TEACHER RESPONSE TO NON-NATIVE SELECTION ERRORS IN COLLEGE- LEVEL ESL FRESHMAN COMPOSITION

Jessica Gerson
University of Arizona

Within a larger theoretical framework exploring the role of creative (i.e. rule based) and routine (e.g. conventionalized) language in L1/L2 use and acquisition, this exploratory pilot study examines an ESL instructor's perception of, and responses to, non native-like (i.e. non-routine) language selection at the sentence level in a college level ESL composition class. Three final student papers were analyzed to determine the degree to which the instructor addressed non-native selection errors (NNSEs). The instructor was interviewed regarding his perceptions of NNSEs and was also asked to participate in an error correction task. The data indicate that NNSEs were often not addressed in final drafts. Further, the error correction choices made by the instructor were a product of a) political beliefs regarding expectations for L2 learners of a global communication tool such as English, b) lack of perception of NNSEs, and c) underlying beliefs regarding second language acquisition and teachability of routine language. Finally, the study design was critiqued and the implications for teacher training, both pedagogical and sociopolitical, are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

An important, but also often overlooked, issue in SLA literature is that of the contrast between creativity and routine in language use and development. 'Creative' refers to the aspect of language involving systematic rules which are internalized and which will govern the production of novel utterances (Mitchell & Myles, 1998). This sense of language as a system of rules and a lexicon of vocabulary items has also been referred to in the literature as the 'open choice principle' or 'slot-and-filler model', and has been cited as the "most normal way of seeing and describing language" (Sinclair, 1991, p. 109). Instruction that emphasizes the teaching of grammar rules, whether explicit or implicit, in context or not, can be said to fall within the domain of creative language teaching in that students are expected to internalize rules and apply them 'creatively' or 'generatively' in different situations. However, research from fields as diverse as corpus linguistics, sociolinguistics, and psycholinguistics have also raised the following question: If language can be explained as a set of grammatical or syntactic rules and a set of lexical items, then why are some phrases, while clearly grammatically correct, simply not acceptable? Why is one *perfectly honest*, not *flawlessly honest*? Why is one *deeply absorbed* in one's work, rather than *strongly absorbed*? Why can *suspicion* be aroused, but not *distrust?* And why do we speak of *strong support*, but *powerful computers?* Surely there is some other factor at work here, restricting the distribution of lexical items. Several theorists, most notably the British linguist Sinclair, assert

that language can be viewed as a set of choices that are constrained *both* by grammar and common usage; these restrictions may be referred to as conventionalized language. Such language has an important sociolinguistic function: the consensus of native English speakers to say *start a fire* rather than *begin a fire* may seem arbitrary and illogical, yet the language of anyone who says that she *began* a fire would be immediately marked as 'odd' or somehow 'foreign'. Native speakers do not use all grammatically correct versions of an utterance, and once a particular phrase has been established by a particular language community to express a particular concept, other equally logical and semantically acceptable terms will not be produced (just imagine a politician referring to *arms of total annihilation* instead of *weapons of mass destruction*) Observations such as these have given rise to the term *native-like selection* (Pawley & Syder, 1983, p. 191), an elusive concept that is even more elusive in the language classroom. For the purposes of this paper, the terms native-like selection, conventionalized language, and routine will be used interchangeably in that they all stand as alternatives to purely novel language. The term non-native selection error, or NNSE, will be used to refer to a non-conventional, non-native like, choice.

Second language researchers are recognizing the role of routine language in both first and second language acquisition and use. According to Mitchell and Myles, "formulas and routines play an important part in everyday language use by native speakers; when we talk, our everyday L1 utterances are a complex mix of creativity and prefabrication" (1998, p. 12). In a recent overview of language teaching methodology, Rogers outlines the ten most likely future directions that language teaching will take. One of the entries, entitled 'Lexical Phraseology', is rooted in the corpus based observation that "only a minority of spoken clauses are entirely novel creations and […] memorized clauses and clause sequences form a high proportion of the fluent stretches of speech heard in everyday conversation" (p. 4). Further, "language corpora […] have provided hard data to support the speculative inquiries into lexical phraseology of second language acquisition researcher" (p. 4). Many other investigators have provided evidence for the use of routine in second language acquisition in both classroom and naturalistic scenarios (e.g., Wong-Fillmore, 1979; Wray, 2002).

Language educators are faced with the challenge of developing linguistic competence, and one aspect of this competence is native-like selection. The expectations teachers have for the final state of a learned L2 vary by context and socio-political beliefs about language. For example, there may be different goals for Asian businesspeople using English with other speakers of Asian languages than there are for the recent immigrants struggling to communicate with native speakers in an environment of low tolerance for linguistic deviation. Those teaching in a second language or immigrant context in particular are often faced with students' desire to sound as native-like as possible and their frustrations at not being able to do so. Complicating this issue is the fact that often, teachers have been trained in an environment that does not discuss the routine, conventionalized nature of language. Often instructors find

themselves needing to explain something about a language that can not be attributed to a rule, and feel chagrin at 'not knowing the answer'. Language mistakes that involve rules- article usage or subject verb agreement, for example- often do not cause as much anxiety as non-native like selection errors, because the latter cannot be easily explained, if at all. To this end, teachers may often ignore such errors as 'unteachable' or 'explainable on a case by case basis', and often tell students that 'it's just the way the language works'. While some of these replies may be perfectly true, given corpus studies and the routine nature of language, not having a sense of the conventionalized realities of language (and therefore having no recourse but to respond in such a manner) may undermine a teacher's confidence.

The problem of native-like selection arises at all levels of language training and much empirical research is needed for the various stages of development. One specific and important classroom learning context involves the teaching of L2 writing. Several studies have addressed the use of prefabricated language in this domain, focusing mainly on the presence or absence of native like phraseology (e.g., Granger, 1998). A study by Howarth (1998) examining the non-native like 'deviations' found in L2 writing suggested that L2 learners' low awareness of NNSEs could be traced back to teachers who do not understand the "phraseological mechanisms of the language" (p. 186) and therefore could not help students to conceptualize and address this important phenomenon in their writing. It is upon this intriguing premise that this investigation, an exploratory pilot case study focusing on an ESL composition instructor, is based. The students whose work was analyzed are matriculated students at the University of Arizona and are expected to complete the same course requirements as their native speaking counterparts in other English composition sections. In order to enroll in such classes, students must display a high level of proficiency in the English language and receive a satisfactory score on the TOEFL examination. Nevertheless, the writing of ESL students in such classes generally contains non native-like selection errors, such as the following: "Luke rescues the princess and gains a reward from her." In this example, while the meaning is clear, word choice is clearly marked as non-native. At this point the instructor must make several decisions: Should one's grade be affected by such language errors? Is native like selection a reasonable goal for L2 writing? If so, should class time be devoted to teaching it? While teachers may not subtract points for individual errors, the overall level of what researchers have termed phraseological competence (Howarth, 1998) leads to the ease with which the reader understands the text and, presumably, may affect the final grade. This is perhaps the most important underlying question of this study: Can one penalize students for lack of competence in an aspect of language that is not fully understood and has no defined pedagogical theory to support classroom application? Faced with this dilemma, many instructors choose not to address such errors. In this vein, the present study seeks to understand the factors involved a single instructor's perceptions of, and responses to, non- native like selections. Only when the choices made by instructors are understood can important adjustments to

teacher training curricula be made. Further, the purpose of language learning is not served when a non-native like selection is ignored or marked 'unclear' or 'awkward', and the student has no native speaker intuition or learned strategies to address the issue.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following questions were addressed through data collection and analysis:

1) Does the instructor address NNSEs in written form (on drafts/finals)? If so, how?
2) What are instructor's perceptions of NNSEs?
3) Are these perceptions reflected in the way such errors are treated?
4) Were issues of creativity vs. routine, prefabricated language, collocation, corpus linguistics, or native like selection discussed in the instructor's language training courses?

Participants

The participant in this exploratory case study was a 27-year-old male composition instructor at the University of Arizona with five years of experience teaching writing to non-native speakers of English. The instructor has a M.A. in TESOL and is currently a doctoral student in a Second Language Acquisition and Teaching program. The three essays from which the instructor's comments were obtained and analyzed were from three international students (two from Japan and one from Korea) enrolled in the instructor's composition class, an ESL section of the first year composition course which all undergraduate students at the University of Arizona are required to take.

Design

For the study, first, both the total number of errors in the student text and the total errors addressed by the instructor (in written form) were tallied. The errors were then divided into two categories: 1) errors of native-like selection (NNSEs) and 2) other (including rule-based grammar, positive comments, content, organization, and mechanics). Errors were classified as NNSEs if a student's structure or word choice was marked as non-native sounding by the researcher's native speaker intuition. The instructor was then given an error correction task in which one was asked to make written corrections to a text containing both NNSEs and rule-based, grammatical errors (appendix A). The instructor was also interviewed to obtain contextual information regarding treatment of NNSEs (appendix B).

In the following task, the participant was asked to address errors in a short ESL text in accordance with the following prompt (see appendix A): "Imagine that this is a draft of a summary of Star Wars that your students will revise and hand in to you for a grade. Make corrections to the text."

The text contained a total of three grammatical errors. On lines 5 and 9, there are two subject-verb agreement errors (i.e., 'he start his journey' and 'Luke return to his world'). On line 5, there is a misuse of the definite article (i.e., 'The hero meets the new friends', when the idea of friends had not yet been referred to). The text also contained six errors that could be classified as NNSEs or collocational (i.e. lines 3, 6, 7, and 9):

Line 3: "he had to make difficult journey to encounter his destiny"
Line 3: "Luke is barred from adventure"
Line 6: "Luke meets the [sic] new people and begins a companionship with them"
Line 7: "has many battles"
Line 6: "he [..] rescues the princess and gains a reward from her"
Line 9: "Luke return [sic] to his world with the accomplishment of trials and is admired."

DATA ANALYSIS

The participant made two in-text corrections, one marginal comment, and one end comment, four instances of feedback in total. First, the subject-verb agreement errors on lines 5 and 9 were addressed. Then in the margins next to line 5, the participant wrote "subject verb agreement" and at the end of the paragraph wrote "Watch subject-verb agreement. Verbs in third person singular end in s". The participant did not address any of the errors categorized as NNSEs.

Interview Data

The participant's answers to nine interview questions regarding grading policies and beliefs about the nature of language, language teaching, and the teaching of writing were recorded. The recording session lasted about an hour (See appendix B).

Figure 1: <u>Response to Essay (Student 1)</u>

	Final Essay	Percent of Total Errors
NNSE errors addressed	1	2.6
Other errors addressed	15	39.5
NNSE errors not addressed	8	21.1
Other errors not addressed	14	36.8
Total Errors	38	100.0
Grade/Pages in text	B	5

Figure 2: Response to Essay (Student 2)

	Final Essay	Percent of Total Errors
NNSE errors addressed	2	4.0
Other errors addressed	15	30.0
NNSE errors not addressed	13	26.0
Other errors not addressed	20	40.0
Total Errors	50	100.0
Grade/Pages in text	B	6.5

Figure 3: Response to Essay (Student 3)

	Final Essay	Percent of Total Errors
NNSE errors addressed	1	2.6
Other errors addressed	15	38.5
NNSE errors not addressed	7	17.9
Other errors not addressed	16	41.1
Total Errors	39	100.0
Grade/Pages in text	B	6

Figure 4: Mean Percent NNSE/Other Addressed

	Percent NNSEs addressed	Percent of other addressed
Student 1	11.1	51.2
Student 2	13.3	42.9
Student 3	12.5	48.5
Mean percent addressed	12.3	47.5

Interview Data

The manner in which NNSEs are addressed must be assessed within the context of an instructor's theoretical and political beliefs. From the interview data, several themes emerged that stand out as factors in the participant's treatment of error: 1) beliefs about the nature of routine language and language in general, 2) beliefs about the 'teachability' of routines and native-like selection, and 3) socio-political ideology regarding English as a global tool of communication and the resulting implications for pedagogy.

Theme 1: The Nature of Routine Language and Collocations

1a. Lack of commentary/ uncertainty regarding the role of routine in language
      When asked to define sentence level competence (an important level of analysis for routine language), the participant stated that it was the ability to "recognize what is a complete sentence. And how words operate within a sentence. Like what an adverb does. Knowing what kinds of words follow a noun. Basic English sentence structure". This response makes reference to a syntactic, "slot-and-filler" view of language competence, i.e., the role and placement of various grammatical elements in the sentence and recognizing syntactically 'complete' sentences. However, in response to a direct question about the role of routine in language (see Appendix A), he stated that "Yes, a lot of language is…routine. There are collocations and phrases that we say in certain situations." It is interesting to note that a neutral question regarding sentence level competence prompted the participant to refer to syntax and other issues of grammar, which, presumably, can be taught through rules. This belief appears to manifest itself in the participant's tendencies in both the student texts and the error correction task, in which the only errors addressed were grammatical and rule based. However, when directly confronted with the concept of routine language, the participant is aware of its role. These responses indicate that the participant may still be assessing the various functions of creativity and routine in language and language acquisition.
      Another interesting insight into the participant's perception of routine language was in response to the question of when one might choose to ignore such errors. According to the participant, "If the person is at a level of just barely being able to put together sentences, then this [addressing grammar errors] is all I would do." This may imply a belief that routine language and collocations should not be expected until basic syntactic and grammatical competence was attained, indicating that the acquisition of routine language is *not* a part of gaining basic competence and has no effect on the syntactic or grammatical decisions made by the learner. If one considers the role of grammatical syntactic collocations such as "leery of" and larger lexicalized units such as "the more you study, the more you learn", it might be argued that attaining collocational competence is a part of attaining native like selection abilities for syntax and grammar. In other words, pure syntax and grammar may not be enough for native like selection in sentence structure.

1b. The nature of routine language is mysterious and hard to describe
      The participant used an interesting metaphor to refer to routine language. According to the instructor, gaining language proficiency is a matter of "learning grammar rules and then taking collocations out of the ether" (making motion of plucking imaginary routine words and phrases out the air above his head). This comment appears to indicate that the participant feels that the origin of such language is mysterious and unknown.

Theme 2: The 'Teachability' of Routine Language and Collocations

2a. Non-native like selection errors are teachable on an individual basis.

   When asked how he would address a collocational error in which it looked as though a student had incorrectly chosen a synonym out of the dictionary, the participant replied that "It happens a lot. I would probably talk to them in person. It's a verbal thing. It's best to discuss errors of collocation in person. On a case by case basis. […] I talk about them individually… in [private scheduled] conferences."

2b. Collocations are difficult to teach or even not teachable at all:

   The participant reported that students often want to learn new words and "when and how they are used". When asked how he would respond to a student request for a class workshop, he responded, "In one day? That's not something I could do in one day…There's no way you could…vocabulary is an ongoing process... you can't give them a list to memorize. I think I would…devote a day to denotation vs. connotation. They'll go to the thesaurus and pick a word that they think sounds best….but it's never right." Upon being given the example of collocational errors such as "*Yesterday I began a fire. I commenced a fire. I initiated a fire.",* the participant responded, *"*Um….there are two things you could say… it's a compound verb issue-- like to start a fire, they just go together. You could ignite a fire…. More scientific…descriptive…like people versus person. Person is often used in legal documents….people can refer to a whole group, a culture… but I was thinking on my feet."

   The final comment indicates that the explanation was the best that could be done at such short notice. This possibly implies the participant suspects that there should be a more satisfactory explanation to these questions.

2c. Collocations in student work are suspicious.

   The instructor was presented with a sample student sentence that contained an obvious lexicalized phrase, "The movie captured the hearts of millions of people around the world." When asked for a reaction to it, the participant responded that he would "think that they read it somewhere" and "would be on the lookout for what else they had taken." This reference to a native-like, collocationally appropriate phrase as "taken" language is an interesting one that warrants further investigation. If such language is taken, where does one draw the line between identifying and using native-like collocations and 'stealing' or plagiarism?

Theme 3: Socio-Political Principles Regarding Expectations for Native Like Selection

3. Expecting native-like selection may not be necessary, given the global nature of English use and the varied linguistic backgrounds of English L2 learners.

An English language instructor's political views regarding World Englishes and English as a global tool of communication strongly affect one's classroom policies. The participant's political views regarding native like selection were clearly defined, "First, I don't know if it is a reasonable goal- if they are not in a English speaking context….Also if they won't be operating [in the future] in a native English speaking context… they don't need it. I mean, what you really mean is speaking like an American, writing like an American, talking like an American…..American English has its own vocabulary, its own tone, its own feel, as opposed to Singapore or Indian English…. its own discourse, rhetoric…. So why should they sound like Americans?"

When asked what the ideal goal, or final state, for a learner of English, the participant responded, "Good enough for whatever the context is that they are going to be working in. Depends on their careers- but I don't necessarily think that they should attain native proficiency."

Theme 4: Pedagogical Conclusions Drawn by Participant

4. Clarity and comprehension- not native like selection- are the appropriate expectations for ESL composition students.

When asked if students should be penalized for NNSEs, the participant replied: "If it's small, but not a major thing- I would not dock points for it. Because I don't think it's a major issue in comprehension." In this response, it can be seen that his views translate into classroom practice.

Error Correction Task

As discussed above, the participant was asked to complete an error correction task in which both grammatical and NNS errors occurred. The participant addressed two of the three grammatical errors (both subject-verb agreement) but did not address the article use error or any of the non-nativelike selection errors. The participant was also asked to comment on the error correction choices as part of the interview. Interestingly enough, when asked why the NNSEs were not addressed, the participant commented that they were "not even picked up on", except for the final error, which was the most egregious of the set. In light of the interview data, the error treatment data makes sense: The instructor is not interested in focusing on or even remarking upon native speaker selection skills. It is not considered sociolinguistically or politically appropriate, and given that many of the students will be returning to their home countries, the participant has chosen not to select it as a classroom goal. Further, as mentioned above, as long as a sentence is clear and comprehension is not impeded, NNSEs are not an issue. This belief may explain why five out of the six NNSEs in the correction task were not even registered: it was never a focus in grading, so they ceased to be detected. It appears that the participant advocates greater linguistic tolerance for marked, non-native sounding language. Further, the participant stated that the responsibilities of a composition teacher included more important issues such as critical thinking, textual analysis, and especially matters of contrastive rhetoric. In light of these

attitudes, then, the lack of attention to NNSE on the error completion task is quite understandable.

Error Correction of Student Essays

For the same reasons cited above, the error treatment pattern found by the data is to be expected. The most salient data is the percent of the NNSEs present per paper which were addressed by the instructor. As per table 4, the percentages for students 1, 2, and 3 were 11.1%, 13.3%, and 12.5%, respectively. The average response per paper to NNSEs for this case study was 12.3%. Again, given the instructor's pedagogical and sociopolitical beliefs regarding native-like selection, these results are not surprising. Also, it is important to compare the treatment of NNSEs to the treatment of the other errors. As indicated by table 4, several errors that were non-NNSEs, such as content, grammar, and mechanics, were not addressed either (52.6% mean of total non-NNSE errors).

Below are the four instances in which the instructor addressed a native-like selection error in the student essays. The underlined sections indicate the part of the sentence referred to. In the first instance, the student wrote ""In Star Wars, Luke and Dark Vader fight on opposite sides. They try to kill each other for their force", to which the instructor replied in the margin, "What does 'for their force mean'?" In the second instance, the student's text read "The answer hinds [sic] in the state how woman appears in stories. Women appear in complete figures. Compared to a man, a woman is perfect from the beginning." The instructor's comment: "I don't understand". The third instance of response to an NNSE was a reference to the above example, when the phrase 'complete figure' was used for a second time ("She was strong, wise, and courageous from the beginning. In other words, she appeared as a complete figure"). The instructor response: "Ah. So this means mature and wise?" Finally, the last example was as follows: "The helper is a very important element in the hero myth; it makes the story to be more reasonable." The instructor comment: I think 'believable' is the word you want."

In accordance with the interview data, the instructor remarks upon NNSEs only when comprehension is impeded, and then only to ask for clarification. For student 2, he addresses a clarified reappearance of the NNS with an encouraging comment, but no second reference to the manner in which it obscures the content. One possible interpretation of these corrections in that they are non-judgmental in nature: if it affects reader comprehension, it is addressed, but if the surrounding text can make it clear in a subsequent appearance, no correction is deemed necessary. As indicated by the data, several NNSEs were not addressed, such as in the following examples: "Susanoo kept doing malicious mischief to her on many occasions", and "As he was full of sorrow and spiritless…" Presumably, as per the interview data, if the intended meaning of these sentences were clear, a comment would be unnecessary.

Correlation between Final Grade and NNSEs

The instructor's conscious decision regarding NNSEs is that they should not affect the final grade, which is determined largely by content and organization. By looking at the student texts, it was clear that the final grade was attributable to factors other than grammar and NNSEs. The following end comment was a typical example: "I think you've done a good job of showing the roles and expectations of women in Star Wars. What I don't see, however, is a discussion of how these expectations appear in the other myths. You must use the sources you incorporate into your works cited page".

In each of the cases, the instructor appears to justify the grade with comments regarding the content of the work. References to language and clarity were not made.

DISCUSSION

As a case study with limited data, the only conclusions that can be drawn are with regards to the instructor in question and how these specific beliefs are reflected through his pedagogy. This work was intended as an exploratory pilot study that would illuminate possible correlations between teacher beliefs regarding native-like selection and classroom practice. It was hoped that various themes would emerge from the data that might be explored further in new contexts, the ultimate goal being to make recommendations for teacher training and development programs. The data in this study indicate that some non-native college level composition students do make NNSEs, and that in this case, the majority of them were not addressed in final drafts nor were a factor in assigning a grade. While the participant does appear to incorporate routine into a personal theory of language, he has also chosen not to make such competence a priority in ESL instruction. The instructor asserts that one's beliefs about the expected final state of a language should be tempered by an awareness of English as a language of global communication and that therefore, tolerance for non-native selection should increase. As a result of these beliefs, the participant did not address such errors unless they impeded comprehension. The data also indicate that there may be a correlation between the degree to which relevant theory was covered during teacher training, and actual classroom practice. As per the data, the instructor viewed formulaic language as coming from the "ether", thus implying that there was something inexplicable or mysterious about it, which may have led to commentary on how difficult it was to teach. According to the participant, little time had been spent during his graduate education on the issues discussed in this paper. While quite familiar with the contribution of corpus studies to linguistics and the idea of collocations, the participant stated that a connection between the concept of creativity vs. routine and pedagogy was not explored during training, nor were specific strategies for addressing non-native like selection errors.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TEACHER TRAINING

The contributions made by corpus linguistics and phraseological studies are being appreciated at the theoretical level, but they must be appreciated at the pedagogical level as well. It is imperative that a graduate education in language teaching highlight the contribution of routine language, prefabricated phrases, and collocation to idiomatic and stylistically appropriate speech and writing, as well as help teachers-in-training bridge the gap between theory and classroom practice. Specifically, it is suggested that graduate level coursework provide a theoretical framework for understanding these issues, including the exploration of grammatical theories which accommodate the formulaic and collocational realities of language (e.g., Sinclair, 1991, Hunston and Francis, 2000). Further, the relationship between corpus findings, pedagogy, and materials selection and design should be explored as well (e.g. Wray, 2000, 2002; Liu, 2003). Teachers-in- training should be introduced to the literature on the subject, which ranges from the general role of formulaic language in communicative competence (e.g., Wray, 1999) to the more specific concerns of second language acquisition, including its role in speech acts and intercultural communication (Wray, 2002) and specific skills such as writing (e.g., Howarth, 1998; Granger, 1998). As per the conclusions drawn by this study, it would be advisable to encourage teachers to reflect upon their own views of formulaic language and routine, as well as their beliefs regarding expectations for second language learners, so that they can make informed pedagogical decisions.

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was not to make specific recommendations for the teaching of formulaic language but rather to explore connections between instructor beliefs and practice, as well as to provide evidence that more emphasis on this area is needed in teacher training. Before specific suggestions can be put forward, more studies with a wider range of participants and data are needed on teachers' perceptions of the phraseological nature of language and how they correlate to classroom practices, as well as more studies, both corpus and classroom based, of NNS use of routine language. Further, extensive analysis of the textbooks used in teacher training courses must be made. Are the issues of routine and conventionalized language, collocation, and native-like selection discussed? If so, in which contexts? Anecdotally, it appears that the topic is broached in chapters on vocabulary learning, but less in the teaching of grammar or ESL writing. This reveals much about the current consensus regarding the usefulness of this knowledge to the various domains of language education. Further, several issues arise in the study of native-like selection, and instructors' perceptions of it, which must be addressed. A serious issue in studies examining these kinds of errors is that there is no easily quantifiable threshold for 'non-nativeness'. Phrases may be perceived as NNSEs by different native speakers with different levels of tolerance or different linguistic

experiences. There is a fine line between what seems collocationally acceptable and what does not, as in the following example: "Anakin and Soosanoo lost their ways and started an unfavorable journey." Different readers may judge the adjective "unfavorable" as differentially acceptable. For the purposes of this study, it was deemed marked enough to count as an error of collocation: journeys are not typically described as "unfavorable". Even though the meaning was clear to the researcher, the use of this adjective seemed somehow non-conventional. Another issue is that some errors may appear to be NNSEs, but if a corpus were to be consulted, it might be discovered that native speakers do produce such a form, combination, or structure. An example from the present study is the sentence identified by the researcher as a NNSE: "He travels between planets and has many battles." The phrase "has many battles" may seem acceptable to some, whereas to the researcher, the proposition that a person "has" battles is not collocationally correct. However, upon examination of a native speaker corpus, it might be found that "has" *is* used in such a context. Future research on formulaic language in general, and teacher perceptions specifically, will need to find a way to control for the uncertainties mentioned above.

REFERENCES

Clark, E. (2003). *First Language Acquisition.* New York: Cambridge
　　　University Press.
DeCarrico, J. (2001). Vocabulary teaching and learning. In M. Celce-
　　　Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign
　　　language* (pp. 285-297). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
Glaser, R. (1998). The stylistic potential of phraseological units in the
　　　light of genre analysis. In A.P. Cowrie (Ed.), *Phraseology:
　　　Theory, analysis, and applications* (pp. 125-144). Oxford:
　　　Clarendon Press.
Granger, S. (1998). Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing:
　　　Collocations and formulae. In A.P. Cowrie (Ed.), *Phraseology:
　　　Theory, analysis, and applications* (pp. 145-
　　　160). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hakuta, K. (1974). Prefabricated patterns and the emergence of
　　　structure in second language acquisition. *Language Learning,
　　　24*(2), 287-298.
Howarth, P. (1998). The phraseology of learners' academic writing. In
　　　A.P. Cowrie (Ed.), *Phraseology: Theory, analysis, and
　　　applications* (pp. 161-188). Oxford: Clarendon.
Hunston, S., & Francis G. (2000). *Pattern grammar*. Philadelphia: John
　　　Benjamins.
Liu, D. (2003). The most frequently used spoken American English
　　　idioms: A corpus analysis and its implications. *TESOL
　　　Quarterly, 37*(4), 671-700.

Mitchell, R. & Myles, F. (1998). *Second language learning theories.*
    New York: Oxford University Press.
Myles, F., Mitchell, R, & Hooper, J. (1997). Interactive chunks in
    French L2: A basis for creative construction? *Studies in
    Second Language Acquisition*, *21*, 49-80.
Pawley, A., & Syder, F. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory:
    Native like selection and native like fluency. In J. Richards
    and R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication.*(pp.
    191-226). London: Longman.
Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in
    language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rodgers, T. (2001). Language teaching methodology. *Eric
    Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.* Washington,
    DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford
    University Press.
Wong-Fillmore, L. (1979). *Individual differences in second language
     differences in language ability and language behavior*. New
    York: Academic Press.
Wray, A. (1999). Formulaic language in learners and native speakers,
    Language Teaching, 32 (1), 213-231.
Wray, A. (2000). Formulaic sequences in second language teaching:
    principles and practice. *Applied Linguistics, 21* (4), 463-489.
Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic language and the lexicon.* New York:
    Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX A: ERROR CORRECTION TASK

Summary of Star Wars: Luke as a Hero Figure

Luke was a young man who grew up on a desert planet with his aunt
and uncle. Like many heroes in many myths, he had to make a difficult
journey to encounter his destiny and save the universe. Luke is barred from the
adventure at first because he has to help his aunt and uncle on their farm. When
they are killed, however, he start his journey. The hero meets the new people
and begins a companionship with them. He travels between planets and has
many battles, and he successfully rescues the princess and gains a reward from
her. He destroys the enemy space station with the Force. Finally, Luke return to
his world with the accomplishment of trials and is admired.

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How was grading for you this semester?
   (*used to elicit information regarding time devoted to grading*)

2. Did you correct first drafts? How do you attend to them? How are first drafts attended to in class (e.g. students peer review, workshops)?

3. What is your philosophy on correcting final drafts? What do you normally do on them? What do you feel responsible for?

4. Do you ever get ESL language burnout?
   (*referring to the inability, after long term exposure to L2 text, to determine whether something sounds 'right'*)

5. You made no mark for sentence _____. Why was that? (*Referring to NNSEs in the error correction task*)

6. Respond to the following sentence: "Language learning is largely a matter of learning rules and applying them in new situations so that you can express whatever you need to."

7. Respond to the following sentence: "Only a minority of spoken or written clauses are entirely novel creations and […] memorized word combinations, clauses and clause sequences form a high proportion of the fluent stretches of speech heard in everyday conversation".

8. Have you discussed the following terms in any of your MA or Ph.D training courses: Collocations, concordances, frequency effects, routines, prefabricated routines, lexicalized multiword units, chunks, conversational gambits, creativity vs. routine, native-like selection?

9. Do your beliefs about the quotes in questions 6 and 7 come out in your ESL teaching ?