

آراء وممارسات مدرسي وطلاب اللغة الانكليزية تجاه الأخطاء المكتوبة لدى الطلاب في جامعة قاسيون الخاصة

د.عدنان عزوز

قسم اللغة الانكليزية، كلية الآداب والعلوم الانسانية، جامعة قاسيون الخاصة

الملخص

تهدف الدراسة الحالية للبحث في الآراء المختلفة لمدرسي وطلاب اللغة الانكليزية تجاه الأخطاء المكتوبة لدى الطلاب. تجري الدراسة في صفوف قسم اللغة الانكليزية في جامعة قاسيون الخاصة. تهدف الدراسة لدراسة آراء المدرسين وطلابهم حول هذه الأخطاء وأفضل طرق تصحيح الأخطاء التي يتبعها الطلاب عادة. وتبحث الدراسة أيضا عن آراء المدرسين حول تفضيلهم لطريقة معينة لتصحيح الأخطاء أكثر من باقي الطرق. تظهر نتائج البحث تفضيل الطلاب أن يشير مدرسهم إلى أخطائهم ويقوموا بتصحيحها وأن يكون تصحيح الأخطاء من مسؤولية مدرسيهم. تختتم الدراسة بتقديم بعض النصائح والتوجيهات حول أفضل الطرق التي يمكن أن يستخدمها المدرسون في تدريسهم لمادة الكتابة ضمن صفوف تعليم اللغة الانكليزية بصفاتها لغة أجنبية.

ورد البحث للنشر بالمجلة بتاريخ ٢٠١٨/٧/١

قبل للنشر بتاريخ ٢٠١٨/٨/١٢

English Language Teachers' and Students' Insights and Practices towards Students' Written Errors at Qasyoun Private University

Adnan Azzouz

*Dept. of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Qasyoun Private University

Abstract

The current study aims to investigate the various perceptions of English language teachers and students towards students' written errors. It takes place within the classes of the English Department at Qasyoun Private University. It aims to study teachers' and students' views regarding these errors and the best correcting error strategies that teachers usually follow. It also detects teachers' views regarding their choice of one particular error-correction method over another or their utilizing of more than one method. The findings have shown that most students wished their teachers to mark and correct errors for them and believed that error correction is primarily the teacher's responsibility. The article ends with some pedagogical implications that can be applied in the writing within English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms.

Keywords: English as a Foreign Language (EFL).

Received 1/7/2018
Accepted 12/8/2018

1- Introduction

Committing errors is considered as a natural and inevitable process in FLL or Second Language (L2) learning. Researchers agree that it is a phenomenon that should not frustrate teachers in their FL teaching. However, the methods that teachers adopt to handle such errors vary in a considerable way. Some teachers prefer to correct all errors, others incline to correct some of them, the most dangerous ones; while others prefer to focus on the errors related to the particular grammatical rule that they are teaching to their students.

The current study attempts to comprehend teachers' and students' insights and practices towards students' committed errors and the methods that teachers adopt to deal with them. It studies teachers' practices and beliefs and the choices they make when they encounter an error; whether they use a marking code or not, among other questions. It also studies students' reactions after they receive their corrected papers in addition to the expectations of their teachers' correcting feedback.

2- Research Questions

- 1- What are teachers' perspectives and students' perspectives regarding students' committed errors? Are these perspectives the same or different? How do teachers correct them?
- 2- What are teachers' reactions towards their students' written errors?
- 3- What are students' perspectives regarding their teachers' correcting methods and which method is the most adequate one for them?

3- Literature Review

Committing errors is a common practice among L2 learners. According to¹, learners' committed errors provide teachers and researchers with a plenty of information about the stages of students' language learning process. These errors help teachers to recognize the specific language notions that should be directed to their students in order to master the L2. This is also valuable for researchers to study the types of errors that are committed at each stage of L2 language learning and the reasons behind such errors.

Many researchers assert the importance of pointing out to students' errors on the basis that if L2 learners commit an error and no one helps them to recognize that, they will keep committing these errors

¹ CORDER, S. P., 1967 - **The Significance of Learners' Errors**. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5, 161-170.

which will foster their language final attainment¹, and.²

3-1 Definition of Corrective Feedback

Various researchers have attempted to present a definition for the notion of 'corrective feedback'. Each one of them tries to view the same phenomenon using different perspectives. For instance, ³define the term correction as "the replacement of error or mistake by what is correct" (p. 363).⁴ defines correction as "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to or demands improvement of the learner's utterance" (p.31). This notion is the one which is practiced by teachers and researchers.⁵ define corrective feedback as "any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect" (p.171).

3-2 Teachers' and Students' Preferences for Error Correction

Many researches have been carried out to study the notion of error correction. Some researchers as ⁶; ⁷; ⁸; and⁹ have shown the importance of teachers' provision of correction feedback to their students' errors. However, some researchers have raised many questions about the effectiveness of error feedback¹⁰ and ¹¹.

¹ AMMAR, A., & SPADA, N., 2006 - One Size Fits All? Recasts, Prompts, and L2 Learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 28, 543-574

² AZAR, B., 2007 - **Grammar-Based Teaching: A Practitioner's Perspective.** *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* 11(2), 1-12.

³ SCHEGLOFF, EMANUEL, A., SACKS, H., & JEFFERSON, G., -1977- **The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation.** *Language*, 53, 361-382.

⁴ CHAUDRON, C., 1977- **A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors.** *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46.

⁵ LIGHTBOWN, P., & SPADA, N, 1999 - **How Languages are Learned.** New York: Oxford University Press. Second Edition.

⁶ ASHWELL, T., 2000 - **Patterns of Teacher Response to Student Writing in a Multi-Draft Composition Classroom: Is Content Feedback Followed by Form Feedback the Best Method?** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227-257.

⁷ BITCHENER, J., & KNOCH, U., 2010a - **The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten Month Investigation.** *Applied Linguistics* 31(2), 193-214.

⁸ ELLIS, R., SHEEN, Y., MURAKAMI, M., & TAKASHIMA, H., 2008 - **The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback in an English as a Foreign Language Context.** *System*, 36, 353-371.

⁹ SHEEN, Y., 2007 - **The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles.** *TESOL Quarterly*, 41, 255-283.

¹⁰ POLIO, C., FLECK, C., & LEDER, N., 1998 - **"If I Only Had More Time: " ESL Learners' Changes in Linguistic Accuracy on Essay Revisions.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1), 43-68.

¹¹ TRUSCOTT, J., & HSU, Y.P., 2008 - Error Correction, Revision, and Learning. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 292-305.

Many researchers have studied the attitudes and reactions of both teachers' and students' towards error correction and some of them have found that there is no concord between them. For example, studies of¹ and² and² show that students prefer to have more grammatical instructions and error correction than their teachers' views. When students encounter a teacher who does not provide a lot of error correction, they feel dissatisfied with that teacher on the ground that the teacher is the person who should provide them with all their English language requirements.³ argues that "such lack of pedagogical face validity could affect learners' motivation" (p. 349). On the other hand, their teachers express their intention not to provide a lot of feedback, so their students can rely more on themselves. This disagreement between students' expectations and teachers' practices should be a useful tool to encourage teachers to have a better vision towards their students' perceptions, so the process of L2 learning will not be affected by this mismatch.⁴ conducts an action research in which he studies the attitude of teachers and students towards error correction in 15 countries. Also, this study shows discrepancy between students and teachers. For instance, in the survey, he asks a question related to whether teachers should correct every error, 76% of students replies with 'Yes', whereas only 25% of teachers replies with 'Yes'.⁵ study the effect of feedback on the structure and content of EFL students' writing tasks. Their study shows that students are enthusiastic to write their tasks for the second time when their teachers provide them with explicit feedback in the field of content and organization. When they are interviewed, students favour to receive written feedback from their teachers, thus they can understand their

¹ 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.

² SCHULZ, R.A., 2001 - **Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback.** *Modern Language Journal*, **85**, 244-258.

³ The same source of ³ 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.

⁴ ANCKER, W., 2000 - **Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice.** *English Teaching Forum*, **38**, 20- 25.

⁵ CORREA PÉREZ, R., MARTÍNEZ FUENTEALBA, M., MOLINA DE LA BARRA, M., SILVA ROJAS, J., & TORRES CISTERNAS, M., 2013 - **The Impact of Explicit Feedback on EFL High School Students Engaged in Writing Tasks.** *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, **15(2)**, 149-163.

errors much better and avoid committing such errors in the future.¹ study shows that most of the teachers provide students with feedback in some form. From all feedback communications coded across the three studies, about 61% are grades, numbers, or symbols, and only 33% are comments. Furthermore, evaluative comments occur nearly as frequently as descriptive comments (10% and 14%, respectively) but only 4% of comments are prescriptive.

² conduct a research about teachers' perceptions on corrective feedback. Their results show that the selection of error correction is the best method of error correction in addition to explicit correction.³ carry out a research to study students' perceptions and preferences on their written corrective feedback in an EFL setting. Their study shows that most of the students prefer to receive error correction. They also favour detailed comments on both the content and grammar of their writings.

4 Methodology

4-1 Context and Participants of the Present Study

This study takes place in an English Department context at Qasyoun Private University in Syria. Students are native speakers of Arabic who have spent around 10-15 years learning English since their childhood at elementary schools. However, their professional study of English as a foreign language is around 2 years when they enrolled and registered at the English Department of Qasyoun University. The main purpose of the English Department program is to provide students with sufficient knowledge in English language and translation in addition to some background knowledge of English literature. Students must have at least 18 hours of exposure to various English language courses per week. It is important to note that students enrolling at this university do not need to pass through a predesigned English language test to measure their English language proficiency to be accepted. It indicates that students' English language level is not

¹ RUIZ-PRIMO, MARIA. A., & LI, M. (2013). **Analyzing Teachers' Feedback Practices in Response to Students' Work in Science Classrooms.** *Applied Measurement in Education*, 26(3), 163–175.

² KIRGOZ, Y., & AGCAM, R., 2015 - **Teachers' Perceptions on Corrective Feedback in Turkish Primary Schools,** *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 574-581.

³ CHEN, S., NASSAJI, H. & LIU, Q., 2016 - **EFL Learners' Perceptions and Preferences of Written Corrective Feedback: A Case Study of University Students from Mainland China.** *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 1, 5.

the same.

On the other side, most of participant teachers in this study are Ph.D. holders of English language of different fields such as "Teaching English as a Second Language", "General linguistics", "Translation" and so on. The rest are M.A. holders. Most of them have 5-10 years experience of teaching English, whereas others have more than ten years experience.

4-2 Questionnaire Data Collection

Students' questionnaire was designed to infer students' perceptions and expectations. It was roughly based upon many surveys used by many researchers such as ¹; ²; ³; and ⁴. Students' questionnaires were distributed to 60 students during the second semester of the Academic year 2017-2018; three weeks before the end of the academic year. The choice of this particular time was to ensure that students were familiar with feedback practices for an adequate span of time. The researcher explained each item of the questionnaire to the students in order to avoid any misunderstanding on their part. Some students asked some questions, so the researcher explained and clarified the unclear points. The time allocated to finish answering the questionnaire was 10 minutes which was extended to 15 minutes after answering students' questions.

Teachers' questionnaire was designed to infer teachers' perceptions and practices. It was roughly based upon many surveys used by many researchers such as ⁵; ⁶; and ⁷. In this

¹ COHEN, A. D., 1987 - **Student Processing of Feedback on their Compositions.** *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, 57-69.

² FERRIS, D. R., 1995 - **Student Reactions to Teacher Response in Multiple-Draft Composition Classrooms.** *TESOL Quarterly*, **29(1)**, 33-53.

³ MONTGOMERY, J. L., & BAKER, W., 2007 - **Teacher-Written Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Self-Assessment, and Actual Teacher Performance.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, **16(2)**, 82-99.

⁴ LEE, I., 2004 - **Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms: The Case of Hong Kong.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, **13(4)**, 285-312.

⁵ The same source of COHEN, A. D., 1987 - **Student Processing of Feedback on their Compositions.** *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*, 57-69.

⁶ The same source of FERRIS, D. R., 1995 - **Student Reactions to Teacher Response in Multiple-Draft Composition Classrooms.** *TESOL Quarterly*, **29(1)**, 33-53.

⁷ The same source of MONTGOMERY, J. L., & BAKER, W., 2007 - **Teacher-Written Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Self-Assessment, and Actual Teacher Performance.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, **16(2)**, 82-99.

questionnaire, teachers were asked questions related to the reasons behind their focus upon each type of feedback that they use in their students' composition (ideas/content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics). These teachers were asked whether they indicated to their students the type of errors that they marked while they corrected their compositions and the methods that they followed to facilitate that for them. Teachers' questionnaires were distributed to 20 teachers at different times. Some of the teachers were doctors of Damascus university who worked as part-time contractors at Qasyoun University. Others were M. A. holders who taught university requirement courses. In private universities in Syria, students have the right to study any course that they like after they pass the pre-requisite for that course. This matter requires a big number of teachers for all these courses.

It took seven minutes for each teacher to finish answering his/her questionnaire. They were asked to fill out a questionnaire eliciting their perceptions about different aspects of written error correction. Teachers were enthusiastic to participate in this research indicating their intention to discern the outcome of the current research.

Students were asked the same type of questions which were about their teachers' usage of markings and whether they comprehended them and if they were satisfied with the amount of feedback that their teachers were providing when they commented on their compositions. They were also asked about the type of codes their teachers were using when they corrected their compositions and whether they captured the symbols that their teachers had used.

4-3 Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

4-3-1 Validity of the Questionnaires

The validity of the teachers' and students' questionnaires was established because it was loosely designed after the one that was made by ¹. Three referees were asked to judge the validity of this test. They were three applied linguistics professors. They asked for the modifications of some items of the content of the questionnaire in order to meet the purposes of the research.

¹ The same source of MONTGOMERY, J. L., & BAKER, W., 2007 - **Teacher-Written Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Self-Assessment, and Actual Teacher Performance**. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.

4-3-2 Reliability of the Questionnaires

The discussion of the concept of reliability in the present study initiated from the fact that questionnaires were designed by ¹ in a way that corresponded to English language teachers and students according to certain criteria that guaranteed the quality of the results of the questionnaires.

To enhance the reliability of the questionnaires, all the subjects were given the same amount of time to finish the questionnaire. Also, for the collection and analysis of the data, a Ph. D. holder of Statistics was asked to double check data insertion and analysis.

4-4 Data Analysis

The data were collected and processed by the researcher himself, and cross-checked for accuracy. Descriptive statistics were used in presenting the results of the surveys. The three questions of the research will be discussed and evaluated directly after presenting the statistics of the data and their implications. Later, findings will be presented and implications will be drawn in relation to feedback practice. Conclusion will be made in addition to the recommendations for future research.

5- Results and Discussion

1-RQ 1: What are teachers' perspectives and students' perspectives regarding students' committed errors? Are these perspectives the same or different? How do teachers correct them?

Feedback is a process that needs to be sharpened differently as student progress in their L2 learning continuum. Therefore, the amount and type of feedback that teachers provide for their students' errors vary accordingly. In teachers' questionnaire, these questions were asked to evaluate teachers' feedback type and amount when they correct their students' compositions. It is important to note that feedback is divided into various types; ideas/content, organization, vocabulary, grammar, and mechanics. They were asked to rank the amount of feedback they provide for their students written compositions on a scale with choices of "none," "a little," "some," and "a lot".

According to the data presented below in Table (1), 80% of the teachers provide 'a lot' of feedback of a grammatical type for their students' errors. Next, teachers considered vocabulary feedback as the

¹ The same source of MONTGOMERY, J. L., & BAKER, W., 2007 - **Teacher-Written Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Self-Assessment, and Actual Teacher Performance.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.

other requirement for better writing. Then, providing feedback about content/ideas has received 70% of teachers' attention. Then, it was followed by 55% as providing feedback about the organization aspects of their students' writing. Finally, teachers have stated that 70% of them provide 'a little' feedback about punctuation and spelling.

	A lot	Some	A little	none
Organization	55%	45%	0%	0%
Content/Ideas	0%	70%	30%	0%
Grammar	80%	20%	00%	0%
Vocabulary	0%	80%	20%	0%
Mechanics	35%	55%	10%	0%

On the other hand, students have the following results as shown in Table (2):

	A lot	Some	A little	none
Organization	0%	53.3%	46.7%	0%
Content/Ideas	36.7%	53.3%	10%	0%
Grammar	45%	26.7%	18.3%	10%
Vocabulary	18.3%	65%	16.7%	0%
Mechanics	0%	43.3%	20%	36.7%

According to the previous results, students reported that they were getting more feedback than what teachers reported in the areas of organization, content/ideas and mechanics. For example, as shown in the 'mechanics' category, the majority of students reported that they received "some (43.3%)" or "a little (20%)" or "none 36.7%" feedback, whereas all teachers reported giving "a lot (35%)" or "some (55%)", or "a little 10%", or "no (0%)" feedback. Whereas in the area of "grammar" category, the majority of teachers reported that they provided "a lot (80%)" or "some (20%)" feedback, whereas some students reported receiving "a lot (45%)" or "some (26.7%)", or "a little 18.3%" feedback.

Regarding the issue of correcting errors, 65% of the teachers stated that teachers should provide feedback on student errors selectively, whereas 35% of them disagreed with that as shown in Table (3).

Table (3) Teachers should provide feedback on student errors selectively

	Frequency	Percent
Strongly disagree	2	10
Disagree	5	25
Agree	11	55
Strongly agree	2	10
Total	20	100

In the present study, teachers stated that they provided their feedback for their students' errors 'selectively', however, students stated that their teachers provided feedback for 'all' their errors. This result shows that there is a discrepancy between the perceptions of students and their teachers' practices. However, in the field of grammar, it seems that there is concord in teachers' and students' perceptions towards the amount of feedback.

When we come to comprehend the results, many interpretations can be drawn out of this. On one hand, students think that when they write and they commit errors, their teachers correct such errors. They feel satisfied that all their errors are corrected. However, their perception is different from their teachers' who think that their correction of their students' errors is 'selective'. There are many researchers who have interpreted this phenomenon as ¹ who find that in many cases when teachers' perceptions are less than students' perceptions of written feedback, the teachers are underestimating the amount that they give, rather than the students overestimating. Likewise, in a study conducted by ², many teachers report that they provide "selective" feedback, but when actual feedback practices are examined she finds that they are marking comprehensively. Therefore, it is suggested that teachers have to monitor themselves when they correct their students and measure the amount of feedback that they provide.

RQ2: What are teachers' reactions and practices towards their students' written errors?

¹ The same source of MONTGOMERY, J. L., & BAKER, W., 2007 - **Teacher-Written Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Self-Assessment, and Actual Teacher Performance.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.

² The same source of LEE, I., 2004 - **Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms: The Case of Hong Kong.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4), 285-312.

This study shows that teachers utilize various error corrections methods for their students' written compositions. Most participating teachers stated that they selected their students' errors to be corrected on the basis of each case. They stated that many factors affected their decision relying on their perception of students' needs, their students' request and the time allocated to finish each class task. However, most teachers (90%) showed their tendency to favour their own judgment of the actual needs of their students over other factors such as their students' request (50%) and time constraints (25%) as shown in Table (4):

	Yes	No
Students' request — i.e. students ask for it /	50%	50%
My Perception of Students' needs	90%	10%
The amount of time I have	25%	75%

About the question of the major principle of error correction, teachers gave 50% to 'the selected errors are directly linked to grammar instruction in class — e.g. after I have taught subject-verb agreement, I provide feedback on subject-verb agreement errors'. It is shown in Table (5).

Table(5) the major principle for error selection

	Frequency	Percent
The selected errors are directly linked to grammar instruction in class — e.g. after I have taught subject-verb agreement, I provide feedback on subject-verb agreement errors.	10	50
The selected errors are related to students' specific needs — e.g. knowing that students are particularly weak in articles, I provide feedback on article errors.	2	10
The errors are selected on an ad hoc basis - i.e. I decide what errors to provide feedback on while I am marking.	8	40
Total	20	100

Teachers were asked many questions regarding the types of error correction techniques that they had used. Their responses showed a variety of techniques to provide the required feedback. They were categorized as shown in Table (6):

Table (6) Teachers' Error Feedback Techniques

	Never or Rarely	Sometimes	Often or always
I indicate (underline/circle) errors and correct them - e.g. has <u>went</u> ^{gone} .	0%	30%	70%
I indicate (underline/circle) errors, correct them and categorize them (with the help of a marking code) -	20%	65%	15%

e.g. has <u>went</u> ^{gone} (verb form).			
I indicate (underline/circle) errors, but I don't correct them - e.g. has <u>went</u> .	70%	20%	10%
I indicate (underline/circle) errors and categorize them (with the help of a marking code), but I don't correct them - e.g. has <u>went</u> (verb form).	80%	20%	0%
I hint at the location of errors - e.g. by putting a mark in the margin to indicate an error on a specific line.	35%	55%	10%
I hint at the location of errors and categorize them (with the help of a marking code) - e.g. by writing 'Prep' in the margin to indicate a preposition error on a specific line.	45%	55%	0%

The majority of teachers 70% stated that they 'always' indicated (underlined/circled) errors and correct them - e.g. has went^{gone}. Whereas 65% of them stated that they 'sometimes' indicated (underlined/circled) errors, corrected them and categorized them (with the help of a marking code) - e.g. has went^{gone} (verb form).

Also, 70% of them stated that they 'never' followed the strategy of indicating (underlining/circling) errors, but not correcting them - e.g. has went.

The majority of teachers 80% also state that they never 'indicated (underlined/circled) errors and categorized them (with the help of a marking code), but didn't correct them - e.g. has went (verb form)'.

Most of the teachers 55% stated that they 'sometimes' hinted at the location of errors - e.g. by putting a mark in the margin to indicate an error on a specific line.

In the final question, teachers had a fair position 55% 'sometimes' and 45% 'never' regarding whether they hinted at the location of errors and categorized them (with the help of a marking code) - e.g. by writing 'Prep' in the margin to indicate a preposition error on a specific line.

These results showed that most teachers indicated the location of the error, showing its type to the students by using a marking code and correcting it.

Regarding the question whether teachers used a marking code for providing error feedback on students' writing, most of the teachers 70% stated that they used a marking code as shown in Table (7).

Table (7) Do you use a marking code for providing error feedback on student writing?

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	70
No	6	30

	Frequency	Percent
Yes	14	70
No	6	30
Total	20	100

Teachers not only referred to the error, but also made sure that their students recognized the type of the corrected error as the majority of them 70% stated as shown in Table (8).

Table (8) Are students aware of error type(s) selected?

		Frequency	Percent
	Yes	15	75
	No	5	25
	Total	20	100

Regarding whose role to correct students' errors, most teachers (70%) agreed that it was the role of the teacher to locate the error and corrected it as shown in Table (9).

Table (9) It is the teacher's job to locate errors and provide corrections for students

		Frequency	Percent
	Disagree	6	30
	Agree	9	45
	Strongly agree	5	25
	Total	20	100

RQ3: What are students' perspectives regarding their teachers' correcting methods and which method is the most adequate for them?

Regarding the notion of students' understanding of their error type, most students (90%) have claimed that their teachers clarify the type of errors they are committing as shown in Table (10).

Table (10) Before / After marking your essays, does your teacher tell you what error types (e.g., verbs, prepositions, spelling) he/she has selected to mark?

		Frequency	Percent
	Yes	54	90
	No	6	10
	Total	60	100

However, in the question regarding which type of correcting methods that students prefer to have from their teachers, most of them (80%) claim that they prefer that their English teacher underlines / circles all their errors as Table (11) shows.

Table (11) Your preference of your teacher's correction habits of your draft

	Frequency	Percent
My English teacher underlines / circles all my errors.	48	80
My English teacher does not underline / circle any of my errors.	12	20
Total	60	100

In the question of whose job to locate students' errors, most students (65%) agree that it is the job of the teacher to locate and correct their errors as shown in Table (12).

Table (12) Whose job to locate and correct students' errors?

	Frequency	Percent
It is mainly the teacher's job to locate and correct errors for students.	39	65
It is mainly the student's job to locate and correct their own errors.	21	35
Total	60	100

This preference of students is hard to determine whether it is beneficial for their writing output or not as ¹ claim that "learners' expectations and preferences may derive from previous instructional experiences, experiences that may not necessarily be beneficial for the development of writing" (p. 173). However, there are hazardous impacts of such expectations because students' language level is not stable. They are improving in their language learning continuum. They should be instructed by their teachers that this type of expectation should be modified because their teachers will not follow the same strategy and they gradually should rely on themselves for their error correction.

It has been found that both students (65%) and teachers (70%) have agreed that it is the job of teachers to locate and correct students' errors. This tendency can be interpreted on the basis that teachers are the ones who are eligible to provide feedback because of their great knowledge and experience.

6- Conclusion

6-1 Implications

This study has focused on students' and teachers' perceptions of correcting errors for English Literature students at Qasyoun University in Syria. With regard to the questions and objectives of this study, the

¹ Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M., 1990 - **Feedback on Compositions: Teacher and Student Verbal Reports**. In Long, M., Richards, J., & Kroll, B., **Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom** (3rd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.

findings reveal that both students and teachers have sometimes different opinions regarding the error correction process in the classroom. Other findings show that some teachers use different strategies to address their students' errors. For both students and teachers, it is comprehended that in error correction, it is 'teachers' who are responsible for providing students with the correct information, so that they are capable of using various techniques to implement that and clarify them for students throughout using markers followed by the type of error and its correct version. Of course, not all teachers follow the same route. Some of them prefer to use one method, while others prefer to use another.

On the other hand, students show preference to be corrected when they commit any error, so they can avoid committing a similar one in the future. They prefer to receive full correcting package of information regarding the position of their error, its type and its corrected version. Also, they show the inclination to be part of the correcting process either by correcting their friends' written errors when they read their compositions publically, or to be given another chance to reread their composition when their teachers point out to their errors by using a marker. Results show that both students and teachers consider students as an essential part of the correcting errors process, thus their views should also be considered.

6-2 Recommendations

It is recommended that teachers should always ask themselves the crucial questions regarding the type of error that they should correct, the best method they follow to correct it, and the appropriate time to correct it. When teachers grasp the recommended knowledge to respond to such questions in an appropriate way, students will be able to develop drastically. It is due to the fact that teachers follow a clear path in dealing with such errors, they should vary their correction feedback methods based on the level of students, their acquired knowledge, and their actual needs.

Engaging students in the process of learning and keeping them updated for their learning improvement track helps them to recognize and appreciate their teachers' work. Since this study shows that students think that their teachers are the ones who should correct their errors, it is advisable that teachers explain their teaching and correcting methods to their students from the very beginning of the teaching process. By doing so, students keep their expectation regarding their teachers' works to its highest level.

Finally, suggestions could be made for further research. Future research could include interviews of both teachers and students to have

a wider range of perspectives concerning their actual practice and thoughts. A further research could include comparing teachers' perspectives with their actual practice because a lot of teachers have assumed that they correct their students' errors selectively, but when they were actually examined, it was found that they corrected all their students' errors

References

1. AMMAR, A., & SPADA, N., 2006 - **One Size Fits All? Recasts, Prompts, and L2 Learning.** *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* **28**.
2. ANCKER, W., 2000 - **Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice.** *English Teaching Forum*, **38**,
3. ASHWELL, T., 2000 - **Patterns of Teacher Response to Student Writing in a Multi-Draft Composition Classroom: Is Content Feedback Followed by Form Feedback the Best Method?** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, **9(3)**.
4. AZAR, B., 2007 - **Grammar-Based Teaching: A Practitioner's Perspective.** *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* **11(2)**.
5. BITCHENER, J., & KNOCH, U., 2010a - **The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten Month Investigation.** *Applied Linguistics* **31(2)**.
6. CHAUDRON, C., 1977- **A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors.** *Language Learning*, **27**.
7. CHEN, S., NASSAJI, H. & LIU, Q., 2016 - **EFL Learners' Perceptions and Preferences of Written Corrective Feedback: A Case Study of University Students from Mainland China.** *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, **1**.
8. COHEN, A. D., 1987 - **Student Processing of Feedback on their Compositions.** *Learner Strategies in Language Learning*.
9. Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M., 1990 - **Feedback on Compositions: Teacher and Student Verbal Reports.** In Long, M., Richards, J., & Kroll, B., **Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom** (3rd ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
10. CORDER, S. P., 1967 - **The Significance of Learners' Errors.** *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, **5**.
11. CORREA PÉREZ, R., MARTÍNEZ FUENTEALBA, M., MOLINA DE LA BARRA, M., SILVA ROJAS, J., & TORRES CISTERNAS, M., 2013 - **The Impact of Explicit Feedback on EFL High School Students Engaged in Writing Tasks.** *Profile Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, **15(2)**.
12. ELLIS, R., SHEEN, Y., MURAKAMI, M., & TAKASHIMA, H., 2008 - **The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback in an English as a Foreign Language Context.** *System*, **36**, 353-371.
13. FERRIS, D. R., 1995 - **Student Reactions to Teacher Response in**

- Multiple-Draft Composition Classrooms.** *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33-53.
14. KIRGOZ, Y., & AGCAM, R., 2015 - **Teachers' Perceptions on Corrective Feedback in Turkish Primary Schools**, *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192.
 15. LEE, I., 2004 - **Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms: The Case of Hong Kong.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13(4).
 16. LIGHTBOWN, P., & SPADA, N., 1999 - **How Languages are Learned.** New York: Oxford University Press. Second Edition.
 17. MONTGOMERY, J. L., & BAKER, W., 2007 - **Teacher-Written Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Self-Assessment, and Actual Teacher Performance.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2).
 18. POLIO, C., FLECK, C., & LEDER, N., 1998 - **"If I Only Had More Time: " ESL Learners' Changes in Linguistic Accuracy on Essay Revisions.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(1).
 19. RUIZ-PRIMO, MARIA. A., & LI, M. (2013). **Analyzing Teachers' Feedback Practices in Response to Students' Work in Science Classrooms.** *Applied Measurement in Education*, 26(3), 163–175.
 20. SCHEGLOFF, EMANUEL, A., SACKS, H., & JEFFERSON, G., -1977- **The Preference for Self-Correction in the Organization of Repair in Conversation.** *Language*, 53
 21. 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.
 22. SCHULZ, R.A., 2001 - **Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback.** *Modern Language Journal*, 85.
 23. SHEEN, Y., 2007 - **The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles.** *TESOL Quarterly*, 41.
 24. TRUSCOTT, J., & HSU, Y.P., 2008 - **Error Correction, Revision, and Learning.** *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17.