contribute to modify my attitude towards error correction. 1 have to be very careful when correcting errors because not all of the students reflect on their errors at the same speed.

Some error correction strategies work with some students and some do not. When correcting errors 1 have to face the group and be sure that al! the students are aware of what the problem is. I did not look at the group when correcting, and some students did not notice where the problem was. The LISC of fingers to express word order was successful in the lesson, students were able to rephrase the utterance after detecting the problem.

I noticed through the video that since 1 implemented this strategy suggested by the co-coordinator, my error correction method has improved. This provides enormous benefits to the students.

I am very happy to have participated in this project that will benefit my teaching, 1 hope all the teachers could have the opportunity I had to learn how to reflect on error correction.

Self-assessment sample from one of the teachers

Appendix 8
Oral error correction / teaching lesson 2

After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	14%	5%	3%	
Marked an error	11%	4%	2%	
Corrected an error			26%	35%

Observees error correction average in the video recorded lesson

Appendix 9

After the teacher	There was self correction	There was peer correction	There was teacher correction	Teacher ignored an error
Challenged an error	14% - 9%	5% - 6%	3% - 4%	
Marked an error	11- 8%	4% - 6%	2% - 5%	
Corrected an error			26% - 19%	35% - 43%

Observees error correction average while Teaching and Re-teaching a video recorded lesson