

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel

Department of English



**The Relationship between EFL Learners' Preferences for Error Corrections in Writing
and Their Language Proficiency**

Case of Third Year LMD Students of English at the University of Mohamed Seddik

Ben Yahia, Jijel

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for a Master Degree in

Didactics of English

Submitted by:

- ❖ HARIDI Lilia
- ❖ ALIOUA Khawla

Supervised by:

Mrs. LEKKAT Sarra

Board of Examiners

Supervisor: Mrs. LEKKAT Sarra University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel

Chairperson: Mrs. KHERBOUCHE Radia University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia,

Jijel

Examiner: Mrs. BOUHALI Salma University of Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel

Academic Year: 2021-2022

Dedication

“In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful.”

Compassionate, all the praise is due to Allah

With the deep profound love, I am dedicating this humble work to

My dearest and wonderful parents who have been with me every step

Who have raised me to be the person I am today.

To the source of happiness and the greatest icon of love in my life,

for her encouragement and prayers that make me able to get such success and honor, my

beloved mother, “Yamina”.

To the symbol of power in my life, the most supportive overprotective my beloved father,

Thank you for the unconditional love, guidance, and support that you have been always

given to me, “Youcef”

To my lovely, beautiful, and precious sisters

Nadia, Widad, Mouna and Abla

To my supportive brothers Adel & Nabil

To my dearest nieces and nephews Ines, Khawla and Yassemine Islem, Housseem, Ziad,

Wael and SiradjEddine

To such a special person in my heart, my beautiful best friend “Chahra”

To my partner

Khawla

To all my friends with whom I shared the University life with its light and shadows

Lilia

Dedication

*With the deep profound love, I am dedicating this humble work to
My dearest and wonderful parents who have been with me every step*

Who have raised me to be the person I am today.

To the source of happiness and the greatest icon of love in my life,

For her encouragement and prayers that make me able to get such success and honor, my

*beloved mother , “**Saliha**”.*

To the symbol of power in my life, the most supportive overprotective my beloved father

Thank you for the unconditional love, guidance, and support that you have been always

*given to me, “**Salah**”,*

To my beloved sisters

Lamia and Ahlem, Meriem, Rafika

To my precious brothers

Mohamed, Nesro and Oussama

To my partner

Lilia

Last and not least, I would like to express my gratitude

To my fiance for his endless support and love since day one

To all my friends with whom I shared the University life with its light and shadows

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our greatest and deepest gratitude to "**ALLAH**", for his blessings and guidance, and to whom we owe everything.

First of all, we would like to express our deepest sense of gratitude to our supervisor Mrs. **LEKKAT Sarra** for her patience, resilience, valuable, and professional guidance, precious help and permanent support all over the preparation of this dissertation. Our appreciation also goes to examiners Mrs. **BOUHALI Salma** and Mrs. **KHERBOUCHE Radia** who accepted to read and correct our research work.

Our profound gratitude and thanks are offered to all teachers of English who taught us from 1st year until 2nd year Master.

We are grateful to any person who contributed to this research

Abstract

The current study was conducted for the sake of investigating the relationship between the EFL learners' preferences for error corrections in writing and their language proficiency. Two data gathering tools were administered to a randomly chosen sample of fifty five (55) third year students of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University- Jijel. A questionnaire was submitted to check the students' preferences for error correction, together with a test of language proficiency to check the level of the participants' proficiency in English. The findings revealed that there are quite different opinions on the topic of error correction; however the latter is influenced by various levels of language proficiency this means that high proficient students show more preferences than low proficient students. Accordingly, learners' error correction preferences should be taken into consideration by teachers to improve the learning process.

Keywords: *Preferences, error correction, language proficiency, EFL learners'*

List of Acronyms

CF: Corrective Feedback

CLT: Communicative Language Teaching

DM: Direct Method

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ESL: English Second Language

GTM: Grammar Translation Method

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

List of Tables

Table A: Student's Level of Proficiency.....	30
Table 1: Frequency of Error Correction.....	30
Table 2: The Timing of Correcting Students' Errors.....	31
Table 3: Proper Sime For Feedback.....	31
Table 4: Color of Pen for Feedback.....	32
Table 5: The Amount of Teacher Written Correction.....	33
Table 6: Deciding Who Will do the correction.....	33
Table 7: Forms of Paper-Marking techniques.....	34
Table 8: Focus on Feedback.....	35
Table 9: Types of Feedback.....	36
Table 10: Teachers' Comments and Corrections.....	37
Table 11: Students Thoughts about Teachers' Comments.....	38
Table 12: Students Satisfaction Regarding Teacher's Response to Errors.....	39
Table 13: Students' Response about Usefulness of Teacher's Correction.....	40
Table 14: Student's Opinions about Correction Frequency of Written Work.....	41
Table 15: Students Opinions about Correction time of Their Written Work.....	41

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Dedication.....	II
Acknowledgments.....	III
Abstract.....	IV
List of Acronyms.....	V
List of Tables.....	VI
Table of Contents.....	VII
General Introduction.....	1
1. Background of the Study.....	1
2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
3. Research Questions.....	3
4. Research Methodology.....	3
5. Organization of the Dissertation.....	4
Chapter One: Literature Review.....	6
Introduction.....	6
Section One: Error and Error Correction in Language Learning.....	7
1.1.1. Definition of Error.....	7
1.1.2. Error Versus. Mistake.....	7

1.1.3. Types of Error.....	9
1.1.4. Causes of Errors.....	10
1.1.5. Error Correction.....	11
1.1.5.1. Should Learner Errors be Corrected?.....	11
1.1.5.2. When Should Learner Errors be Corrected?.....	12
1.1.5.3. Which Learner Errors be Corrected?.....	12
1.1.5.4. How Should Learner Errors be Corrected?.....	13
1.1.5.5. Who Should Correct Learner Errors?.....	14
1.1.6. Correction Feedback.....	15
1.1.7. Error Correction Preferences of students	15
1.1.8. Error Correction in Teaching Methods	16
1.1.8.1. Grammar Translation Method (GTM).....	17
1.1.8.2. Direct Method 1(DM).....	17
1.1.8.3. Communicative Language Teaching Method (CLT).....	17
1.1.9. Error Correction Stages.....	18
1.1.10. Error Correction Debates.....	19
1.1.10.1. Negative Perspective of Error Correction.....	19
1.1.10.2. Positive Perspective of Error Correction.....	20
Section Two: Written Error Correction.....	20
1.2.1 The role of Written Error Correction.....	20

1.2.1.1. Error Correction as Focus on Form.....	20
1.2.1.2. Error Correction to Facilitate Noticing.....	21
1.2.2. Approaches and Methods of Written Error Correction.....	21
1.2.2.1. General Approaches.....	21
1.2.2.2. Explicit Written Error Correction.....	22
1.2.2.3. Implicit Written Error Correction.....	22
1.2.2.4. Error Correction Codes.....	23
1.2.3. Importance of Written Error Correction.....	23
1.2.4. Practice of Written Error Correction.....	24
1.2.5. Types of Errors in Writing.....	24
1.2.6. Strategies to Improve Error Correction.....	25
1.2.7. Language Proficiency.....	26
Conclusion.....	27
Chapter Two: Field Work.....	28
Introduction.....	28
2.1. Population and Sampling.....	28
2.2. Description of the Research Tools.....	28
2.2.1. Description of the student's questionnaire.....	29
2.2.2. Description of the Language Proficiency Test.....	29
2.3. Data Analysis.....	30

Discussion of the results.....	42
Conclusion.....	43
General Conclusion.....	44
Limitations of the Study.....	45
Pedagogical Recommendations	45

List of References

Appendices

Résumé

ملخص

General Introduction

1. Background of the study

Learning a foreign language is a gradual process, in that making mistakes during is inevitable. Nobody is able to master a foreign language without making mistakes. They were regarded as part of the learning process. According to Brown (2007) “Errors are the idiosyncrasies in the language of the learner that are a direct manifestation of a system within which a learner is operating at the time “(p.258). Therefore, teachers are an important element of the learning process; since they are the ones who help students correct their mistakes and avoid them in the future. Meanwhile, students gradually become active participants in their own learning process.

It is very important to provide students with feedback because it plays an important role in guiding, motivating, and encouraging students to improve their accuracy in foreign language acquisition. As Alavi and Kaivanpanah (2007) put it “providing language learners with clear feedback plays a crucial role in developing learners’ language abilities and helping them direct their learning” (2007, 181). Error correction is one sort of feedback that is provided for students. It is one of the most delicate aspects of language learning, especially when it comes to when, how, and with whom it must be done (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Park (2010) believed that correcting students’ errors has both positive and negative effects. He believed that error correction may lead to better language learning; but, it could be hindering to learners’ language development.

It was believed that error correction was a crucial and advantageous practice in the teaching and learning of second languages (Alroe, 2011). It assists teachers in choosing their instructional strategies and classroom management techniques to raise student competency. The value of error correction, according to Lightbown and Spada (1991) is to

motivate students acquiring the language and participating in dialogue in the target language. It is not surprising that English language learners make a lot of mistakes as they learn the language because human learning is never perfect. Their teachers typically have to respond by giving them some sort of feedback, which frequently takes the form of correction. The ability for personalized teacher-student communication, which is uncommon in the day-to-day operations of a second language writing class, has led some to regard the role of written corrective feedback as a crucial component of second language L2 writing teachers' instruction (Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997). Hendrickson's pioneering work in 1978, in which he questioned the if, which, when, and how of textual error correction, the usefulness and efficacy of CF have come under criticism.

L2 writing students prefer written corrective feedback over other formats, such as peer and self-correction, and desire, expect, and value instructor feedback on their written errors (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Lee, 2004). Along with the question of whether or not L2 writing instructors should provide constructive criticism, the impact of various strategies for correcting written errors have also been studied.

In conclusion, this study will focus on students' preferences and attitudes towards error correction since these attitudes have a great impact on the entire learning process.

2. Statement of the problem

The main role of English as a foreign language writing teachers is to help their students improve their writing proficiency in accordance with student needs and course objectives. Providing feedback is viewed as an important part of EFL writing instruction. In the case of the written corrective feedback, teachers believed to have the responsibility for selecting the appropriate way of providing such feedback. However, if both teachers

and students share common ideas about feedback strategies, corrective feedback will be more productive. Individual learners may well differ in terms of the particular error correction strategies most appropriate for their unique language development needs. Hence, it is necessary that teachers are well informed of how students perceive error correction in order to teach effectively. Learner's preferences for error correction are various and debatable, thus, in this study the focus is on whether there is a relationship between the learners preferences for error correction and their language proficiency.

The present research aims at exploring the corrective feedback preferences of the foreign language learners and to analyze how learners of different proficiency levels feel about corrective feedback. This topic is important as it provides the teachers with the necessary knowledge about students' mindsets toward the issue and enable them to act accordingly.

3. Research Questions

The present study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. How do learners perceive error correction in writing?
2. What is the effect of error correction on learners' language acquisition?
3. Is there any relationship between EFL learners' preferences for error correction and their language proficiency?
4. Is there a difference in attitudes between more proficient and less proficient learners?

4. Research Methodology

The present study is based on quantitative data collection and analysis as an attempt to explore and investigate the relationship between EFL learners' preferences for error

corrections in writing and their language proficiency. Two data gathering tools were used. First, a questionnaire was administered and distributed to a randomly chosen sample of fifty five (55) third year students of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University-Jijel in order to investigate learners' attitudes towards error correction preferences in EFL writing classrooms. Second, a language proficiency test was used to measure the participants' English language proficiency level. The higher the students' scores, the higher their level of English language proficiency is.

5. Organization of the Dissertation

The current research work is divided into two main chapters with a general introduction and a general conclusion. The first chapter, which is composed of two sections, represents the theoretical part. The first section deals with the concept of error and error correction in language. Secondly, difference between error and mistake is clarified. Later on, different error types are introduced and, various causes of errors are examined. After that, error correction field of study is introduced. In which Hendrickson's five questions are mentioned and discussed. The term corrective feedback is defined and error correction preferences of learners are presented. Different teaching methods are clarified, thus, error correction stages and debates are introduced.

In the second section the role of written error correction was examined, together with different approaches and methods of written error correction including: general approaches, explicit and implicit written error correction, and error correction codes. Besides, the importance and the practice of written error correction were presented. After that, types of errors in writing are clarified. Finally, the main strategies English teachers used to improve error correction are introduced, and various proficiency definitions, and the main components that comprise it

The second chapter sheds light on the practical part of the study, it deals with the methodology of the study, and analyzing data comes out with the result and discussion of the findings. The chapter tackles the limitations of the study together with suggesting a number of pedagogical recommendations.

Chapter One: Literature Review

Introduction

The concept of error has been the focus of some studies in the last thirty years. If one wants to engage in the error correction study, he should first define what the term error represents. Making errors is an important and useful part of language learning because it allows learners to experiment with language and measure their success, in the writing of a second or foreign language learner; both errors and mistakes are expected to appear. This chapter deals with the concept of error and error correction in language learning. The first section deals with various definitions of error. Then, difference between error and mistake is clarified. Later on, different types and causes of error are presented. After that, error correction field of study is introduced, in which five Hendrickson's questions are mentioned and discussed. The term corrective feedback is defined and error correction preferences of learners are presented together with different teaching methods, error correction stages and debates.

In the second section the role of written error correction was examined, together with different approaches and methods of written error correction including: general approaches, explicit and implicit written error correction, and error correction codes. Besides, the importance and the practice of written error correction were presented. After that, the section clarifies types of errors in writing, and introduces the main strategies English teachers used to improve error correction. Finally, various proficiency definitions were provided, and the main components that comprise it.

Section One: Error and Error Correction in Language Learning

1.1.1. Definition of Errors

Different definitions have been given by researchers (e.g. Chambers, Brown, Burt...) mainly arising from changes in pedagogy. Errors are morphological, syntactic, and lexical forms that deviate from the rules of the target language. Corder (1967) in his influential article entitled "The Significance of Learners' Errors" indicated that errors are significant in three aspects: first, errors are important for the language teacher because they indicate the learner's progress in language learning, second, errors are also important for the language researcher as they provide insight into how language is learned and finally, errors are significant to the language learners themselves as they get involved in hypothesis testing. Furthermore, Strevens (1969) in Richards (1974:4) hypothesized that errors should not be seen as a problem to be solved but rather as a normal concept indicating the learners use strategies.

Chambers (1994) stated that "The nature of the error is problematic for the teacher and the researcher who have no access to the learner's processes; another major difficulty is the criteria chosen for describing errors" (p.3). Another definition provided by Brown (2007) is "Errors are the idiosyncrasies in the language of the learner that are a direct manifestation of a system within which a learner is operating at the time" (p.28). Dulay, Burt, and Krashen (1982) considered errors to be deviations, they said: "Errors are the flawed side of learner speech or writing, they are those parts of conversation or composition that deviate from some selected norm or natural language performance" (p.138)

1.1.2. Errors versus Mistakes

Errors and mistakes are terms commonly used interchangeably by teachers and students to describe the foul-ups occurring in a second language. However, a distinction has always been made between the concept of error and mistake; it has always been a problem for both teachers and researchers. The error/mistake distinction was introduced by Corder (1967) who supported Chomsky's competence and performance notion insisting that mistakes are not important to the process of language learning since they are not caused by incompetence but are related to performance failure, mistakes can occur in first language as well as second language which means that they can be committed by native speakers as well as learners. H. D. Brown (1994) defines mistakes as "A mistake is a performance error that is rather a random guess or a 'slip' in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly". (p.205). He defines an error as "a noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, reflecting the interlanguage competence of the learner". Concerning the distinction mentioned previously we can define an error as lack of competence and mistakes as performance phenomena, this means that errors are not self-correctible however it reflects knowledge. On the other hand, mistakes are self-corrected by the learner and they play no role in the process of language learning. James (1998) proposed the criterion of self-correctability (as cited in AbiSamra, 2003) that said: mistakes can be corrected by the learner if they pay attention to them, but errors cannot be self-corrected. Gass and Selinker (1993) in Keshavarz's book confirms that errors are systematically controlled by rules and appear because the learner's knowledge of the target language is insufficient; nevertheless, errors made by the learners can only be detected by teachers or researchers. In contrast to errors, Keshavarz (2012) defined mistakes as:

“ Random deviations, unrelated to any system, and instead represent the same types of performance mistakes that may occur in the speech or writing of native

speakers, such as slips of the tongue or pen, false starts, lack of subject-verb argument in a long complicated sentence, and the like “ (p.61)

Mistakes occur due to the non-linguistic factors that can be corrected by the language user; these factors are fatigue, strong emotions, memory limitation, and lack of concentration. Typically, errors are viewed as something that diverts an SL learner's attention away from the model they are attempting to master (Allwright & Bailey, 1991). According to James (1998, p. 78), the difference between a mistake and error can be found in the ability to correct; an error is a flaw in the learner's statement that he can and will remedy. An error, on the other hand, is something that a student is unable or unwilling to remedy. Corder (1967) distinguished between error and mistake. According to him, the term error refers to something that is incorrect and has to do with language understanding. As a result, errors reveal a learner's current degree of language development in a certain language. The term error, on the other hand, refers to situations in which a learner generates improper form due to a slip of the tongue, memory loss, or other such cause.

1.1.3. Types of Errors

In the field of applied linguistics, researchers typically distinguish two types of errors: competence error and performance error. Competence errors are errors that reflect inadequate learning and they are serious. On the other hand, performance errors are errors made by learners when they are tired or hurried. In most cases, this type of error is less serious than competence errors. The learner can overcome it with little effort. In this relation, researchers like Gefen (1979) distinguish between mistakes that are lapses in performance and mistakes that reflect inadequate competence.

Other researchers like Burt and Kiparsky (1978) distinguished between global and local errors. Global errors interfere with the comprehensibility of the text, and

communication and disrupt the meaning of utterances. Local errors, on the other hand, are less serious than global errors because local errors are minor errors that do not impede understanding.

Besides, as a pedagogical distinction, Ferris (1999) introduced a dichotomy between treatable and untreatable errors as a response to Truscott's 1996 essay. Treatable errors are related to a linguistic structure, they are treatable because the student can rely on books or a certain set of rules to fix the problem, they include verb tense and form. Untreatable errors, on the other hand, are idiosyncratic and the student will use the existing acquired knowledge of language to self-correct, they include most word choice errors.

Finally, language learning errors involve all language components: morphological errors refer to grammar errors specifically words, tenses, and conjugation. Another type of error is a phonological error which is a mispronunciation of a word. Lexical errors are the third type, these involve vocabulary used incorrectly. The last type of error is syntax errors which are errors in word order, subject-verb agreement, and the use of the resumptive pronoun in English relative clauses.

1.1.4. Causes of Errors

There are mainly three major sources of errors in second language learning, the first source is interference from the native language while the second source can be attributed to intralingual and developmental factors, and the context of learning represents errors due to mistaught in learning. Brown (1994) and James (1998), (as cited in Tomkova, 2013, p.51) presented six possible reasons for the errors students make:

- **Ignorance and avoidance:** when students lack the knowledge and do not know the first and target language items, they create the utterances, or they avoid using items when they are not aware of them.

- **Find language influence:** due to interference from the mother tongue errors occur, usually, occur when the student applies the rules and the norms of their first language to the target language.
- **Target language causes:** the issue appears when the student is unfamiliar with the target language and consequently ignores the target language items.
- **Communication strategy-based errors:** it is a strategy used by students to avoid becoming hesitant to communicate owing to the unfamiliar target language by using synonyms, super ordinate phrases, or antonyms.
- **Induced errors:** students can be misled by the way teachers' present examples, definitions, or explanations in the classroom, or by the work itself.
- **Compound and ambiguous errors:** when there are two competing diagnoses of mistakes and we can't tell which one is the genuine source, ambiguous errors occur.

1.1.5. Error Correction

While acquiring a second language, it is inevitable for learners to produce errors in their linguistic productions. Therefore, the concept of error correction in L2 learning has been hotly debated in the past decades among researchers and practitioners in the field of second language acquisition. Hendrickson (1978) proposed five questions related to the error correction process, which are :(1) should learner errors be corrected? (2) When should learner errors be corrected? (3) Which learner errors should be corrected?

(4) How should learner errors be corrected? (5) Who should correct learner errors?

1.1.5.1. Should Learner Errors be Corrected?

The first question that needs to be answered is whether or not learner errors should be corrected. There are opposing views concerning error correction. Some consider it a

positive feature while others consider it negative. Hendrickson (1978), for example, believed that students' errors correction has a positive impact on their proficiency than when it remains uncorrected. Multiple studies have shown that students often want more feedback and correction than is given to them because they consider it an essential part of the language learning process. On the other hand, some are not in agreement with this. Krashen (1994) for example believed that error correction may be counterproductive to the L2 learning process and are not effective in its learning. Hendrickson (1978) concluded that to achieve an appropriate atmosphere in the classroom, mistakes must be corrected, but not all of them.

1.1.5.2. When Should Learner Errors be Corrected?

The question of when to correct learner errors has been addressed widely among linguists. There is great support for the correction of learner's errors. So, it is very important to determine an appropriate time to correct learner errors. Havranek (2002) suggested that the errors that are related to simple rules should be followed by corrective feedback, for instance, when correct grammatical errors, the learners are reminded of the given rules and their correct application. Dekeyser (1993) studied the learners' readiness for error correction. His findings indicated that it is not only a matter of student readiness for correction and their language proficiency is not the only determining factor, but there are other factors like anxiety and motivation. According to Yoshida's (2008) study, there are many inconsistencies concerning classroom correction regarding when who, and how learner errors should be dealt with. Teachers questioned students' ability to understand the notes, and worried that their explicit corrective notes would negatively affect students' self-esteem. George (1972) claimed that it is very important for teachers to determine whether correcting learners' mistakes will improve their speaking and written work. It is very

complicated to indicate when to correct learners' errors because both the learner's feedback and teachers' intuitions are equally important.

1.1.5.3. Which learner errors should be corrected?

Since there is a consensus by researchers that learners' errors must be corrected at specific moments during the lesson, it is necessary to know what errors must be corrected. A study among Japanese students of English by Katayama (2007) showed that the majority of students prefer the correction of pragmatic errors and errors disrupting the conversation. Another study was conducted by Cathcart and Olsen (1976) with a group of learners, where they found that more than ninety percent of the students questioned preferred to correct errors all or most of the time. Learners' errors were classified by Burt (1975) into global errors and local errors: Global errors refer to "errors that significantly hinder communication and those that affect overall sentence organization, such as wrong word order, missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors" (p. 56). On the other hand, "local errors affect single elements in a sentence but do not usually hinder communication significantly such as errors in noun and verb inflections, articles, and auxiliaries" (p. 57). Hendrickson (1978) stated that while errors should be corrected, the correction of all errors was undesirable, or at least unfeasible. Havranek (2002) suggested that correction is best for errors when they include simple grammar rules such as verb endings and the auxiliary do. The type of error can be the most important factor determines whether or not it should be corrected.

1.1.5.4. How should learner errors be corrected?

There is another question that must be addressed, which is how to correct learners' errors. Written corrective feedback is divided into two types: implicit and explicit. Implicit feedback refers to providing the learner with indirect forms of feedback without providing him/her with the correct answer. However, explicit feedback is to provide the correct forms

and explicitly show students' errors, it indicates the location of error and provide the correct answer. According to Yoshida (2008), implicit feedback is more appropriate for the student as it is non-sudden, less confusing, and less intimidating to the learner. It depends on the student's ability to distinguish them as corrective feedback, identify the error, and find the correct pattern.

On the other hand, the research conducted by Dabaghi (2008) indicates that explicit feedback is more effective than implicit one, and it helps the learner avoid making mistakes in the future. There are some other suggestions to correct learners' written errors. One suggestion is to give a chance to students and motivate them to self-correct their mistakes, using symbols and abbreviations (e.g., T = tense). Another suggestion by Wingfield (1975) stated five techniques that the teacher should use to correct written errors: "(1) providing clues for self-correction; (2) correcting the text; (3) making marginal notes; (4) explaining errors orally to students; and (5) using errors as an illustration for class discussion."(p.311).

1.1.5.5. Who should correct learner errors?

One of the most important questions in the process of error correction is who should correct learner errors. The possible answer to this question is that the teacher is the capable and the authorized one to correct the errors. However, peer correction is another way that deserves attention, by doing group or pair communication exercises in which they correct each other mistakes. Peer correction is very beneficial and plays an important role in instruction. Witbeck (1976) concluded that peer correction results in a "greater concern for achieving accuracy in written expression in individual students and creates a better classroom atmosphere for teaching the correctional aspects of composition" (p 325). In a study conducted by Morris and Taron (2003) students were asked to work in pairs and

correct each other, however, there were conflicts between high achievers and low achievers, which did not contribute to the effectiveness of corrective feedback. A study conducted by Mackey revealed that correction is observed in less than half of the cases when students correct each other's mistakes, while when a native speaker corrects an English learner, 77 % of the corrections were noticed. It is believed that self-correction is better than teacher correction (Yoshida, 2008); however, self-correction depends on the error type and learners' proficiency.

Hendrickson (1978) thought that self-correction can be helpful in language learning.

1.1.6. Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback is an essential part of effective learning. It plays a head role in L2 acquisition. Many experts have used different definitions of corrective feedback. Chaudron (1977) defined correction as “any reaction of the teacher which transforms, disapprovingly refers to or demands improvement of the learner’s utterance” (p.31). Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977) defined the term correction as “the replacement of error or mistake by what is correct” (p. 363). According to Lightbown and Spada (1999), the term corrective feedback refers to “any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect”(p. 172). Another definition made by James (1998) defined correction as “a reactive second move of an adjacency pair to a first speaker’s or writer’s utterance by someone who has made the judgment that all or part of that utterance is linguistically or factually wrong” (p. 235). Corrective feedback can be either implicit or explicit. Implicit feedback refers to providing the learner with indirect forms of feedback. However, explicit feedback is to provide the correct forms overtly, and explicitly show students’ errors.

1.1.7 Error Correction Preferences of Students

Various studies have been conducted about learners' preferences for error correction. According to Horwitz (1998), teachers need to be familiar with students' preferences to foster more effective learning strategies; otherwise, serious disappointment on the part of students caused by the discrepancy between student expectations and classroom reality can impede language acquisition.

A study made by Schulz (1996, 2001) has revealed several contradictions in the perceptions of teachers and learners, in which there is a strong preference from learners for the study of grammar and errors correction more than teachers expected. Thus, when the teachers do not pay attention to students' instructional expectations, their motivation can be negatively affected, and teachers' credibility may be questioned. The main reason for not wanting the corrective feedback is because of its negative impact on students' confidence and motivation. While the main reason for wanting the CF is the importance of learning and speaking the language correctly.

Ancker (2000) suggested that the difference between teacher and learner preferences should be discussed and correct conflicting expectations between teachers and students about how to address errors in ways that are effective and encouraging for students. The students preferred to think about their errors before they receive feedback from their teachers, this allows them to come up with the correct forms.

Previous studies have consistently shown that students pay a great deal of attention to teacher feedback and that they value correcting their mistakes as a way to improve the accuracy of their writing. (Ferris, 1995; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Komura, 1999; Leki, 1991) Research also indicates that students rely on teachers for error correction in improving their L2 writing accuracy (Lee, 2004). Reviewing the literature

requires further research to investigate and explore students' preferences regarding written error correction.

1.1.8. Error Correction in Teaching Methods

There are a variety of useful and effective teaching methods that teachers adapt to achieve the teaching/learning objectives. These methods are followed and implemented to teach language classes: Grammar Translation Method, Direct Method, and Communicative Language Teaching Method. Freeman (2000) presented briefly each method and suggests error correction techniques in different teaching methods.

1.1.8.1. Grammar Translation Method (GTM)

According to Freeman (2000), the Grammar Translation Method is a language teaching method that enables and helps learners to read and understand foreign language literature. This method is very important to teach linguistic forms correctly and to get the right answer/usage from students. In GTM, getting a correct answer from students is so important. If students make errors or do not know the correct answer, the teacher supplies them with the correct answer. The teacher corrects the errors strictly and immediately. In this method, there is no scope for self-correction.

1.1.8.2. Direct Method (DM)

In the direct method, language is learned for communication, as Freeman (2000) stated language is primarily speech. Classroom instruction and classroom activities are carried out in the target language; therefore, students are actively involved in using the target language. In other words, translation is not allowed in the classroom. In DM, various techniques of error correction are used to make students aware of their mistakes. Also, teachers in this method try to get students to self-correct whenever possible.

1.1.8.3. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

Communicative Language Teaching is an approach to the teaching of L2 and FL. This method focuses on developing learners' communicative competence by incorporating the interdependence of language and communication (Freeman, 2000). The main goal of CLT is to enable students to communicate through interaction in the target language. This method also enables students to engage in authentic and meaningful communication through classroom activities. In CLT, the teacher acts as a facilitator who facilitates the communication process between students in the classroom and encourages communication. He also acts as an adviser and organizer of classroom activities. Additionally, the teacher could be a partner for communication.

In CLT, students are responsible for their learning, they are active during classes. They are team members and communicators. They feel like they are important for this method. Games are very important in this method because they give valuable communicative practice to students. Errors in the CLT method were no longer seen as a negative manifestation of learners' performance because these are seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills. According to Freeman (2000), the teacher noted the errors that students made during fluency-based activities and return to them later on during accuracy-based activities to give feedback. Students' mistakes can be treated by discussion.

1.1.9. Error Correction Stages

As MacDonald Lightbound (2005) points out, finding an error in vocal production is far more difficult than in written production. Linguists disagree on how to distinguish different stages of working with errors. Three stages are identified by Hendrich et al. (1988): identification (a mistake has occurred), interpretation (kind of error), and

correction (suggesting an acceptable solution). On the other hand, Broughton et al. (2003) recognize three stages as well, but they are significantly different: Teachers first determine what the error is; then they determine possible sources of the error to devise an effective strategy for dealing with it; and finally, teachers determine the seriousness of the error and whether or not a correction should be provided (Broughton et al., 2003, p. 136-7).

Choděra (2006) cited in Tomkova (2013) identified five distinct phases in the process of dealing with an error: detection is noting an error has been made, identification is identifying the type of error, interpretation of sources is identifying possible reasons for the error, and finally, correction is dealing with the error. Overall, this stage classification appears to be the most appropriate in terms of the complex process that leads to correction and the correction itself.

1.1.10. Error Correction Debates

Writing teachers and students have long considered written error correction to be an important part of increasing L2 accuracy (Roberts, 2001; Lee, 2004; Brown, 2007). In the last decade, there has been a discussion about its usefulness (Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999; Chandler, 2003). According to the findings of certain studies (Kepner, 1991; Truscott & Hsu, 2008), error correction is not only useless but also potentially harmful to L2 writing development. Other researchers (Bitchener, Young, & Cameron, 2005; Bitchener, 2008) has found that error correction is effective and beneficial in the development and improvement of students' L2 writing accuracy.

1.1.10.1. Negative Perspective of Error Correction

Error correction has been classified as effective, ineffective, beneficial, usable, and unusable. While no definitive response can be given, several L2 instructors recognize the need to provide written correction feedback to facilitate students' language learning (Brown, 2001; Casanave, 2004).

Truscott (1996) maintained that grammatical correction in L2 writing classes should be neglected, he backed up his claim with a review of past studies, grammar correction to be uncooperative and ineffective as well as error correction; however, Truscott argued that error correction in general and grammatical correction have a negative impact on L2 student writing accuracy.

1.1.10.2. Positive Perspective of Error Correction

Unlike some investigators' previously stated viewpoints (Kepner1991; Truscott 1996) supporters of corrective action have offered research proof, and feedback to support the worthwhile advantages that may occur when using written mistake correction.

Ferris (1999) refuted Truscott's claims of grammar correction effectiveness, she weighed in on Truscott's arguments and researched the studies he used to back up his allegation, however, Ferris took notes, considering the above-mentioned proofs. It is clear that the topic of the efficacy of textual error correction is open to further examination; furthermore, previous studies on error correction have produced a variety of results as a result of changes in research style. It is debatable whether error repair should be continuous unless its efficiency and destructiveness are proven.

Section Two: Error Correction in Writing and Language proficiency

1.2.1. The Role of Written Error Correction

Error correction takes many forms and can be spoken or scripted. None can deny the fact that error correction is crucial for the development of learners' ability to write perfectly because it is a method of providing obvious, overwhelming, and reliable feedback on learners' grammatical errors. Error correction plays a key role in motivating, stimulating, and inspiring learners to improve their accuracy in L2 writing.

1.2.1.1. Error Correction as Focus on Form Intervention

One of the greatest teaching techniques known as the focus-on-form tool is error correction (Ellis, 2005; Van Beuningen, 2010). The concentrate-on-form method (Long, 1991) alerts students to linguistic components as they progress through lessons with a primary concentration on meaning or communication. By using explanation, the L2 students focus will be on the linguistic qualities required by the communicative requirement. Taking this into consideration, error correction may be used to focus learners' attention on sound grammatical forms while they are doing a communicative task. As a result, it is also debatable if one of the goals of error correction in L2 education is to improve learners' output of grammatically sound L2 forms that are nonetheless adequate for communicative purposes.

1.2.1.2. Error Correction to Facilitate Noticing

The hypothesis stated that for learners to easily absorb any chunk of the L2, they must pay attention to the relevant information in the linguistic data provided within the environment. Taking the hypothesis into account, suggestions for error correction on L2 instruction emerge. For starters, by providing error correction, learners can pay attention to the presence of new L2 features. Furthermore, students become more aware and capable of filling in the gaps between their L2 usage and that of L1 speakers. Also, error correction may assist learners in determining the limitations of their L2 communication capabilities with their given L2 resources. Thus, it is debatable whether error correction is possible.

1.2.2. Approaches and Methods of Written Error Correction

Although the most popular technique among language teachers is correcting grammatical errors, however, it has been suggested to use different types of corrective feedback which are considered to be more effective than relying on one single technique. Researchers have identified a couple of wide-ranging approaches and a couple of particular methods to correct written errors.

1.2.2.1. General Approaches

According to recent literature (Ellis, 2009; Van Beuningen, 2010), there are two types of general approaches that are utilized in giving written error correction: comprehensive approach and selective approach. These two approaches stand out for the comprehensiveness of written texts for students. The comprehensive (unfocused) approach involves that the teachers correct all errors in a student's text, regardless of the classification of these errors. The comprehensive correction of written errors may lead students to not only focus on errors in the writing but also on new features of the target language to facilitate more effective language learning.

On the other hand, the selective (focused) approach is aimed at focusing only on specific linguistic features, neglecting all of the remaining errors outside of the current focus domain uncorrected. This approach can be related to Pienmann's (1984) teach ability hypothesis in that L2 learners are capable of learning new aspects of the target language only when they are ready for it. Moreover, Ellis (2009) believes that a selective approach may be more effective in correcting written errors as students can examine multiple collections for a single error. As a result, L2 students would gain a better understanding of how their writing was incorrect, as well as gain opportunities to acquire the correct form. No studies are comparing whether one approach is more effective than the other because it needs further investigation.

1.2.2.2. Explicit Written Error Correction

Explicit error correction (also known as direct or obvious error correction) is the type of feedback in which L2 teachers explicitly show students' errors and provide them with direct forms of feedback. It is more effective because it directs the attention of the learners and helps them to avoid making mistakes in the future.

1.2.2.3. Implicit Written Error Correction

Implicit error correction or indirect feedback refers to the type of feedback in which the L2 teacher shows that an error has been made through various means such as underlining, encircling, or correction codes. This type of feedback is more appropriate for the student as it is non-sudden and less confusing to the learner.

1.2.2.4. Error Correction Codes

Error correction code is a type of implicit clerical error correction. This technique involves presenting the correction in the form of symbols (e.g. [] ‘for a missing word, or () ‘for extra words) and abbreviations (e.g. pl/sing – Plural/Singular) to inform the learner not only that a mistake has been made but also the type of error that he has made (Hendrickson, 1984). According to Hyland (1990), error correction codes allow language teachers to provide implicit feedback. By using error correction codes, language teachers can identify the type and location of errors. It also allows teachers to indicate the points that were taught to L2 students. With the different types of written error correction discussed, each strategy of giving feedback has its advantages and disadvantages.

1.2.3. Importance of Written Error Correction

Providing students with feedback on their writings is likely the most common and effective way of reacting to student writing (Ferris, 2003). Despite the ongoing debate over the effectiveness of written error correction, teachers continue to believe that providing corrective feedback is important in helping students improve their writing skills (Hyland & Hyland, 2006; Brown, 2007). Teachers think that offering written error correction to their students is important in helping them improve their writing accuracy. Furthermore, they believe that correcting written errors encourages kids to read more to improve their writing skills (Corpuz, 2011).

Error correction is provided to focus student’s attention on grammatically accurate forms within the context of performing a communicative task (Long, 1991). As a result,

one of the roles of error correction in L2 instruction promotes students' production of L2 structures that are grammatically accurate and are still applicable for communicative purposes.

According to Ortega (2009), there are several implications regarding error correction instruction in L2 classes. Firstly, by providing error correction, students can pay attention to the existence of new features of the L2. Furthermore, students become aware of the differences between their L2 usage and that of L1 speakers. Second, error correction may help students in identifying the limitations of their L2 communication abilities while using the L2 resources available to them. As a result, error correction may act as a "noticing facilitator," directing L2 students' attention not only to errors but also to new features of the target language.

1.2.4. Practice of Written Error Correction

For teachers, written error correction is very important in helping their students improve their second language writing accuracy (Ferris & Robert, 2001; Lee, 2004; Brown, 2007). Teachers prefer written error correction because it allows for more personalized teacher-to-student communication, which is rare in L2 writing classes. On the other hand, teachers have their method of error correction that is based on the following factors: the use of error correction codes, thorough remarks, explicit error correction, and underlining and encircling errors. They each have their method of practicing error correction as well as providing it. Some teachers believe in delivering feedback explicitly, while others believe in providing feedback implicitly, through the use of error correction codes. The disparities in their opinions and preferences could be construed as a reflection of their prior experiences with delivering written error correction (Corpuz, 2011).

1.2.5. Types of Error in Writing

It is important to understand the type of error when discussing error correction strategies. Errors are categorized in different ways. According to Burt (1975), errors are classified into two categories: global errors and local errors. Global errors are errors that significantly interfere with communication and disrupt the meaning of utterances “those that affect overall sentence organization, such as wrong word order, missing, wrong, or misplaced sentence connectors” (p. 56). On the other hand, local errors are less serious than global errors because local errors are minor errors that do not impede understanding. “local errors affect single elements in a sentence but do not usually hinder communication significantly such as errors in noun and verb inflections, articles, and auxiliaries” (p. 57). Rather differently, Chaudron (1977) categorized errors into “linguistic (phonological, morphological, syntactic) to subject matter content (factual and conceptual knowledge) and lexical items” (p.32).

1.2.6. Strategies to Improve Error Correction in Writing

According to Suarez, A. E. (2013) the strategies to improve error correction in writing are:

-Allow ESL students time

Some SL students may need to read the content before writing, which can be a long and tedious procedure for some. Provide pupils with an assignment as soon as feasible so that they have time to develop and modify it. Time is required for ESL pupils.

-Provide "Live" Revision Feedback

If a responder's remarks help with modification rather than defending a final grade, they are less likely to be ignored, and the responder's time is more productive. If comments are supplied on drafts that allow students to modify rather than on a finished text with a grade, the approach is more likely to produce better writers. (Bliss, 2001)

-Avoid marking all errors

While professors and students may assume that their work is finished only when all faults are corrected, research demonstrates that correcting all errors does not improve student performance on subsequent writing assignments. Also, marking a rule-driven error pattern once, modeling one correction, and asking the student to uncover similar errors is more successful.

-Give Feedback to Content First

Students must feel that their readers are as interested in what they have to say as they are in sentence-level correctness, if not more so. As a result, giving content comments first is effective. This isn't to argue that a responder should overlook mistakes; rather, there should be clear indications that the reader is interested in the writer's thoughts.

-Make distinctions between global and local issues

Addressing errors that influence meaning and distinguishing between "local" and "global" faults is more successful.

-Provide written assignments and provide written instructions

Because listening capabilities vary, ESL students want paper copies of assignments. If delivered verbally, students may expend so much cognitive effort attempting to comprehend the task that what is written may be erroneous and incomplete.

1.2.7. Language Proficiency

Language proficiency is concerned with the degree to which the learners have grasped language. Furthermore, Language proficiency refers to the extent to which the learner has mastered the use of a language. As Hamayan & Damico (1991) stated that acquiring proficiency in a specific language is supposed to be a cline and is “the degree of control one has over the language in question” (as cited in Tavakkoli et al., 2014, p. 1886). Furthermore, Language proficiency is defined as an individual’s skill in language

use for a specific purpose, and it can be measured through the application of a proficiency test (Richards, Platt & Platt, 1992, as cited in Gharbavi & Mousavi, 2012, p.111).

Language proficiency is composed of the four skills together with the communicative skills. According to Stem (1991), language proficiency has to do with „the four skills“, i.e. Listening, speaking, reading, and writing, besides speech act rules, language functions, and context (Gharbavi & Mousavi, 2012, p.113). In this regard, Spolsky (1989) explained that language tests involve measuring both a subject's language knowledge and his/her proficiency in the use of that language (as cited in Razmjoo, 2011, p.87).

Conclusion

This chapter discussed EFL Learners' Preferences for Error Corrections in Writing. It is divided into two sections. This chapter deals with the concept of error and error correction in language learning. The first section deals with various definitions of error. Then, difference between error and mistake is clarified. Later on, different types and causes of error are presented. After that, error correction field of study is introduced, in which five Hendrickson's questions are mentioned and discussed. The term corrective feedback is defined and error correction preferences of learners are presented together with different teaching methods, error correction stages and debates. In the second section the role of written error correction was examined, together with different approaches and methods of written error correction including: general approaches, explicit and implicit written error correction, and error correction codes. Besides, the importance and the practice of written error correction were presented. After that clarifies types of errors in writing. Then, introduces the main strategies English teachers used to improve error correction. Finally, various proficiency definitions were provided, and the main components that comprise it.

Chapter Two: Field Work

Introduction

The practical chapter presents the results of the conducted field work and analyses and interprets the findings. Two data gathering tools were used. First, a questionnaire was administered and distributed to a randomly chosen sample of fifty five (55) third year students of English at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia University- Jijel in order to investigate learners' attitudes towards error correction preferences in EFL writing classrooms. Second, a language proficiency test was used to measure the participants' English language proficiency level, the higher the students' scores, the higher their level of English language proficiency.

2.1. Population and Sampling

The population selected for this study is 55 third year students, who have been studying English for almost three years at the University of Mohammed Seddik Benyahia-Jijel. Fifty Five (55) of third year LMD learners from different groups at the department of English language were randomly selected to be a sample of this study. The identity of the participants remained anonymous. It is very important to choose an appropriate sample to make the study more valid and reliable.

2.2. Description of the Research Tools

To collect the needed data for conducting this research, two data gathering instruments were administered, a questionnaire to know the students preferences for error correction, along with a language proficiency test to measure the student' proficiency in English. The two data gathering tools were used at the same time to achieve better results.

2.2.1. Description of the Students Questionnaire

The questionnaire of this study is addressed to a sample of fifty five (55) third year students in the department of foreign languages at Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel University to gather data about students' preferences for error correction. Only 50 students responded to the questionnaire. In the questionnaire, students were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree or disagree with each of the given statements. Also, it includes a set of close ended questions, open-ended questions and multiple choice questions. Besides, using a "5" point scale where 1 means "not important at all", "3" means "moderately important" and "5" means extremely important, the students can choose the answer which is the closest to their opinion, for the sake of unfolding their opinions and attitudes towards the subject under study. The first section of the questionnaire was about error correction in general. The second one was made up of questions about preferred corrective feedback in writing.

2.2.2. Description of the Language Proficiency Test

Language proficiency test is considered as a tool for measuring learners' proficiency level in English and identifying deficiencies. This test is adopted from the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), a widely used language proficiency test. The short version of the test consists of activities in: spelling, punctuation, grammar, vocabulary, sentence structure, reading and writing. The ranges of participants' scores are from 0- 30 marks divided as follow: spelling 05 marks, punctuation 04 marks, grammar 04 marks, vocabulary 04 marks, sentence structure 03 marks, reading 03 marks and writing 07 marks.

Table A: Student's Level of Proficiency

Student's Level of Proficiency		N	%
High Level	0-15	22	44
Low Level	16-30	28	56

The table shows that the participants are grouped according to their scores into two groups: low proficiency students (0-15) and high proficiency students (16-30). To obtain correct results, we decided to take the same number from the two samples which is 22 low proficient and 22 high proficient students.

2.3. Data Analysis

This chapter presents the analysis of the survey:

Table 1: Frequency of Error Correction

How often would you like to be corrected by your teacher?	High		Low	
	N	%	N	%
A/Always	13	59	10	45
B/Usually	4	18	6	27
C/Sometimes	3	14	3	14
D/Occasionally	2	9,1	3	14
E/Never	0	0	0	0

The first question investigated how often students would like to be corrected by their teachers. The results showed that 59% of high proficient students chose the first option always, (14%) of them chose the option sometimes, while 45% of the low proficient students chose the first option always, (14%) of them chose the option sometimes. This means that the majority of students regardless of their proficiency level want their errors to be corrected.

Table 2: Student's Opinions about Correction Frequency of Written Work

High Proficiency Language Students		
1/How often does your teacher correct your written work?	N	%
A/Always	10	45.5
B/Sometimes	7	32
C/Rarely	4	18.2
D/Never	1	4.5
Low Proficiency Language Students		
1/How often does your teacher correct your written work?	N	%
A/Always	5	22.7
B/Sometimes	10	45.5
C/Rarely	6	27.3
D/Never	1	4.5

When asked students how often their teachers correct their written work, (32%) of high and (45.5%) of the low proficiency language students responded sometimes, this means that student's written work are not corrected most of the time. (45.5%) of the high participants and (22.7%) of the low participants responded that their teachers correct their written work always. However, the least favorite option among the high and the low students was rarely with the percentage of (18.2%) and (27.3%) respectively.

Table 3: The Timing of Correcting Students' Errors

High Proficiency Language Students										
When would you like to be corrected?	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%
A/Immediately after making the error	2	9.1	11	50	2	9.1	6	27	1	4,5
B/After I finish my writing	5	23	10	45	5	23	1	4.5	1	4,5
C/After the end of given activity	6	27	13	59	2	9.1	1	4,5	0	0
D/After the end of the lesson	5	23	7	32	4	18	3	14	3	14
Low Proficiency Language Students										
When would you like to be corrected?	SA	%	A	%	N	%	D	%	SD	%
A/Immediately after making the error	6	27	9	41	2	9,1	3	14	2	9,1
B/After I finish my writing	2	9,1	10	45	10	45	0	0	0	0
C/After the end of given activity	5	23	10	45	4	18	3	14	0	0
D/After the end of the lesson	2	9,1	11	50	6	27	3	14	0	0

SA = strongly agree, a = agree, N = neutral, D = disagree, SA= strongly disagree

This question examined when the learners like to be corrected. Half of high level participants (59.1%) agreed with correcting their errors immediately after they make an error. Besides, (45%) agreed with the correction which takes place after they finish their writings. The most favorite option among the high proficient students was the correction after the end of a given activity, the highest number of learners chose the option agree (59%). The idea of correcting errors after the end of the lesson has (32%) of agreement by the participants. On the other hand, the most favorite option among the low proficient students was the correction of errors at the end of the lesson (50%); thus, almost half of the low participants (45%) agreed with the correction which takes place after they finish their writing, and after the end of a given activity; while, (41%) of them agreed with the statement of correcting errors immediately.

Table 4: Proper Stage For Feedback

High Proficiency Language Students						
I would like my teacher to give me feedback at:	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/The prewriting stage	12	54,5	9	40,9	1	4,54
B/The drafting stage	9	40,9	5	22,7	8	36,4
C/The revising stage	12	54,5	5	22,7	5	22,7
D/The evaluation stage	17	77,3	4	18,2	1	4,54
Low Proficiency Language Students						
I would like my teacher to give me feedback at:	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/The prewriting stage	10	45	4	18	8	36
B/The drafting stage	15	68	5	23	2	9,1
C/The revising stage	9	41	6	27	7	32
D/The evaluation stage	5	23	10	45	7	32

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

In the table above, 54.5% of high proficiency language students agreed with the statement of giving feedback at the prewriting stage. 40.9 % of them prefer to have feedback at the drafting stage, more than half of the learners (54.5%) are with the idea of having feedback

at the revising stage. Besides, getting feedback at the evaluation stage is more important for students in their ideas (77.3%). On the other hand, (68%) of the low proficiency language students agreed with the statement of giving feedback at the drafting stage, (45%) of the low participants are likely to have feedback at the prewriting stage, while (41%) of the participants chose to receive feedback at the revising stage. However, the less important option for the low proficient students was giving feedback at the evaluation stage (23%). It is clear that the most preferred option for the high participants was giving feedback at the evaluation stage.

Table 5: Color of Pen for Feedback

High Proficiency Language Students						
In giving feedback, I like teachers to use:	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/The red pen	14	64	7	32	1	4,5
B/The pencil	9	41	11	50	2	9,1
Low Proficiency Language Students						
In giving feedback, I like teachers to use:	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/The red pen	13	59	9	41	0	0
B/The pencil	9	41	8	36	5	23

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

The above table illustrated that 64% of the high proficiency level students prefer to be corrected using red pen, while using a pencil came in as the second choice with (41%) of votes. On the other hand, 59% of the low level students prefer to be corrected using red pen, while 41% of them prefer to be corrected using a pencil. The results showed that using the red pen is useful as it highlights the errors by making them apparent to the learner.

Table 6: The Amount of Teacher Written Correction

High Proficiency Language Students						
It would be better if my teacher:	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Corrects all the errors	21	95	1	4,5	0	0
B/Selects some errors	12	55	5	23	5	23
C/Doesn't correct any error	1	4,5	18	82	3	14

Low Proficiency Language Students						
It would be better if my teacher:	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Corrects all the errors	15	68	5	23	2	9,1
B/Selects some errors	10	45	8	36	4	18
C/Doesn't correct any error	0	0	18	82	4	18

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

In the table of the high proficiency language students, the highest percentage (95%) was given to the idea of correcting all errors, while 55% preferred the selection of some errors; however, there were only (4.5%) votes for the idea of not correcting the errors at all. On the other hand, 68% of the low level students agreed with idea of correcting all errors, while 45% insisted on the selection of some errors, however there were no votes for the idea of not correcting the errors. Thus, most students favored the whole correction of errors to be understood for them.

Table 7: Deciding Who will do The Correction

High Proficiency Language Students						
Who do you think should correct the errors in your writing?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Teacher	22	100	0	0	0	0
B/Your Peers (Classmates)	15	68	4	18	3	14
C/Yourself (self-correction)	13	59	5	23	4	18
Low Proficiency Language Students						
Who do you think should correct the errors in your writing?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Teacher	20	91	2	9,1	0	0
B/Your Peers (Classmates)	0	0	18	82	4	18
C/Yourself (self-correction)	17	77	5	23	0	0

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

In the above table, all the high proficiency language students (100%) and (91%) of low proficiency language students agreed that the teacher is the best person to correct their errors. This is maybe because students feel comfortable when the errors are corrected by the teacher. More than half of the high participants (68%) accepted to get some correction from their peers, besides, (59%) liked to correct errors by themselves; while, more than

half of the low participants (77%) preferred the idea of self-correction. The correction from peers got no votes.

Table 8: Forms of Paper-Marking Techniques

High Proficiency Language Students						
How would you like teachers to correct students' errors in writing?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Writing questions	10	45	11	50	1	4,5
B/Writing Statement	19	86	2	9,1	1	4,5
C/Underlining the errors and write comments at the end of the essay	20	90,9	0	0	2	9,1
D/Using imperatives	8	36	8	36	6	27
E/Using exclamations	11	50	9	41	2	9,1
F/Crossing out the error and writing in the correct word or structure	18	82	3	14	1	4,5
G/Using correction codes	11	50	7	32	4	18
Low Proficiency Language Students						
How would you like teachers to correct students' errors in writing?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Writing questions	15	68,2	5	22,7	2	9,1
B/Writing Statement	18	81,8	3	13,6	1	4,5
C/Underlining the errors and write comments at the end of the essay	20	90,9	1	4,54	1	4,5
D/Using imperatives	12	54,5	8	36,4	2	9,1
E/Using exclamations	12	54,5	8	36,4	2	9,1
F/Crossing out the error and writing in the correct word or structure	17	77,3	3	13,6	2	9,1
G/Using correction codes	12	54,5	8	36,4	2	9,1

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

This table illustrates that statements (B), (C) and (F) have a high percentage of agreement by high proficiency language students with the percentage (86%), (90.9%) and (82%) respectively. Afterwards, the statement (E) and (G) showed the same percentage (50%). Almost half of the high participants (45%) chose the statement (A). Statement (D) showed the less percentage (36%) by high level learners on correcting their errors in writing by their teachers using correction codes and writing questions. On the other hand, the

statement (B), (C) and (F) have a high percentage of agreement by participants with the percentage (81.8%), (90.9%) and (77.3%). Afterwards, the statement (D), (E) and (G) showed the same percentage (54.5%) by the low level participants on correcting their errors using imperatives, exclamations and correction codes. (68.2%) of the low level participants want their teachers to correct their errors in writing by writing questions.

Table 9: Focus on Feedback

High Proficiency Language Students						
Which aspect(s) in writing would you prefer teacher's comments to focus on?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/ grammar	21	95	0	0	1	4,5
B/ punctuation and spelling	16	73	5	23	1	4,5
C/vocabulary choice	14	64	3	14	5	23
D/content	18	82	2	9,1	2	9,1
E/organization and paragraph construction	12	55	7	32	3	14
Low Proficiency Language Students						
Which aspect(s) in writing would you prefer teacher's comments to focus on?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/ grammar	16	73	2	9,1	4	18
B/ punctuation and spelling	14	64	5	23	3	14
C/vocabulary choice	10	45	2	9,1	10	45
D/content	18	82	4	18	0	0
E/organization and paragraph construction	12	55	5	23	5	23

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

In the table above high proficiency language students gave a great importance to the statements (A) and (D), they would like their teachers to focus on the grammatical errors (95%) and content (82%). While, (73%) of them preferred their teachers to focus on punctuation and spelling. In the statement (C) more than half of the high participants (64%) insist their teachers to focus on vocabulary choice. Finally, (55%) of them preferred their teachers to focus on the organization and paragraph construction. On the other hand, (82%) of low proficiency language students would like their teachers to focus on the content (statement D), more than half (73%) of the low proficient students preferred their teachers to focus on the grammar mistakes. while (64%) of them prefer their teachers'

comments to focus on punctuation and spelling. Finally, the statement (C) and (E) are almost close to each other with the percentage (45%) and (55%) respectively.

Table 10: Types of Feedback

High Proficiency Language Students						
Which type of teacher's comments do you prefer?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/General comments	20	91	1	4,5	1	4,5
B/Detailed and specific comments	14	64	7	32	1	4,5
C/Positive comments	21	95	1	4,5	0	0
D/Negative comments	11	50	9	41	2	9,1
E/Direct feedback	17	77	2	9,1	3	14
F/Indirect feedback	8	36	12	55	2	9,1
G/Margin feedback	7	32	7	32	8	36
H/End feedback	7	32	9	41	6	27
Low Proficiency Language Students						
Which type of teacher's comments do you prefer?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/General comments	15	68	6	27	1	4,5
B/Detailed and specific comments	14	64	8	36	0	0
C/Positive comments	15	68	7	32	0	0
D/Negative comments	9	41	11	50	2	9,1
E/Direct feedback	13	59	8	36	1	4,5
F/Indirect feedback	15	68	5	23	2	9,1
G/Margin feedback	10	45	8	36	4	18
H/End feedback	13	59	7	32	2	9,1

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

The above table indicates that statements (C), (E), (B) and (A) get high various percentage by the high language proficiency students, in which (95%) of them preferred positive feedback, while (77%) of them chose direct feedback. (91%) of high proficiency language students stand for general comments, while (64%) of them chose detailed and specific comments. Besides, (36%) of them preferred their teachers to give them indirect feedback. The less important options are margin feedback and end feedback (32%). On the other hand, the statement (A),(C) and (F) got the same high various percentage (68%), in which low proficiency language students preferred general comments, positive comments and indirect feedback. While (64%) chose to receive detailed and specific comments. However,

more than half of the low participants (59%) stand for direct feedback and end feedback. The statements (D), and (G) are almost close to each other with the percentage (41%), and (45%) respectively.

Table 11: Teachers' Comments and Corrections

High Proficiency Language Students						
What do students usually do after they read their teacher's comments and corrections?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Students like to read every mark/ comment their teacher wrote on their piece of work carefully	18	82	2	9,1	2	9,1
B/Students are mostly concerned and motivated about the grade	20	91	0	0	2	9,1
C/Students ask their teacher for help	16	73	3	14	3	14
D/Students ask some other teachers for help	7	32	10	45	5	23
E/Students use the internet to find more reference	19	86	1	4,5	2	9,1
F/Students go to the library to consult reference materials (e.g. grammar book dictionary)	15	68	5	24	2	9,1
G/Students ask their classmates for help	10	45	6	27	6	27
H/Students make correction themselves	11	50	7	32	4	18
I/Students ignore them because they do not know how to make the corrections	6	27	12	55	4	18
J/ Students don't like to read the entire composition again after their teachers have marked them	7	32	12	55	3	14
Low Proficiency Language Students						
What do students usually do after they read their teacher's comments and corrections?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Students like to read every mark/ comment their teacher wrote on their piece of work carefully	15	68,2	5	22,7	2	9,1
B/Students are mostly concerned and motivated about the grade	14	63,6	6	27,3	2	9,1
C/Students ask their teacher for help	13	59,1	8	36,4	2	9,1
D/Students ask some other teachers for help	10	45	8	36,4	4	18
E/Students use the internet to find more reference	16	72,7	4	18,2	2	9,1
F/Students go to the library to consult reference materials (e.g. grammar book dictionary)	13	59	7	31,8	2	9,1
G/Students ask their classmates for help	7	32	10	45,5	5	23
H/Students make correction themselves	10	45	10	45,5	2	9,1
I/Students ignore them because they do not know how to make the corrections	8	36,4	10	45,5	4	18
J/ Students don't like to read the entire composition again after their teachers have marked them	5	22,7	15	68,2	2	9,1

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

In the table above, (91%) the high proficiency language students are mostly concerned and motivated about the grade (statement B). The results of statement (A), (E), (C) and (F) were almost close to each other (82%), (86%), (73%) and (68%) respectively. Also, the statements (G) and (H) were almost close to each other with the percentage of (45%) and (50%) respectively. the statements (D) and (J) have the same percentage (32%). Finally, statement (I) is the less important option (27%). On the other hand,(72.7%) of the low proficient students use the internet to find more references. The results of statement (A), (B) ,(C)and (F) were almost close to each other with the percentage (68.2%), (63.2%), (59.1%) and (59%) respectively. The statements (D) and (H) had the same percentage (45%). The last three statements (G), (I) and (J) were almost close to each other with the percentage (32%), (36,4%) and (22.7%) respectively.

Table 12: Students Thoughts about Teachers' Comments

High Proficiency Language Students						
How do you think about teacher's comments (pre, while, after correcting errors)?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Teacher's comments are too negative and discouraging	8	36,4	12	4,54	2	9,09
B/Teacher's comments are too general	14	63,6	5	22,7	3	13,6
C/Teachers enjoy writing comments on composition	17	77,3	2	9,09	3	13,6
D/Teacher's comments and corrections help students to know what to avoid/ improve next time	19	86,4	2	9,09	1	4,54
E/Teacher's comments and corrections help students to know where mistakes are and correct them	20	90,9	2	9,09	0	0
F/The feedback given makes students want to try harder to improve in their writing	18	81,8	3	13,6	1	4,5
G/The feedback given makes students feel good about them	8	36,4	7	31,8	7	31,8
H/Students feel that their writing have improved because of the feedback given on their paper	16	72,7	3	13,6	3	13,6
I/Generally, I like the way the composition is marked	11	50	5	22,7	6	27,3
Low Proficiency Language Students						
How do you think about teacher's comments (pre, while, after correcting errors)?	A	%	DA	%	DN	%
A/Teacher's comments are too negative and discouraging	22	100	0	0	0	0
B/Teacher's comments are too general	20	90,9	2	9,09	0	0
C/Teachers enjoy writing comments on composition	10	45,5	2	9,09	10	45,5
D/Teacher's comments and corrections help students to	19	86,4	1	4,54	2	9,09

know what to avoid/ improve next time						
E/Teacher's comments and corrections help students to know where mistakes are and correct them	18	81,8	2	9,09	2	9,09
F/The feedback given makes students want to try harder to improve in their writing	15	68	5	22,7	2	9,09
G/The feedback given makes students feel good about them	4	18	16	72,7	2	9,09
H/Students feel that their writing have improved because of the feedback given on their paper	9	41	11	50	2	9,09
I/Generally, I like the way the composition is marked	13	59,1	5	22,7	4	18,2

A= agree, DA= disagree, DN= I do not know

The table above indicates that the highest percentage of high language proficiency students (90.9%) agreed that teacher's comments and corrections help them to know where mistakes are and correct them. The statement (D), (C), (F), (H) and (B) were almost close to each other with the percentage (86.4%), (77.3%), (81.8%), (72.7%) and (63.6%) respectively. Half of the high participants (50%) like the way the composition is marked. Finally, Statement (A) and (G) showed the less percentage (36.4%) respectively. On the other hand, all the low proficiency language students (100%) agreed that teacher's comments are too negative and discouraging. The statement (B),(D) and (E) were almost close to each other with the percentage (90.9%), (86.4%) and (81.8%) respectively. (68%) of the low participants agreed with the idea that the feedback given makes them want to try harder to improve in their writing, while (59.1%) of them like the way the composition is marked. The statements (C) and (H) are almost close to each other with the percentage (45.5%) and (41%) respectively. Finally, Statement (G) showed the less percentage (18%).

Table 13: Students Satisfaction Regarding Teacher's Response to Errors

High Proficiency Language Students	Yes	%	No	%
Students satisfaction regarding teacher's response to errors	16	72,7	6	27
Low Proficiency Language Students	Yes	%	No	%
Students satisfaction regarding teacher's response to errors	4	18,2	18	82

The table above illustrates that (72.7%) of the high proficiency language students were satisfied with the way the teacher responds to their errors, while 27% didn't agree. However, (82%) of the low proficiency language students were not satisfied with the way the teacher responds to their errors, while (18.2%) agreed with the idea.

Table 14: Students' Response about Usefulness of Teacher's Correction

High Proficiency Language Students		Yes	%	No	%
students' response about usefulness of teacher's correction		18	82	4	18.2
Low Proficiency Language Students		Yes	%	No	%
students' response about usefulness of teacher's correction		7	32	15	68

When asked about usefulness of teacher's correction, 82% of the high proficiency and 32% of the low proficiency language students answered "Yes" because they find it helpful. On the other hand, 18.2% of high proficiency and 68% of the low proficiency students didn't find their teacher's correction useful.

Table 15: Students Opinions about Correction Time of Their Written Work

High Proficiency Language Students		
When do you want to be corrected by your teacher in writing class?	N	%
A/At the end of the activity, in front of the other students	6	27.3
B/During the activity, in front of the students	3	14
C/After the activity, in front of the students	0	0
D/After the activity, in private	7	31.8
E/It does not matter	6	27.3
Low Proficiency Language Students		
When do you want to be corrected by your teacher in writing class?	N	%
A/At the end of the activity, in front of the other students	5	22.7
B/During the activity, in front of the students	5	22.7
C/After the activity, in front of the students	2	9.1
D/After the activity, in private	3	14
E/It does not matter	7	31.8

27.3% of high proficiency language students and (22.7%) of the low proficiency language students prefer to receive feedback at the end of the activity in front of the class. (27.3%) of the high participants and (31%) of the low participants do not mind about correction time. (31.8%) of high proficiency language students and (14%) of the low proficiency students prefer to receive feedback after the activity in private. (14%) of the high proficiency language students want their errors to be corrected during the activity in front of students, while, (22.7%) of the low participants agreed with the idea.

Discussion of the Results

The results of this study provided the answers to the research questions. This study investigates the relationship between students' preferences for error correction and their language proficiency level.

Firstly, the results show that there are quite different opinions on the topic of error correction. This difference in opinions proved that students are not oblivious to the topic and would like to be a part of the process of error correction in writing:

- The student dependence on their teachers was obvious by both groups of students and they regarded it as a necessity and the teacher's responsibility.
- Some ways of error correction are preferred by some students than others and this diversity of these preferences will help the learners and their teachers get rid of the boredom of traditional writing classes.

Second, the study proved that error correction preferences are influenced by various levels of language proficiency:

- More proficient and low proficient learners were both interested in error feedback but they differ in the type of preferences.

- The high proficient learners do not make as many errors as less proficient students. They are more confident and more experienced in language learning than less proficient students; thus, they have special preferences for error correction.
- Error correction might demotivate less proficient learners and might make them more anxious about receiving errors since it draws attention to their weaknesses.

Conclusion:

This chapter tackled the description of the research design, instruments, and population. It was also an attempt to answer the research questions through the analysis of both the learners' questionnaires and test of language proficiency. It has confirmed the proposed hypotheses. Furthermore, it contains some recommendations that the researcher has reached thanks to the basis of the main findings.

General Conclusion

This research investigates the relationship between EFL learners' preferences for error corrections in writing and their language proficiency. It was undertaken to answer the following problem: How do learners perceive error correction and what is its effect on their language proficiency? Is there any significant relationship between EFL learners' preferences for error correction and their language proficiency? Is there a difference in attitudes between more proficient and less proficient learners? To answer these questions we relied on a mixed method, randomly choosing a sample of 55 third year EFL students. A questionnaire and a test were administered to the third year students of English in the department of English at the University of Jijel for the academic year 2021-2022.

Concerning the findings of this quantitative study, it has been noticed from the results obtained that some ways of error correction are preferred by some students than others and there are quite different opinions on the topic of error correction. Moreover, the study proved that error correction preferences are influenced by the level of language proficiency. More proficient learners tend to be more interested in error feedback than those of lower proficiency, because high proficient are more confident and more experienced in language learning than less proficient students; thus, they have special preferences for error correction. However, Error correction might demotivate less proficient learners and might make them more anxious about receiving errors since it draws attention to their weaknesses.

To put things together, it must be said that investigating the preferences of error correction is of great importance for the teachers and students. In fact, the diversity of these preferences will help the learners and teachers get rid of the boredom of traditional writing classrooms.

Limitations of the study

1. This study did not intend to provide definitive answers but rather to investigate learners' attitudes in order to suggest some preliminary findings which may help further research.
2. Due to several weaknesses in the research design, the results can, of course, only be regarded as tentative. The small sample size is an obvious reason for treating the following results with some skepticism. Thus, adding the classroom observation would be useful for the accuracy of the results.
3. Learners' proficiency influences their attitudes towards error correction; learners with higher grades have a more positive attitude towards error correction.

Pedagogical Recommendations

There are several recommendations which can be given based on the findings of this research:

1. Students need to be aware that they have the capability to correct others as well as themselves. It necessary that they change their mind and the teacher cannot be the only one involved in the correction process.
2. Teachers as well as students need to discuss what the best way is for them about giving feedback to their written pieces. Students should participate in new activities to feel more comfortable and inspired throughout class.
3. Adding activities to the process of error correction in writing would be useful like games and free writings.
4. The preferences for error correction for both teachers and students should be applied.

5. Teachers should know more about students' preferences for error correction for the sake of directing, guiding, and understanding them to enhance the process of learning.
6. Researchers are recommended to replicate this study using observation as a method of data collection.

List of References

- AbiSamra, N. (2003). *An Analysis of Errors in Arabic Speakers' English Writings*. Beirut: American University of Beirut.
- Alavi, S. M., & Kaivanpanah, S. (2007). Feedback expectancy and EFL learners' achievement in English. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, 3(2), 181-196.
- Alroe, M. J. (2011). Error correction of L2 students' texts- Theory, evidence and pedagogy. *Asian EFL journal*, 50, 34-70
- Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the Language Learner*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice. *English Teaching Forum*, 38(4), 20-24.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 14, 191-205.
- Broughton, G., Brumfit, Ch. and Pincas, A. and Wilde, R. D. (2003). *Teaching English as a foreign language*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching by principles : interactive language teaching methodology*. New York : Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc. 396.
- Burt, H.D. (1975). Error Analysis in The Adult EFL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9(1), 53-63.

- Burt, M., & Kiparsky, C. 1978. Global and local mistakes, in J. Schumann & N. Stenson (Eds.). *New frontiers in second language learning*. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishing, Inc.
- Casanave, C. P. (2004). *Controversies in Second Language Writing: Dilemmas and Decisions in Research and Instruction*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Cathcart, R., & Olsen, J. (1976). Teachers' and Students' Preferences for Correction of Classroom and Conversation Errors. *Washington, DC. TESOL*, 41-53.
- 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, 267-296.
- Chaudron, C. (1977). A Description Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46.
- Choděra, R. (2006). *Didaktika cizích jazyků*. Praha: Academia
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 4, 161-169.
- Dabaghi, A. (2008). A Comparison of the Effects of Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback on Learners' Performance in Tailor-made Tests. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 8, 1-13.
- Dekeyser, R. (1993). The Effect of Error Correction on Second Language Grammar Knowledge and Oral Proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 501-514.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M. and Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 28, 339-368.

Ellis, R. (2009). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal* 63 (2), 97-107.

Ferris, D. (1995). Student Reactions to Teacher Response in Multiple-Draft Composition Classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*. 29, 33-53.

Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C. & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher Commentary on Student Writing: Descriptions and Implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 6(2), 155.

Ferris, D. (1999). The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 8(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes. How Explicit Does It Need To Be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 10, 161-184.

Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. New Jersey: Mahwah. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. 50-51.

Freeman, Diane Larsen. 2000. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S.M. and Selinker, L. (Eds.). 1994. *Language transfer in language learning* (re.ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

George. H. V. *Common Errors in Language Learning*. Rowley. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers. 1972.

Gharbavi, A., Mousavi, S.A. (2012). Do language proficiency levels correspond to language learning strategy adoption? *English Language Teaching*, 5(7), 110-122.

Havranek, G. (2002). When is Corrective Feedback Most Likely to Succeed? *International Journal of Educational Research*, 27, 3-4, 255-270.

Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on Feedback. Assessing Learner Receptivity to Teacher Response in L2 Composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 3, 141-163.

Hendrickson, J.M. (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. *Modern Language Journal*, 62, 387-398.

Hendrickson, J. (1978). Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching: Recent Theory, Research, and Practice. *Modern Language Journal*. Vol. 62: 457-467

Hendrickson, J. M. (1984). The Treatment of Error in Writing Work. In. S. McKay (Ed.), *Composing in a Second Language*. Rowley MA: Newbury House Publishers. 145-159.

Horwitz, E. K. (1988). The Beliefs About Language Learning of Beginning University Foreign Language Students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72, 283–294.

Hyland, K. (1990). Providing Productive Feedback. *ELT Journal*. 44(4), 279-285.

Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. *Language Teaching*. 39(2), 83-101.

James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis*. London: Longman.

Katayama, A. (2007). Learners' Perceptions Toward Oral Error Correction. *Conference Proceedings, Tokyo: JALT*. 2-10.

- Kepner, C. G. (1991). An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills. *The Modern Language Journal*. 75 (3), 305-313.
- Komura, K. (1999). Student Response to Error Correction in ESL Classrooms. In Ferris, D. (2003). *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students*. New Jersey: Mahwah. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. 105.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Institute.
- Krashen, S. (1994). The Pleasure Hypothesis. *Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics*, 299-322.
- Lee, I. (2004). Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms: The Case of Hong Kong. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 13, 285-312.
- Leki, I. (1991). The Preferences of ESL Students for Error Correction in College-level Writing Classes. *Foreign Language Annals*. 24, 203-218.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. (1991) Focus on Form: A Design Feature in Language Teaching Methodology. In K. D. Bot & R. B. Ginsberg & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research from a cross-cultural perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lyster, R. and Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake. *Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 19(1), 37-66.
- Mac Donald Lightbound, P. (2005). *An analysis of interlanguage errors in synchronous/asynchronous/ intercultural communication exchanges* [Pdf file]. (Doctoral

dissertation, Universitat de Valencia, 2011). Retrieved January 3, 2013 from

<http://tdx.cat/handle/10803/9786>

Morris, F. & Tarone, E. (2003). Impact of Classroom Dynamics on the Effectiveness of Recasts in Second Language Acquisition. *Language Learning*, 53(2), 325-368.

Ortega, L. (2009). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. London: Hodder Education. 13-21, 337-367.

Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological Constraints on the Teachability of Languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 6, 186-214.

Razmjoo, S. A. (2011). Language proficiency tests in the Iranian context: Do they represent communicative language testing model? *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 85-96.

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G., & Sacks, H. (1977). The Preference for Self-correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation. *Language*, 53(2), 361-382.

Schmidt, R. (1994). Deconstructing Consciousness in Search of Useful Definitions for *Applied Linguistics*. *AILA Review*. 11, 11-26.

Schulz, R. A. (1996). Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Students' and teachers' views on error correction and the role of grammar. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 343-364.

Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: the USA– Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-258.

Suarez, A. E. (2013) The effect of teacher's error correction strategies on students' writing, seventh grade [Mémoire non publié]. <https://repositorio.unan.edu.ni/1109/1/784.pdf>

Tavakkoli, Z., Rakhshandehroo, F., Izadpanah, M., & Moradi-Shad, M. (2014). Ego identity

types and language proficiency of Iranian EFL learners. *Procedia - social and behavioral sciences*, 98, 1885 – 1894.

Tomkova, G. (2013). *Error Correction in Spoken Practice*. A thesis for Master Degree of Arts in the Department of English and American Studies in Masaryk University. Czech Republic.

Truscott, J. (1996). *The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes*. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.

Truscott, J. & Yi-ping Hsu, A. (2008). *Error Correction, Revision, and Learning*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292-305.

Van Beuningen, C. (2010). *Corrective Feedback in L2 Writing: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Insights, and Future Directions*. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10 (20), 1-27.

Wingfield, R. J. "Five Ways of Dealing with Errors in Written Compositions." *English Language Teaching Journal* 29 (1975): 311-313.

Yoshida, R. (2008). *Teachers' Choice and Learners' Preference of Corrective Feedback Types*. *Language Awareness*, 17(1), 78-93.

Appendix (A)

Students' questionnaire

Dear students,

This study is prepared for the sake of collecting data that will furnish us with the necessary to validate our final findings and to bring our master's dissertation to an end. This questionnaire aims at investigating the students' preferences for error correction in writing. We are kindly asking you to fill in this questionnaire. May we thank you in advance for your cooperation and for the time devoted to answer the questionnaire.

I. Personal information:

1. Gender

Female Male

II. Academic Aspects:

Section One: Error and Error Correction in Language Learning

***Circle the answer which is the closest to your opinion.**

1. How often would you like to be corrected by your teacher?

Always Usually Sometimes Occasionally Never

2. How often does your teacher correct your written work?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never

2. When would you like to be corrected?

***Immediately after making the error**

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

*** After I finish my writing.**

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

***After the end of given activity.**

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

***After the end of the lesson.**

Strongly agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly disagree

3. Use a tick (✓) to indicate the answer which is the closest to your opinion

Items: agree (A), disagree (DA), I do not know (DN)

1/I would like my teacher to give me feedback at:	A	DA	DN
a/The prewriting stage			
b/The drafting stage			
c/The revising stage			
d/The evaluation stage			

2/In giving feedback, i like teachers to use:	A	DA	DN
a/The red pen			
b/The pencil			

3/It would be better if my teacher:	A	DA	DN
a/Corrects all the errors			

b/Selects some errors			
c/Doesn't correct any error			

Section Two: Written Error Correction

4/Who do you think should correct the errors in your writing?	A	DA	DN
a/Teacher			
b/Your Peers (Classmates)			
c/Yourself (self-correction)			

5/How would you like teachers to correct students' errors in writing?	A	DA	DN
a/Writing questions			
b/Writing Statement			
c/Underlining the errors and write comments at the end of the essay			
d/Using imperatives			
e/Using exclamations			
f/Crossing out the error and writing in the correct word or structure			
g/Using correction codes			

6/ Which aspect(s) in writing would you prefer teacher's comments to focus on?	A	DA	DN
a/Point out errors in grammar			

b/Point out errors in punctuation			
c/Make comments on the organization of the paper			
d/content			
e/organization and paragraph construction			

7/ Which type of teacher's comments do you prefer?	A	DA	DN
a/General comments			
b/Detailed and specific comments			
c/Positive comments			
d/Negative comments			
e/Direct feedback			
f/Indirect feedback			
g/Margin feedback			
h/End feedback			

8/ What do students usually do after they read their teacher's comments and corrections?	A	DA	DN
a/Students like to read every mark/ comment their teacher wrote on their piece of work carefully			
b/Students are mostly concerned and motivated about the grade			

c/Students ask their teacher for help			
d/Students ask some other teachers for help			
e/Students use the internet to find more reference			
f/Students go to the library to consult reference materials (e.g. grammar book dictionary)			
g/Students ask their classmates for help			
h/Students make correction themselves			
i/Students ignore them because they do not know how to make the corrections			
j/ Students don't like to read the entire composition again after their teachers have marked them			

9- How do you feel about teacher's comments?	A	DA	DN
a/Teacher's comments are too negative and discouraging			
b/Teacher's comments are too general			
c/Teachers enjoy writing comments on composition			
d/Teacher's comments and corrections help students to know what to avoid/ improve next time			
e/Teacher's comments and corrections help students to know where mistakes are and correct them			
f/The feedback given makes students want to try harder to improve in			

their writing			
g/The feedback given makes students feel good about them			
h/Students feel that their writing have improved because of the feedback given on their paper			
i/Generally, I like the way the composition is marked			

1. Do you like the way your current teacher responds to your errors in your writings?

.....

2.Can you please describe how your teacher corrects your writing errors?

.....

3. Do you find the way your teachers correct your writing to be useful?

.....

4. How often does your teacher correct your written work?

Always Sometimes Rarely Never

5.When do you want to be corrected by your teacher in writing class?

*At the end of the activity, in front of the other students

*During the activity, in front of the students

*After the activity, in front of the students

*After the activity, in private

*It does not matter

Appendix (B)

The Language Proficiency Test

This test is adopted from the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), a widely used language proficiency test. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xNhILN6ajd0>

*Circle the answer which fits within the blank:

A/SPELLING:

1. The school report implied that discipline could do with some.....

A.improovments /B.inprovements /C.improovements /D.improvements /E.immprovements

2. The team made a.....to improving standards in English departments.

A.comitment / B.commitment / C.committment / D.comittmant / E.cermittment

3. Students acted as.....of the school during the trip.

A.representatives / B.reprisentitives / C.reppresentatives / D.reppresentatives

/E.representitives

4. There were no new additions to this year's mathematics.....

A.curriculum / B.curicullum / C.curricullum / D.corriculum / E.cirriculum

5. Ramps were installed to.....for students using wheelchairs.

A.accomidate / B.accommadate / C.acomidate / D.accomodate / E.acommodate

B/PUNCTUATION:

Q1.Which of the following sentences has to correct placement of commas and full stops?

- A. So far seventeen students have been placed under observation, with at least five of them, at risk of temporary suspension.
- B. So far, seventeen students have been placed under observation, with at least five of them at risk of temporary suspension.
- C. So far, seventeen students have been placed under observation. With at least five of them at risk of temporary suspension.
- D. So far seventeen students have been placed under observation with at least five of them at risk of temporary suspension.

Q2. Which of the following sentences has the correct placement of commas and full stops?

- A. The colour of the school tie, had been changed from a deep blue to bright purple, with an emblem at the top.
- B. The colour of the school tie had been changed from a deep blue to bright purple with an emblem at the top.
- C. The colour of the school tie had been changed from a deep blue to bright purple with an emblem at, the top.
- D. The colour of the school tie had been changed from a deep blue to bright purple, with an emblem at the top.

C/ GRAMMAR:

Q1. Which of the following sentences is grammatically correct?

- A. Steven asked them to go over their because he felt the experience would be of benefit to their future.
- B. Steven asked them to go over they're because he felt the experience would be of benefit to their future.
- C. Steven asked them to go over there because he felt the experience would be of benefit to their future.

D. Steven asked them to go over their because he felt the experience would be of benefit to there future.

Q2. Which of the following sentences is grammatically correct?

A. There are lots of spiders in their garage, so they're going to clean it out tomorrow.

B. There are lots of spiders in their garage, so there going to clean it out tomorrow.

C. There are lots of spiders in their garage, so their going to clean it out tomorrow.

D. There are lots of spiders in they're garage, so they're going to clean it out tomorrow.

D/VOCABULARY:

*Insert the missing word.

Q1. We can't believe you're going to the Maldives this summer; it must be costing you a.....!

A. money B. fortune C. earth D. a lot

Q2. Try.....the lawn with a lawn mower. It'll work better.

A. cut B. moving C. cutting D. rowing

Q3. Samantha was reading a magazine when she.....across an article about her old boss.

A. noticed B. came C. mumbled D. read

Q4. The thunderstorm.....the house shake!

A. started B. shook C. forced D. made

E/SENTENCE STRUCTURE:

Q1. Which two words need to be swapped around in order for the sentence to read correctly?

Doctors are sometimes confused as to why a treatment is not following and it is often the case that the patient is not working their advice.

Q2. Which two words need to be swapped around in order for the sentence to read correctly?

The only way to ensure a strong economy is to maintain that unemployment is low and productivity is high.

Q3. Which two words need to be swapped around in order for the sentence to read correctly?

The torrential rain had been flooding down for 6 hours now, and the drain was beginning to pour.

F/READING:

*After reading the passage, decide whether the statement is TRUE, FALSE or CANNOT SAY based on the information provided.

Pull-ups are a great way of building the core upper body muscle groups. The unfortunate thing about this type of exercise is you will probably need to attend a gym in order to carry it out. Having said that, there are a number of different types of pull-up bars available to buy on the market that can easily and safely be fitted to a doorway at home. If you choose to purchase one of these items, make sure that it conforms to the relevant safety standards first.

Q1. Before carrying out any form of exercise it is important that you stretch thoroughly.

A. TRUE

B. FALSE

C. CANNOT SAY

Q2. Pull-ups are not an effective way of building core upper body muscle groups.

A. TRUE

B. FALSE

C. CANNOT SAY

Q3. Fitting a pull-up bar safely to a doorway at home is not easy.

A. TRUE

B. FALSE

C. CANNOT SAY

G/WRITING:

Q1. The following sentences (A-E) can be put together to form a well-connected passage but are not in the correct order. Choose the option that gives the best order of sentences.

A. Then they went back into the cabin.

B. His father walked into the large bedroom to the right of the kitchen

C. Michael went into the little room on the left.

D. They stood in silence for a full five minutes.

E. Each hungered to embrace the other, to cry, to scream with excess of sorrow.

a. DACBE

b. DEACB

c. CBDEA

d. CBEDA

Q2. Read the following and choose the right word to connect the sentences:

The weather office had predicted that it would rain.....1.....Their predictions are usually accurate.....2....., it did not rain for several days. When.....3.....the rain did come, it was insufficient.....4.....the crops were damaged.

1. a. frequently

b. much

c. soon

d. well

2. a. however

b. but

c. through

d. instead

3. a. definitely b. in the end c. at last d. lastly

4. a. and b. also c. even d. that

Résumé

L'étude actuelle a été menée dans le but d'enquêter sur la relation entre les préférences des apprenants ALE pour les corrections d'erreurs en expression écrite et leur maîtrise de la langue. Deux outils de collecte de données ont été administrés à un échantillon choisi au hasard de cinquante-cinq (55) étudiants de troisième année d'anglais à l'Université Mohammed Seddik Ben Yahia-Jijel. Un questionnaire a été élaboré pour vérifier les préférences des étudiants en matière de correction d'erreurs, ainsi qu'un test de compétence linguistique pour vérifier le niveau de compétence des participants en anglais. Les résultats ont révélé qu'il existe des opinions assez différentes sur le sujet de la correction d'erreurs, mais la correction d'erreurs est influencée par le niveau de compétence linguistique, ce qui signifie que les élèves très compétents montrent plus de préférences que les élèves peu compétents. En conséquence, les préférences des apprenants en matière de correction d'erreurs doivent être prises en compte par les enseignants pour améliorer le processus d'enseignement.

Mots clés : Préférences, correction d'erreurs, maîtrise de la langue, apprenants ALE.

ملخص

أجريت هذه الدراسة من أجل التحقق من العلاقة بين تفضيلات متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية لتصحيح الأخطاء في الكتابة وإتقانهم اللغوي. تم استخدام أداتين لجمع البيانات لعينة عشوائية تتكون من خمسة وخمسين (55) طالبا وطالبة بالسنة الثالثة في جامعة محمد الصديق بن يحيى- جيجل. تم اعتماد استبيان للتحقق من تفضيلات الطلاب لتصحيح الأخطاء ، إلى جانب اختبار الكفاءة اللغوية للتحقق من مستوى إتقان المشاركين في اللغة الإنجليزية. كشفت النتائج أن هناك آراء مختلفة تمامًا حول موضوع تصحيح الخطأ ، ولكن هذا الأخير يتأثر بمستويات مختلفة من إتقان اللغة ما يعني أن الطلاب ذوي الكفاءة العالية يظهرون تفضيلات أكثر من الطلاب ذوي الكفاءة المنخفضة. وبناءً على ذلك ، يجب أن يأخذ المعلمون تفضيلات تصحيح الأخطاء لدى المتعلمين في الاعتبار لتحسين عملية التدريس.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التفضيلات ، تصحيح الخطأ ، إتقان اللغة ، متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية.