

An On-line Questionnaire Survey on Students' Views and Teachers' Practices in Corrective Feedback in Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages

Li Qin Wu¹, Yong Wu¹ & Xiangyang Zhang¹

¹ Anhui University of Finance and Economics, Bengbu, Anhui, China

Correspondence: Li Qin Wu, Languages and Media, AUFE. 962 Caoshan Road, Bengbu, Anhui, China. 233030.

Received: December 19, 2020; Accepted: January 3, 2021; Published: January 6, 2021

This research is financially supported by The Key Anhui Humanities and Social Sciences Planned Project Fund (AHSKZ2018D16); and by The Key Scientific Research Fund in Anhui University of Finance and Economics (AUFE) (ACKY1805ZDA).

Abstract

By conducting an on-line questionnaire survey, the article compared 97 international students' views with 23 Chinese teachers' practices on 8 issues in corrective feedback (CF) in teaching Chinese to speakers of other languages (TCSOL). Results revealed that students' views and teachers' practices conformed to each other in *cognition of committing verbal errors*, and in *whether to correct*; that they were mostly incongruent with each other in *what to correct*; that they were congruent with each other in *peer correction*, but not in *teachers' correction* or *self-correction*; that they coincided with each other in *indirect* correction, but not in *direct* one, nor in *immediate* correction or the *maximum correction frequency* in one class; and that CF mainly generated *positive psychological effects and better learning* on students, but its pedagogical efficacy was not evidently approved by the teachers. This research aimed at gaining a deeper insight into the effectiveness of CF in TCSOL to improve the quality of TCSOL.

Keywords: CF, TCSOL, students' views, teachers' practices, efficacy

1. Introduction

The research on the correlation between CF and views (beliefs/ attitudes/ preferences) of students and teachers in second language acquisition (SLA) or in foreign language learning and teaching (FLLT) has been conducted for many years by scholars or educators in the world, and a great deal has been achieved (Akiyama, 2017; Cinkara & Galaly, 2018; Couper, 2019; Horwitz, 1985; Xuan & Murray, 2020; Zhang & Rahimi, 2014). Entering the keywords *corrective feedback* between 1970 to 2020 in *Bing Academic*, a Microsoft search engine for academics, we obtained 178,000 academic results in English. They covered fields in linguistics, grammar, psychology, pedagogy, pragmatics, cognition, learning disability, computer, etc. and different aspects of learning, such as speaking, writing, listening, and communication, etc.

Students' views and teachers' practices in CF in TCSOL are closely related to the relation between CF and students' and teachers' views in L1 or L2 or FLLT. However, most of the previous researches were concentrated on CF of alphabetic or other languages, few of them were directed at those in the context of TCSOL.

Are students' views of CF congruent with teachers' practices in TCSOL? How effective is CF for students and teachers? What pedagogic implication will this study have for TCSOL, L1, L2 or FLLT? All of these are what we concern.

2. Review of Literature

Previous studies have demonstrated that CF types used by teachers tend to influence students' performance. Therefore, knowing how CF is classified is conducive to language learning and teaching. Through combining the most popular and influential data, we teased out three major taxonomies of CF techniques: six-type classification, two-type classification, and x-type classification.

2.1 CF Taxonomies

1. Six-type classification: The most oft-cited six-type classification was put forward by Lyster & Ranta (1997). They include *explicit correction*, *recasts*, *clarification requests*, *metalinguistic feedback*, *elicitation*, and *repetition* (they initially included in their analysis the seventh type *multiple feedback*). Of course, the six types are not used evenly, *recasts* are proven to be mostly used by teachers, although the least likely to lead to uptake of any kind. The six-type classification can also be seen in Ellis's (2009) work, the only difference is that Ellis used *paralinguistic signal* to replace *metalinguistic clues*.

2. Two-type classification: The initial six-type classification was then synthesized by Ranta & Lyster (2007) into two broader categories: *reformulations* (including *recasts* and *explicit correction*) and *prompts* (including *clarification request*, *metalinguistic feedback*, *elicitation* and *repetition*). Ellis (2009) differentiated *input-providing* (including implicit: *recast*; explicit: *explicit correction*) from *output-prompting* (including implicit: *repetition*, *clarification request*; and explicit: *metalinguistic explanation*, *elicitation*, and *paralinguistic signal*). Two-type CF classification is also reflected in *explicit* and *implicit* or *direct* and *indirect* researches (Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011; Ellis et al, 2009; Karim & Nassaji, 2020; Kim et al. 2020; Lyster et al, 2013; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; Suh, 2014).

3. X-type classification: This is especially used to refer to CF types in TCSOL. We categorize it into *x-type* for the time being because no consensus so far has been reached on the number of CF types in TCSOL. For example, one of the findings in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom by Fu and Nassaji (2016) revealed that there were 12 types of CF.

2.2 Eight Issues in CF Study

Horwitz's (1985) study suggests that a systematic assessment of student beliefs would increase student learning and satisfaction in the foreign language methods class. Horwitz's (1988) creation of the well-known Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) questionnaire has greatly stimulated scholars interest in L2 learner beliefs (Loewen et al., 2009). Researches indicate that learners' beliefs in SLA or FLLT might be accountable for learners' behaviors, learning strategies, motivations, and proficiency (Ghabanchi & Meidani, 2012; Zhu & Wangle, 2019).

To study students' and teachers' views and CF types is to a certain extent to find clues to the following eight issues based on the early five fundamental issues (Ellis, 2009; Hendrickson, 1978): 1. Whether to correct; 2. What to correct; 3. Who is to correct; 4. When to correct; 5. How to correct; 6. Which type of CF is the most effective; 7. How often is to correct; and 8. What effects of CF.

Forty-eight thousand two hundred results relevant to the eight issues in CF study between 1970 to 2020 on *Bing Academic* prove that although the answers to the eight questions are controversial, this does not prevent scholars from researching them. For decades of years, scholars have been revolving around the issue of CF and learners' and teachers' beliefs, attitudes, preferences, views, etc. to explore the correlation between them with the common goal to improve efficacy of L1 or L2 or FLLT.

Whether to correct? For the first question, is it necessary to correct the errors? When unable to recognize their own errors, students need some professional assistance from their teachers. A survey on college students' attitudes toward error correction indicates that students do want to be corrected, and their eagerness to be corrected is more than what teachers feel they should be (Hendrickson, 1978).

What to correct? For this questions, different answers are provided by different scholars or teachers in different classes. Most researchers suggest that teachers should not correct all the errors but correct those that interfere with the meaning of a message or comprehension of the intended meaning of the speaker or writer. Teachers are expected to focus attention on a few error types rather than try to address all the errors learners made (Ellis, 2009). Errors should be corrected when the goal is learning, but not at all times, and it is useless for acquisition (Amara, 2015). Correction of *global* errors is more crucial than that of *local* one because it clarifies the intended message more than the correction of several local errors in the same sentence (Burt, 1975). *Phonemes* and *words* are what to be corrected in pronunciation (Couper, 2019).

Who is to correct? The third question is about whether it is teachers or learners themselves or peers that should correct the errors. Earlier studies reveal that correcting students' errors is mainly teachers' responsibility (Hendrickson, 1978). But later, being more proficient in pedagogy, teachers do not correct learners' errors all the way. They tend to lead learners to find problems themselves so that they can be aware of the importance of autonomous learning and achieve more. Chandler's (2003) findings indicate that students feel that they learn more from *self-correction*. Besides, teachers encourage *peer correction* to let learners to help each other and learn from each other. Sato's (2013) study reveals that positive beliefs lead to positive *peer interaction* and *peer CF*.

When to correct? Concerning this question, the heated debate over *immediate* or *delayed* correction has never ceased. Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk's research (2016) displays that *immediate* feedback is not felt comfortable, and students are discouraged from speaking in a classroom atmosphere. Amara's (2015) findings show that the *timing* of correction is determined by the type of errors committed. For pronunciation or grammatical errors, *immediate* correction is preferable. But for communicative purpose, *delayed* correction is more preferred. Li et al (2016) find both the *immediate* and the *delayed* feedback result in gains in grammaticality judgment test scores, with *immediate* feedback showing some advantage over *delayed* feedback.

How to correct? For the fifth question, different correction methods are applied in different situations. Couper (2019) provides diverse correction methods used by participants. Yoshida (2008) finds that teachers choose *recasts* correction methods because of the time limitation of classes and their awareness of learners' cognitive styles. They also choose *elicitation* or *metalinguistic feedback* when they think learners can work out correct forms themselves. However, for most of the learners, they prefer to be able to think about their errors and the correct forms before receiving correct forms by *recasts*. Cinkara & Galaly's (2018) finding reveals that students show high preference of *specific* written feedback to facilitate the correction of mistakes. Omidpour & Bavali's (2017) study suggests that teachers with normative styles are likely to use oral CF techniques more frequently than those with higher diffuse-avoidant style score.

Which type of CF is the most effective? Concerning this question, the answers also differ from different angles, different learners and teachers. Li's (2010) findings indicate that there is a medium overall effect for CF, and the effect of *implicit* feedback is better retained than that of *explicit* feedback. On the other hand, Maleki & Asl (2015) confirm the efficacy of *explicit* feedback strategies than that of *implicit*. Learners who use explanation as an *explicit* CF strategy achieve higher scores than those who use *recast* and *error code feedback* strategies. Ölmezer-Öztürk & Öztürk (2016) argue that different types of CF might result in quite different students' perceptions. For example, *recasts* and *clarification requests* are perceived as ambiguous, and meta-linguistic feedback as anxiety-provoking and difficult to comprehend. Chandler's (2003) study proves that *direct* correction is best for producing accurate revisions in writing, and students prefer it for its being the fastest and easiest. Masantiah et al (2018) find that different CF is supposed to be used for different learners considering their basic knowledge.

How often is to correct? By *how often is to correct*, we mean the frequency of a teacher's maximum correction in one class that is acceptable to both teachers and students. After examining individual versus team differences, Pyke & Sherlock (2010) find that teams tend to receive a greater amount of CF, whereas individuals require greater *motivational feedback* (providing motivation to the learner to perform a task or to learn). However, it seems that few researches in the previous studies were on this issue, and it was not singled out for elaboration, but was mingled with *whether or which or what to correct*.

What effects of CF? Whether CF contributes to L1 or SLA or FLLT is another controversial issue. Much research evidence in L1 or L2 indicates that teachers' feedback focusing principally on correcting the errors is not likely to produce substantive or even measurable improvement in the quality of students' learning (Baleghizadeh & Dadashi, 2011). Results of devoting much valuable time to correcting students' mistakes may not be satisfactory as was expected (Hendrickson, 1978; Truscott, 2007). Interestingly, some studies in writing have proven the effectiveness of CF in promoting acquisition (Ellis, 2009; Kang & Han, 2015; Tanveer et al, 2018).

Different from the above studies, this article focused on the major CF issues by making a qualitative and quantitative comparison study between the types of CF students expect the teacher to use and those teachers actually use in the context of TCSOL, aiming at probing into the depth of CF and contributing to researches in TCSOL, L1, L2 or FLLT.

3. Research Design

In this research, the authors used an online questionnaire survey (Note 1) to investigate congruence and incongruence between students' views and teachers' practices in CF in TCSOL.

3.1 Hypotheses

- H₁: Students' and teachers' cognition of committing verbal errors conform to each other.
- H₂: Students' view and teachers' practice in whether to correct conform to each other.
- H₃: Students' view and teachers' practice in what to correct conform to each other.
- H₄: Students' view and teachers' practice in who is to correct conform to each other.
- H₅: Students' view and teachers' practice in when(immediate) to correct conform to each other.
- H₆: Students' view and teachers' practice in how to correct conform to each other.

H₇: Students' view and teachers' practice in how often is to correct conform to each other.

H₈: Students' view and teachers' perception in what effects of CF produces conform to each other.

3.2 Instrument

Wen juan xing, an online questionnaire survey software (SPSS) in China was used separately used to distribute, collect and analyze the data of students and teachers. Then, the proportion and correlation analysis between students' views and teachers' practices in CF in TCSOL was further evaluated by Pearson chi-square test accomplished by cross-tabs.

To ensure the validity of the survey, a 5-point Likert scale was used to measure students' views and teachers' practices in CF in TCSOL. Two types of scale were adopted: for students, it was from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. For teachers, it was from *not true of me at all* to *always true of me*. The reliability coefficient values of students (0.77) and teachers (0.62) are over 0.6. The number of respondents of students(97) and teachers(23) might be one of the major factors that lead to the different results of Cronbach α coefficients.

3.3 Participants

Among 97 international students who participated in this questionnaire survey, 54.64% were male and 45.36% female. They came from 33 countries all over the world, including Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bénin, Burundi, Cambodian, Chile, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominica, East Timor, Egypt, England, Ethiopia, France, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Madagascar, Mexico, Mongolia, Moroccan, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Russia, South Africa, South Korea, Thailand, Ukraine, Vanuatu, and Vietnam. Their length of studying Chinese ranged from 5 months to 5 years. A great majority of them were studying in different universities in Anhui Province.

Among 23 Chinese teachers of TCSOL from different universities in Anhui Province, 21.74% were male and 78.26% female. Their ages varied from 26 to 60 years old, but 60.87% were 31~40 years old. 69.56% majored in linguistics, of which 30.44% in education, and psychology, etc. They taught students at the beginning, intermediate and advanced levels in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Their length of TCSOL was from 0 to 33 years, but 73.91% had over ten-year teaching experience.

3.4 Materials

The questionnaire survey for students comprised three parts. The first part was about demographic data composed of 4 issues: gender, nationality, length of Chinese study, and the university where he or she was learning. The second part was composed of 24 items. It covered the students' *cognition of committing verbal errors in Chinese classes*, CF 7-W issues in *whether, what, who, when, how, how often, and what effects*. The third part included 11 items concerning students' psychological responses to CF in Chinese classes and learning effects of CF. In each of the above items, there are five choices for them to choose from: 1. strongly disagree; 2. disagree; 3. not sure; 4. agree; 5. strongly agree.

For teachers, the questionnaire survey contained three parts, too. The first part was also about demographic data composed of 4 issues: gender, age, the major of the final degree, and length of TCSOL. The second part was the same as the students'. The third part included 4 items concerning teaching effects of CF. In each of the above sentences, there are five choices for them to choose from: 1. It is not true of me at all; 2. It is not true of me; 3. not sure; 4. It is usually true of me; 5. It is always true of me.

In the questionnaire, the items of the same category were not arranged in sequence but scattered through the whole questionnaire. Some items were affirmative, some negative to avoid the subjects' inertial choosing, consequently affecting the quality of the survey. But in this article, the items are arranged alphabetically and taxonomically for the sake of convenient reading.

4. Results and Analysis

The survey started from November 2018 and ended in January 2019. After 3 months survey, we obtained the valid results from 97 foreign students from all over the world and 23 Chinese teachers. We compared students' views with teachers' practices in CF in Chinese classes, and obtained the following results.

4.1 Comparison on the Cognition of Committing Verbal Errors

The first comparison was about students' and teachers' cognition of committing verbal errors (see Table 1a).

Table 1a. Comparison on the cognition of committing verbal errors % (N)

Item		1	2	3	4	5
It is natural for foreign students to commit	*S	1.03(1)	1.03(1)	10.31(10)	48.45(47)	39.18(38)
*verbal errors in the process of Chinese learning.	*T	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	43.48(10)	56.52(13)

*S: students; *T: teachers *verbal: spoken and written language

100% of teachers against 87.63% of students thought it natural for foreign students to commit verbal errors in the process of Chinese learning. 10.31% of students were not sure about that, and 2.06% disagreed or strongly disagreed to it. But generally, like teachers, a majority of students agreed to it.

Pearson chi-square test was used for further analysis (see Table 1b).

Table 1b. Pearson chi-square test: Comparison on the cognition of committing verbal errors

Item	Cognition of committing verbal errors
Value	4.259 ^a
df	4
Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)	.372

The result reveals that the asymptotic significance (2-sided) is more than 0.05, indicating that students' and teachers' cognition of committing verbal errors is not significantly different, hence this result accepts H₁.

4.2 Comparison on Whether to Correct

Then the authors compared students' view and teachers' practice in whether it is necessary to correct students' verbal errors (see Table 2a).

Table 2a. Comparison on whether to correct % (N)

Item		1	2	3	4	5
It is very necessary to correct students' verbal errors.	S	0.00(0)	1.03(1)	12.37(12)	51.55(50)	35.05(34)
	T	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	43.48(10)	56.52(13)

For the necessity of CF, 86.6% of students agreed or even strongly agreed to whether to correct. Similarly, 95.65% of teachers did usually or always practice it.

Pearson chi-square test was used for further analysis (see Table 2b).

Table 2b. Pearson chi-square test: Comparison on whether to correct

Item	Whether to correct
Value	4.113 ^a
df	3
Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)	.250

Pearson chi-square test reveals that the asymptotic significance(2-sided) is more than 0.05, i.e. this result accepts H₂.

4.3 Comparison on What to Correct

What is to correct? Should all the mistakes or grammar mistakes or the mistakes that interfere with comprehensibility be corrected (see Table 3a)?

Table 3a. Comparison on what to correct % (N)

Item		1	2	3	4	5
✓ a. Teachers should correct every mistake students make.	S	3.09(3)	8.25(8)	11.34(11)	52.58(51)	24.74(24)
	T	21.74(5)	52.17(12)	8.70(2)	13.04(3)	4.35(1)
✓ b. Teachers should not correct students' pronunciation errors in class unless they interfere with comprehensibility.	S	29.90(29)	37.11(36)	18.56(18)	10.31(10)	4.12(4)
	T	0.00(0)	21.74(5)	43.4(10)	21.74(5)	13.04(3)
✓ c. Teachers should not correct students' grammar errors in class unless they interfere with comprehensibility.	S	26.80(26)	39.18(38)	17.53(17)	13.4(13)	3.09(3)
	T	0.00(0)	30.43(7)	39.13(9)	26.09(6)	4.35(1)
✓ d. Teachers should correct students' common	S	3.09(3)	13.40(13)	37.11(36)	36.08(35)	10.31(10)
	T	0.00(0)	4.35(1)	8.70(2)	60.87(14)	26.09(6)
✓ e. Teachers should correct students' oral errors.	S	1.03(1)	1.03(1)	8.25(8)	61.86(60)	27.84(27)
	T	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	26.09(6)	69.56(16)	4.35(1)
✓ f. Teachers should correct students' written errors.	S	1.03(1)	0.00(0)	5.15(5)	55.67(54)	38.14(37)
	T	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	73.91(17)	26.09(6)
✓ g. Teachers' error correction should focus on grammatical errors.	S	5.15(5)	12.37(12)	27.84(27)	48.45(47)	6.19(6)
	T	0.00(0)	39.13(9)	43.48(10)	17.39(4)	0.00(0)

As for *a*, students' view was quite different from teachers' practice. 77.32% of students expected the teachers to correct *every* mistake they made, but only 17.39% of teachers usually or always practiced it. Similarly, in *b* and *c*, 67.01% and 65.98 % students expected teachers to correct their *pronunciation* and *grammar* mistakes respectively in class even if they did not interfere with comprehensibility, however only 21.74% and 30.43% of teachers respectively did so. For *d*, 86.96% of teachers corrected *common* or *habitual* errors, but only 46.39% of students agreed or strongly agreed to them, 37.11% of students against 8.70% of teachers were not sure about it. For *e*, compared with 89.70% of students who agreed or strongly agreed to *oral correction*, 73.91% of teachers practiced it. 26.09% of teachers against 8.525% of students were not sure about it. But for *f*, the percentage of students' (93.81%) view and that of teachers' (100%) practice in correcting students' written errors were almost congruent with each other. As to *g*, 54.64% of the students agreed or strongly agreed to focusing on grammatical errors, but only 17.39% of teachers practiced it. 43.48% of teachers against 27.84% of students were not sure about it.

Pearson chi-square test was used for further analysis (see Table 3b).

Table 3b. Pearson chi-square test: Comparison on what to correct

Item	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Value	41.509 ^a	17.590 ^a	12.526 ^a	12.827 ^a	10.116 ^a	3.223 ^a	15.912 ^a
df	4	4	4	4	4	3	4
Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)	.000	.001	.014	.012	.039	.359	.003

We can see that all the asymptotic significances(2-sided) are less than 0.05 except *f*, indicating that students' view and teachers' practice in what to correct are significantly different in most cases, hence the results accept *written errors*, but reject H_3 in most cases.

4.4 Comparison on Who is to Correct

Who is to correct? Is it the teacher or the student himself or herself or the peer that should correct the errors (see Table 4a)?

Table 4a. Comparison on who is to correct % (N)

Item		1	2	3	4	5
✓ a. Students don't like teachers to correct their errors in class.	S	38.14(37)	38.14(37)	11.34(11)	10.31(10)	2.06(2)
	T	0.00(0)	17.39(4)	47.83(11)	17.39(4)	17.39(4)
✓ b. Students' verbal errors should be corrected by teachers because they are specialists.	S	2.06(2)	3.09(3)	17.53(17)	46.39(45)	30.93(30)
	T	8.70(2)	21.74(5)	21.74(5)	39.13(9)	8.70(2)

✓ c. Students prefer to be corrected by peers in a small group work rather than by the teacher in front of the entire class.	S	11.34(11)	26.80(26)	34.02(33)	25.77(25)	2.06(2)
	T	0.00(0)	17.39(4)	43.48(10)	30.43(7)	8.70(2)
✓ d. Teachers are supposed to guide students to find the correct answer by themselves.	S	0.00(0)	2.06(2)	10.31(10)	55.67(54)	31.96(31)
	T	0.00(0)	17.39(4)	8.70(2)	34.78(8)	39.13(9)

The table indicated that 76.28% of students disagreed or strongly disagreed to *a*, in other words, they preferred *teachers' correction*. This percentage formed a sharp contrast with that of teachers' (17.39%). 11.34% of students against 47.83% of teachers were not sure about it. 77.32% of students agreed or strongly agreed to *b*, but only 47.83% of teachers believed so, and 30.44% of teachers did not think it true for them. *Peer correction* in *c* was agreed or strongly agreed to by 27.83% of students, and practiced by 39.13% of teachers. 34.02% of students against 43.48 of teachers were not sure about it. In *d*, 87.63% of students approved of *self-correction*, and 73.91% of teachers practiced it.

Pearson chi-square test was used for further analysis (see Table 4b).

Table 4b. Pearson chi-square test: Comparison on who is to correct

Item	a	b	c	d
Value	34.154 ^a	15.994 ^a	6.337 ^a	10.643 ^a
df	4	4	4	3
Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)	.000	.003	.175	.014

It is found that all the asymptotic significances (2-sided) are less than 0.05 except *c*, indicating that students' view and teachers' practice in *teachers' correction* and *self-correction* are significantly different, hence the results reject *teachers' correction* and *self-correction*, but accept that of *peer correction*, partially accept *H₄*.

4.5 Comparison on When to Correct

In this research, *delayed CF* was not examined because of the limited length of the paper. The comparison only involved *immediate CF* in *pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, language use, reading aloud, and answering questions* (see Table 5a).

Table 5a. Comparison on immediate CF % (N)

Item		1	2	3	4	5
✓ a. Teachers should immediately correct students' errors in class.	S	0.00(0)	5.15(5)	15.46(15)	59.79(58)	19.59(19)
	T	8.70(2)	43.48(10)	34.78(8)	13.04(3)	0.00(0)
✓ b. Teachers should immediately correct students' errors in pronunciation.	S	0.00(0)	1.03(1)	9.28(9)	56.70(55)	32.99(32)
	T	0.00(0)	56.52(13)	4.35(1)	30.43(7)	8.70(2)
✓ c. Teachers should immediately correct students' errors in vocabulary.	S	0.00(0)	3.09(3)	12.37(12)	58.76(57)	25.77(25)
	T	0.00(0)	43.48(10)	39.13(9)	17.39(4)	0.00(0)
✓ d. Teachers should immediately correct students' errors in grammar.	S	1.03(1)	3.09(3)	7.22(7)	58.76(57)	29.90(29)
	T	4.35(1)	43.48(10)	26.09(6)	17.39(4)	8.70(2)
✓ e. Teachers should immediately correct students' errors in language use.	S	0.00(0)	3.09(3)	8.25(8)	62.89(61)	25.77(25)
	T	4.35(1)	39.13(9)	8.70(2)	39.13(9)	8.70(2)
✓ f. Teachers should immediately correct students' errors in reading aloud even by interrupting them.	S	1.03(1)	5.15(5)	15.46(15)	51.55(50)	26.80(26)
	T	43.48(10)	21.74(5)	26.09(6)	8.70(2)	0.00(0)
✓ g. Teachers should immediately correct students' errors in answering questions even by interrupting them.	S	3.09(3)	5.15(5)	9.28(9)	55.67(54)	26.80(26)
	T	43.48(10)	34.78(8)	21.74(5)	0.00(0)	0.00(0)

As the table indicated that 79.38% of students agreed or even strongly agreed to *a*, but only 13.04% of teachers usually practiced it with zero *always* practicing it. Likewise, students had stronger views than teachers' practices in *immediate correction* in all the other errors in their learning process. The percentages of students' views in

immediate correction in *pronunciation* (89.69%), *vocabulary* (84.53%), *grammar* (88.66%), *language use* (88.66%), and *reading aloud* (78.35%) in *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, and *f* were 50.56%, 67.14%, 62.57%, 40.83%, and 69.65% higher than those of the practices of teachers (39.13%, 17.39%, 26.09%, 47.83%, and 8.70%) respectively. For each of the above items the percentages of being *not true at all* or *not true* for the teachers reached 56.52%, 43.48%, 47.83%, 43.48%, and 65.22% respectively. It was noted that 39.13%, 26.09%, and 26.09% of teachers were not sure whether they should correct students' mistakes immediately respectively in *vocabulary*, *grammar*, *reading aloud even by interrupting them*. None of the teachers corrected students' mistakes *immediately even by interrupting them* when they were *answering questions* in *g*, for 78.26% of teachers it was not true at all or not true, 21.74% were not sure about it; but a great majority of students (82.47%) agreed or strongly agreed to it, only 8.24% disagreed or strongly disagreed to it.

Pearson chi-square test was used for further analysis (see Table 5b).

Table 5b. Pearson Chi-square Test: Comparison on immediate CF

Item	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Value	46.398 ^a	55.967 ^a	47.785 ^a	44.824 ^a	32.576 ^a	57.921 ^a	64.498 ^a
df	4	3	3	4	4	4	4
Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

It is found that all the asymptotic significances(2-sided) are less than 0.05, indicating that students' views on *immediate* correction are significantly different from the teachers' practices, thus the results reject H₅.

4.6 Comparison on How to Correct

The sixth comparison was CF type preferred by students and practiced by teachers (see Table 6a).

Table 6a. Comparison on how to correct % (N)

Item		1	2	3	4	5
✓ a. Teachers are supposed to correct directly the students' errors.	S	0.00(0)	5.15(5)	13.4(13)	57.73(56)	23.71(23)
	T	0(0)	56.52(13)	17.39(4)	21.74(5)	4.35(1)
✓ b. When a student makes a mistake, the best strategy is to say directly, "No, you should say...."	S	7.22(7)	9.28(9)	25.77(25)	41.24(40)	16.49(16)
	T	17.39(4)	21.74(5)	39.13(9)	21.74(5)	0.00(0)
✓ c. Indirect CF is better than direct one, for it does not hurt students' self-esteem.	S	5.15(5)	14.43(14)	29.90(29)	32.99(32)	17.53(17)
	T	0.00(0)	8.70(2)	52.17(12)	30.43(7)	8.70(2)

It was found in *a* that *direct* CF was agreed or strongly agreed to by a great majority of students (81.44%), but only 26.09% of teachers practiced it. 56.52% teachers did not practice it. 57.73% of students accepted *direct* correction in *b*, but only 21.74% of teachers practiced it, and 39.13% did not practice it. In *c*, in order not to hurt students' self-esteem, *indirect* CF was agreed or strongly agreed to by 50.52% of students, but practiced by 39.13% of teachers. 29.90% of students against 52.17% of teachers were not sure about it.

Pearson chi-square test was used for further analysis (see Table 6b).

Table 6b. Pearson chi-square test: Comparison on how to correct

Item	a	b	c
Value	41.136 ^a	11.423 ^a	5.298 ^a
df	3	4	4
Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)	.000	.022	.258

It is found that the asymptotic significances (2-sided) in *a*, *b* are less than 0.05, indicating that students' view and teachers' practice in *direct* correction are significantly different, hence the results reject the *direct* correction. But

the asymptotic significance (2-sided) of *c* is more than 0.05, indicating it accepts the *indirect* correction. Therefore, the results partially accept H_6 .

4.7 Comparison on How Often is to Correct in One Class

The seventh comparison was about students' view and teachers' practice in the maximum correction frequency in one class. We provided the options *1-2 times*, *3 times*, *4 times*, *5-10 times*, *limitless*, and *not sure* for them to choose from (see Table 7a).

Table 7a. Comparison on the maximum CF in one class % (N)

Frequency		1-2	3	4	5-10	Limitless	Not sure
What is your maximum CF in one class?	S	13.40(13)	13.40(13)	3.09(3)	31.96(31)	24.74(24)	13.40(13)
	T	21.74(5)	52.17(12)	0.00(0)	0.00(0)	8.70(2)	17.39(4)

This table revealed that 73.91% of teachers' practice in the maximum correction was no more than three, but only 26.80% of students agreed to it. 31.96% of students accepted 5-10 times correction, 24.74% of them even maintained there should be no limit. The proportion of being *not sure* was similar to each other.

Pearson chi-square test was used for further analysis (see Table 7b).

Table 7b. Pearson chi-square test: Comparison on the maximum CF in one class

Frequency	1-2	3	4	5	6-10	Limitless	Not sure
Value							24.757 ^a
df							6
Asymp. Sig.(2-sided)							.003

It is found that the asymptotic significance(2-sided) is less than 0.05, indicating that students' view and teachers' practice in the maximum correction frequency in one class are significantly different, hence the result rejects H_7 .

4.8 Comparison on CF efficacy

As for this part, it is difficult for the researchers to give the same options for the subjects to choose from because it concerns positive or negative effects of CF on students' psychology and students' learning effects, which quite differ from the actual teaching efficacy confirmed by teachers. Therefore, the data were calculated separately.

4.8.1 CF Psychological and Learning Effects on Students

This part concerned students' psychological responses to CF and learning effects (see Table 8).

Table 8. CF psychological and learning effects on Students %(N)

Item	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Negative response to correction</i>					
If the teacher keeps correcting me, I will					
✓ a. be unwilling to speak.	32.99(32)	23.71(23)	28.87(28)	8.25(8)	6.29(6)
✓ b. be afraid to speak. Teachers' correction in class makes me	42.27(41)	27.84(27)	20.62(20)	7.22(7)	2.06(2)
✓ c. feel humiliated.	47.42(46)	28.87(28)	14.43(14)	6.19(6)	3.09(3)
✓ d. feel nervous and anxious.	47.42(46)	22.68(22)	21.65(21)	7.22(7)	1.03(1)
✓ e. feel shy.	45.36(44)	19.59(19)	26.80(26)	6.19(6)	2.06(2)
✓ f. be reluctant to answer the questions for a period of time.	43.30(42)	26.80(26)	19.59(19)	8.25(8)	2.06(2)
<i>Positive response to correction</i>					
✓ g. I feel lucky when my teachers correct my errors in class.	10.31(10)	8.25(8)	24.74(24)	24.74(24)	31.96(31)
✓ h. I feel grateful to my teacher for correcting my errors.	7.22(7)	4.12(4)	23.71(23)	23.71(23)	41.24(40)

✓ i. I have learnt a lot from teachers' corrections of other students' errors.	1.03(1)	6.19(6)	17.53(17)	49.48(48)	25.77(25)
✓ j. I have learnt a lot from teachers' corrections of my errors.	0.00(0)	2.06(2)	15.46(15)	48.45(47)	34.02(33)
✓ k. Teachers' correction is of great help to my Chinese learning.	0.00(0)	1.03(1)	6.19(6)	54.64(53)	38.14(37)

We assumed that *teachers' keeping correcting* would make students *unwilling to speak* or *afraid to speak*. However, the results in *a* and *b* showed that 56.7% and 70.11% of students disagreed or strongly disagreed to them respectively. We assumed that *teachers' correction* would make students *feel humiliated, nervous and anxious, shy*, and even *reluctant to answer the questions for a period of time*. On the contrary, 76.29%, 70.10%, 64.95% and 70.10% in *c, d, e, and f* disagreed or strongly disagreed to it respectively. What's more, 56.70% *felt lucky* when their teachers corrected their errors in class, and 64.95% *felt grateful* to their teacher for correction, as were revealed in *g* and *h*. From *i, j* and *k*, it was learned that students learnt much whether from teachers' correction of other students' mistakes(75.25%) or from teachers' correction of their own mistakes(82.47%). Teachers' correction is beneficial to students' Chinese learning(92.78%). In other words, these results showed that CF mainly produces positive psychological effects and better learning on students.

4.8.2 CF Teaching Effects by Teachers

As for CF efficacy conformed by teachers in Chinese classes, we focused on the actual effect of CF in the teaching process. Will students commit the same mistakes after correction (see Table 9)?

Table 9. CF Teaching Effects by Teachers %(N)

Item	1	2	3	4	5
✓ a. After correction, students would not answer the questions enthusiastically.	13.04(3)	47.83(11)	21.74(5)	17.39(4)	0.00(0)
✓ b. I try in vain to correct students' mistakes in class because they will be repeated	4.35(1)	39.13(9)	43.48(10)	13.04(3)	0.00(0)
✓ c. The mistakes I have corrected are not repeated in class, but are after class.	0.00(0)	13.04(3)	47.83(11)	39.13(9)	0.00(0)
✓ d. The mistakes I have corrected in class are not repeated in class.	4.35(1)	26.09(6)	52.17(12)	17.39(4)	0.00(0)

As *a* indicated that 60.87% did not think that CF would affect students enthusiasm in answering the questions although 21.74% were not sure of it, and 17.39% approved it. *b* displayed that 13.04% of teachers thought that CF was useless, and students would repeat the mistakes. But 43.48% were not sure about it, and less than half of the teachers (43.48%) didn't think it true to them. *c* indicated that 39.13% believed that the mistakes were not repeated in class, but were repeated after class. However, 47.83% were not sure about it. 13.04% didn't think it true at all for them. *d* revealed that only 17.39% of teachers believed that students would not repeat the corrected mistake, 52.17% were not sure of it, and 30.44% did not approve it. The results suggested that it was still not certain that CF was very pedagogically effective, and students would not repeat the mistakes after correction. Therefore, the results in 4.8.1 and 4.8.2 partially accept H₈.

5. Discussion

Results revealed that both students and teachers conformed to each other in cognition of committing verbal errors in the process of Chinese learning. They were congruent with each other in *whether to correct*, which confirmed the results in the early study (Hendrickson, 1978). However, students' views and teachers' practices in *what to correct* were quite different in many aspects. Most students (77.32%) hoped that teachers could correct every mistake whether they interfered with comprehensibility or not, but only 17.39% of teachers practiced it. A great majority of teachers (86.98%) just focused on common or habitual errors. More students (54.64%) than teachers (17.39%) paid attention to correcting grammatical errors. Of course, they coincided with each other in *written errors*. These results considerably matched those controversial researches in early times (Ellis, 2009). As for *who is to correct*, most students preferred teachers' correction, but fewer teachers practiced it. More students than teachers approved *self-correction*. Although they consisted with each other in *peer correction*, the percentages of view (27.83%) and practice (39.13%) were not high. These results agreed to some extent with those in the previous

studies (Chandler, 2003; Ellis, 2009; Hendrickson, 1978; Sato, 2013). With regard to *when to correct*, students' view on *immediate correction* were significantly different the teachers' practice. Most students preferred *immediate correction*. As far as *how to correct* is concerned, it is a very complicated issue, for it could be understood in a broad or narrow sense. In the broad sense, it refers to direct or indirect CF. But in the narrow sense, it involves specific CF methods and teachers' attitudes. In this study, broadly speaking, students and teachers consisted with each other in *indirect* correction, but not in *direct* one. Practically, how to correct is contingent on the type of courses, the level of learners, the beliefs of learners and teachers. This result agreed with the earlier researches, too. In terms of the maximum correction frequency in one class, students' view and teachers' practice were also measurably different. 73.91% of teachers' practice in the maximum correction was no more than three, but 56.65% of students accepted 5-10 times correction or limitless correction. As for the CF efficacy, from both students' and teachers' perspectives, CF mainly generated positive psychological effects and better learning effects on students, but it did not prove distinctly that CF was very effective, and students would not repeat the mistakes after correction.

6. Pedagogic Implications

Based on the results discussed above, the present study on CF might have implications for TCSOL, L1, L2 or FLLT. To satisfy students' CF need and minimize their repetition of mistakes, it is suggested that teachers correct as many mistakes as possible. Next, compared with peer correction, most students preferred teachers' correction because they were considered authoritative and their corrections tended to be reliable. Thus teachers are suggested to spend more time in CF. Besides, since self-correction under teachers' guidance was welcomed by the majority of students, it should be practiced more in and after class. Furthermore, most students reported a preference for immediate correction of pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, language use, reading aloud and answering questions without caring about being interrupted, such results may eliminate teachers' uncertainty about when to correct mistakes or reduce their delay in immediate correction. Finally, as to frequency of CF, teachers can perform 5-10 times correction or even more in one class period without worrying that it would result in negative effects of CF.

7. Limitations and Prospective Researches

This article compared students' views with teachers' practices in CF in the context of TCSOL. As CF is an indispensable part in the process of teaching, our findings may be of some help to TCSOL, L1, L2 and FLLT.

But there are still some limitations in the research. Firstly, the research methodology was simple. It was only based on the network survey, lacking of class observations or students' performances. As a result, *the most effective type of CF* was not examined. Secondly, it just involved part of the contents in CF research for the limited length of the survey, and it did not cover all the detailed or specific issues. For instance, *delayed correction* was not involved. Thirdly, students at different levels and teachers teaching different courses were mixed together to compare, they were not divided into groups according to levels and courses. This might influence the results of the survey. Finally, cultural factors were not covered to go into the deeper side of the research.

Prospective researches may require diverse research methods and more detailed design to explore the relationships between students' views with teachers' practices in CF in the context of TCSOL. They can be interdisciplinary, taking more psychological and cultural factors into account, instead of a pedagogical longitude study.

8. Conclusion

To learn or teach a foreign language or L2 well is a hard journey. SLA study reveals that result of L2 acquisition is an *implicit* system, which concerns the "mental representation". Instruction can only affect *explicit* knowledge, but acquisition involves the development of *implicit* knowledge, and few scholars, if any, believe that explicit knowledge turns into implicit knowledge (VanPatten et al., 2020: 237, 288). Hence to improve the efficacy of CF and the quality of language learning and teaching, there is still a long way to go.

References

- Akiyama, Y. (2017). Learner beliefs and corrective feedback in telecollaboration: A longitudinal investigation. *System*, 64, 58-73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.12.007>
- Amara, N. (2015). Errors correction in foreign language teaching. *The Online Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 5(3), 58-68.
- Baleghizadeh, S., & Dadashi, M. (2011). The effect of direct and indirect corrective feedback on students' spelling errors. *Profile, Bogotá, Colombia*, 13(1), 129-137.
- Burt, K. M. (1975). Error analysis in the adult EFL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 53-63.

<https://doi.org/10.2307/3586012>

- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743\(03\)00038-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9)
- Cinkara, E., & Galaly, F. J. (2018). EFL students' and teachers' attitudes towards written Feedback in writing classes: A case of Iraqi high-schools. *I-manager's Journal on English Language Teaching*, 8(1), 44-55. <https://doi.org/10.26634/jelt.8.1.13947>
- Couper, G. (2019). Teachers' cognitions of corrective feedback on pronunciation: Their beliefs, perceptions and practices. *System*, 84, 41-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.04.003>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development, *L2 Journal*, 1, 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2009). *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching*. Clevedon, North Somerset: United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847691767-016>
- Fu, T. F., & Nassaji, H. (2016). Corrective feedback, learner uptake, and feedback perception in a Chinese as a foreign language classroom. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 159-181. <https://doi.org/doi:10.14746/ssl.2016.6.1.8>
- Ghabanchi, Z., & Meidani, E. N. (2012). Beliefs about language learning and strategy use: The case of Iranian non-English majors. *World Journal of English Language*, 2(1), 21-30. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v2n1p21>
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62(8), 387-398. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1978.tb02409.x>
- Horwitz, E. K. (1985). Using student beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18, 333-340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.1985.tb01811.x>
- Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The beliefs about language learning of beginning university foreign language students. *Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283-294. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1988.tb04190.x>
- Kang, E. Y., & Han, Z. H. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12189>
- Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research*, 24(4), 519-539. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818802469>
- Kim, Y. J., Choi, B., Kang, S., Kim, B., & Yun, H. (2020). Comparing the effects of direct and indirect synchronous written corrective feedback: Learning outcomes and students' perceptions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 53(1), 176-199. <https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12443>
- Li, S. F. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in SLA: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 309-365. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x>
- Li, S., Zhu, Y., & Ellis, R. (2016). The Effects of the timing of corrective feedback on the acquisition of a new linguistic structure. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100(1), 276-295. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12315>
- Loewen, S., Li, S. F., FEI, F., Thompson, A., Nakatsukasa, K., Ahn, S., & Chen, X. Q. (2009). Second language learners' beliefs about grammar instruction and error correction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 93(1), 91-104. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00830.x>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1-40. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000365>
- Maleki, N. A., & Asl, H. D. (2015). A comparison study of the effects of implicit and explicit corrective feedback on EFL learners levels of grammatical accuracy. *English Literature & Language Review*, 2(8), 82-88.
- Masantiah, C., Pasiphol, S., & Tangdhanakanond, K. (2018). Student and feedback: Which type of feedback is preferable? *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2018.07.020>
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E., & Öztürk, G. (2016). Types and timing of oral corrective feedback in EFL classrooms: Voices

- from students. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 10(2), 113-133.
- Omidpour, E., & Bavali, M. (2017). The relationship between frequency of oral corrective feedback and identity processing style among Iranian EFL teachers. *Journal of Studies in Learning and Teaching English*, 6(1), 23-45.
- Pyke, J. G., & Sherlock, J. J. (2010). A closer look at instructor-student feedback online: A case study analysis of the types and frequency. *MERLOT Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 110-121.
- Ranta, L., & Lyster, R. (2007). A cognitive approach to improving immersion students' oral language abilities: The awareness-practice-feedback sequence. In R. DeKeyser (Ed.), *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141-160. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667275.009>
- Sato, M. (2013). Beliefs about peer interaction and peer corrective feedback: Efficacy of classroom intervention. *The Modern Language Journal*, 97(3), 611-633. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2013.12035.x>
- Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 286-306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.011>
- Suh, B. (2014). The effectiveness of direct and indirect coded written feedback in English as a foreign language. *Second Language Research*, 50(3), 795-814.
- Tanveer, A., Malghani, M., Khosa, D., & Khosa, M. (2018). Efficacy of written Corrective feedback as a tool to reduce learners' errors on L2 writing. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 8(5), 166-180. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v8n5p166>
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16, 255-272. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.06.003>
- VanPatten, B., Smith, M., & Benati, A. G. (2020). *Key Questions in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge/ New York/Port Melbourne/New Delhi / Singapore: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108761529>
- Xuan, V. H., & Murray J. C. (2020). Corrective feedback: Beliefs and practices of Vietnamese primary EFL teachers. *Language Teaching Research*, 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820931897>
- Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78-93. <https://doi.org/10.2167/la429.0>
- Zhang, L. J., & Rahimi, M. (2014). EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes. *System*, 42, 429-439. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.01.012>
- Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. L. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: A large-scale survey, *Language Awareness*, 28(2), 139-161. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>

Note

Note 1. In this questionnaire survey, the question items in Wu's(2020) research were used.

Wu, Liqin (2020). Gender and learners' beliefs in corrective feedback in learning Chinese as a foreign language: A network questionnaire survey report. *International Educational Research*, 3(4), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.30560/ier.v3n4p1>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).