KASDI MERBAH UNIVERSITY OUARGLA
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English Language and Letters

Dissertation

Domain: Letters and Foreign Languages Major:

Applied linguistics an ESP

Prepared by: **Adel Belhadj & Brahim Temmar**

<u>**Title**</u>

Corrective Feedback Models and Their Impact on Students' Oral Proficiency: Case Study Second Year Licence Kasdi Merbah Ouargla

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree in App-Ling & ESP
Before the jury

Bourahla Djelloul	President	UKM-Ouargla
Sadoune Farida	Supervisor	UKM-Ouargla
Doufen adb El MAdjid	Examiner	UKM-Ouargla

Academic Year: 2015 –2016

1.

Dedication

first and for all most , I wish to dedicate this work to my dear father who has been there for me whenever I needed him , for him I say '' Thank you to the sky ''

As well I dedicate this work to my mother , and I wish her a long healthy life.

To my brothers and my sisters specially my little brother ''Mohammed''

To my uncles all

To my friends, Khaled, Abdo, Houssam, Yacine, Islam, Adel, Hossam, Fozi, Marouan, Baki, Mouad, Haydar, Amine, Moun3im, Kada, Bilal, Tibo, Khiro, Mery :

you were there for me , so Thank You .

To my dear teachers all , who has been with me during my first year till this very moment.

Special thanks for my dear supervisor "Farida Sadoune"

To everyone in this life , to those who know me , to the future teachers , I hope to give you one new information.

BrahimTemmar

Dedication

first and for all most , I wish to dedicate this work to my dear father who has been there for me whenever I needed him , for him I say '' Thank you to the sky ''

As well I dedicate this work to my mother , and I wish her a long healthy life.

To my brothers and my sisters specially my little brother ''ANIS''

A very special thanks exclusive for my supervisor "FARIDA SADOUNE"

To all my family

To my friends , Brahim , Tarek, Mouad, Zaki, Khaled , Abdo , Houssam , Fozi , Amine, Marouan ,Zkiro, Baki ,   Kada , Ziko, Abd Allah , Sohaib, and a big one to my dear Hessona , and DR. HAlimi Mouhamed Sghir ,you were all there for me , so Thank You .

To everyone in this life, to those who know me, to the future teachers , I hope to give you one new information

Adel Belhadj

Acknowledgments

First , thanks to ALLAH for his endless help and his grace . Second , this very modest work has been accomplished with the help and the contribution of many people to whom we are grateful.

We are grateful to our supervisor: **Sadoune Farida**, for her help , patient and tolerant .

We are so grateful to our parents, brothers, friends, colleagues and the English section staff .

Special thanks goes to our teachers of the English language since the first year to this very moments

List of Abbreviations

CF	Corrective Feedback
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
FLA	First Language Acquisition
L2	Second Language
NNS	Non-native Speaker
NNSs	Non-native Speakers
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
TL	Target Language
VS	Versus

List of Tables

List of figures

Table of Contents

CHAPTERONE:CLASSROOM CENTRED-RESEARCH

CHAPTER Two: Error Analysis

CHAPTER THREE: THE TREATEMENT OF ORAL ERRORS: WHAT
TEACHERS DO

CHAPTER FOUR:RESULTS OF THE FINDINGS AND TENTATIVE INTRPRETATION

General introduction

Background of the Study

There was a call for change, through decades of the dominance of the teacher and student centered approaches; each apart. Which has resulted in the emergence of new approaches, and the classroom-centered approach came into use. Corrective feedback came up through the teachers' attempts to correct and treat their students' mistaken utterances .which is: "any teacher behavior following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error" Chaudron (1988, p.150), to be able to achieve a native-like spoken language .Corrective feedback is known as a response to learner's utterances that contains errors. its models play an important role in enhancing the oral proficiency of the foreign language , and many studies in this field have been accomplished , focusing on the oral proficiency issue, and only a positive corrective feedback can provide this improvements by giving attention to how and when to correct. If we refer to the literature that tackled the notion of corrective feedback, we find it voluminous concerning CF in writing. It is traced back to over than 27years ago; while the one that is concerned with oral proficiency has recently been investigated. This was the focus of this study, as far as we are interested in the impact of those models; we are going to apply it in our study, to experiment to what extent they are effective.

Statement of the Problem

This research focuses mainly on oral errors treatment, considering them as a natural phenomenon in any learning process on the one hand, and on the other hand it attempts to examine the most appropriate corrective model that promotes learners' proficiency. Teachers deal with learner's errors using the corrective feedback, which is provided through many models suggested by well-known scholars. Our concern is on observing the errors the moment they

occur, and how teachers respond towards these errors using a particular model. Moreover, we take into consideration the student reaction towards the corrective feedbacks, and the ability to use it effectively. From the classroom observation and the interviews that was conducted with teachers at the University of Kasdi Merbah, it was noted that almost all the teachers reported that they do use corrective feedback; however, the way of implementing it was different from one teacher to another .Therefore, the way CF is implemented along with attitudes of both teachers and students toward the treatment of errors would be investigated.

Research Questions

In order to achieve the aim of the study we raised the following questions:

- What corrective acts are most frequently used by the teacher in the classroom?

- Does corrective feedback have a positive impact on improving oral performance?

- What are the possible students' attitudes towards the corrective feedback?

Hypothesis

- The classroom teacher should vary their corrective acts according to the errors' nature

- The time and the way of correcting errors affect learners production

- Teacher's corrective feedback should take into account the affective side of the learners

Significance of the Study

First, one obvious significance of this study is setting backgrounds of why certain ways of implementing CF are favored by teachers rather than other ways. Second, the results of how students perceive after the treatment of their errors, and to what extent it might inspire the teachers about how to implement it in ways that enhances students' level. Finally,

knowing both positive and negative attitudes would give insights about the aspects of CF that work well or are commonly accepted by both teachers and students.

Methodology

The present study is an experimental research. It is a combination of both quantitative (since we are interested in measuring student's acceptance while receiving corrective feedback), and qualitative (as we are interested to know teacher's opinion and assumptions about the effectiveness of corrective feedback to learners) approaches, to obtain data for the research; a classroom observation was done in the second semester .During the observation of our sample, we will be using Griag Chaudron's model of corrective feedback to project our findings into statistic results and discuss them to find out to what extent the correction feedback has affected the classroom communication in enhancing the oral proficiency. An interview was conducted as well. The interview was with two teachers who teach oral language in their tutorial lessons. The collected data was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively. The interview was recorded and then analyzed qualitatively.

Structure of the Work

The study is divided into four main chapters; the first one is about the major issues of classroom centered research, and the second is about the error analysis and its types, sources and causes, and the third is about the treatment of errors and how and when the teacher interferes to correct the error. The fourth chapter consists of the used research methodology, as well as the analysis and interpretation of the classroom observation, and the interview. Followed by, results and recommendations and finally, the conclusion.

Chapter One

Classroom Centered-Research

Introduction

1. Classroom Centered Research

1.1 The Importance of Classroom Centered Research

1.2 Major Issues in Second Language Classroom

1.2.1 Teacher Talk

1.2.2 Amount of Teacher Talk

1.2.3 Modification of Teacher Talk

1.2.4 Distribution of Teacher Talk

1.3 Learners Behavior in Second Language Classroom

1.3.1 Language Production

1.3.2 Learners Production

1.3.3 Interaction Between Learners

1.3.4 Learner Strategies

1.4 Classroom Interaction in Second Language Acquisition

1.4.1 Questioning Behavior

1.4.2 Feedback

Conclusion

Introduction

If second language (L2) is to be improved, the characteristics of successful techniques and procedures must be expended within L2 Teaching community; it requires careful observation within it. And the utility of research is related to its reliability, "The extent to which any measuring procedures yield the same result on repeated trial" (carmines and zeller 1979, p.11) and also the reliability of the classroom observation , "the degree to which a finding interpreted in a correct way" (Kirk and Milles,1986,p.20). On the other hand, the question of a practical significance of research findings has become an issue in education researches during the last two decades. But researches may be helpful to schools' educators in solving the problems facing them.

1. Classroom Centered Research

Classroom centered research is concern with classroom events: "it simply tries to investigate what happen in the classroom" (Allwright and bailey 1991, p.3), it concentrate its investigations on both learners and teachers, though researchers also focus on the interaction which take place inside the classroom such as the type of linguistic input provided in the classroom, how teachers response to their learners errors, mutual feelings inside the classroom, and reflections after class.

According to Ellis (1985,p.143), the attention of researchers was directed to the process in the classroom itself. For that reason Allwright and Bailey (ibid) focus on the language classroom events; rather than planning to know whether those events were planned or not , and guarantee perfect results .Whereas some lessons which are not properly well prepared by the teacher , may be done and performed successfully. In here we can clearly notice the significance of their instruction, but only the one that can be an effective factor in the process.

1.1 The Importance of Classroom Centered Research

There are a number of theoretical issues related to the classroom research; one of those is the reliance of the importance of the study in the classroom research, according to Chaudron (1988) this Issue hinges on the degree to which the SLA is through a natural development and exposure to it in meaning , social interaction , formalistic environment, which means it can contribute to the process of acquisition of certain items , the question of whether this study has an absolute positive effect on the acquisition ,will be obviously depending on the particular

program and circumstances. Long (1983) argues that some classroom process may aid the acquisition of certain structures such as vocabulary without influencing the others like syntax. By noting different effects, classroom research study can help teachers gain control in class. Besides guiding them, it can provide researchers and curriculum developers with some backgrounds, or guide administrators toward principles of effective instruction. Cited in Xiao-yan (2006)

1.2 Major Issues in Second Language Classroom

Krashen (1982) states that; the classroom should function to provide the learners with comprehensible input in an effectively supportive climate, to illustrate the nature of classroom events we shall discuss some issues concern the classroom interaction such as teacher talk, student behavior, and teacher-learner interaction concerning the oral contact, since those are the main issues or factors that make and enhance the classroom events.

1.2.1 Teacher Talk

The classroom is the area where learners are exposed to deal with L2 to obtain comprehensible instruction from the teacher, who in order to convey the information to his learners, he addresses them with a special language called "teacher talk" as Allwright and Bailey (1991, p.139) state: "Talk is one of the major ways the teacher uses to convey information to learners, and it is also one of the primary means of controlling learners behavior". And according to Richards (1992, p.471)"while trying to communicate with learners , teachers often simplify their speech ; giving it many of the characteristics of foreigner talk ,and other simplified style of speech addressed to language learners". Ellis (1985, p.145), has also a perspective point of view concerning teacher talk: "Teacher talk is the special language that the teacher use when addressing L2 learners in the classroom, there is a systematic simplification of the formal properties of the teacher's language … studies of teacher talk can be divided into those that investigates the type of language that the teacher use in a subject lesson".

In this paper it is the oral form of teacher talk that is important instead of written form; it means the language the teacher use in class rather than in many setting. (Cited in Xiao-yan 2006, p.5)

1.2.2 Amount of Teacher Talk

According to SLA theories, both teachers and students should participate in language use actively. It means the teacher have to care about the input and more important to make sure that the learner will practice and deal with the TL sufficiently. A number of researchers such as Chaudron (1988, p.51) ; focus on the Distributing teacher talk time in the classroom considering it as the main factor that has a big impact on learners proficiency and practicality. Who have established that the teacher tends to do most of the classroom talk.

Researches show that Teacher talk make up: 70% to 89% of the total talk during a class, whereas learners account only for: 11% to 30% but this is considered negative according to Chaudron (ibid), because the domination of teacher talk will indeed restrict student talk with less opportunities to practice and use the target language, and consequently they will not develop their language proficiency as appropriately as needed

To overcome this problem, researchers and scholars assumed to maximize student talk time through discussion and participating in tasks and activities under leading of teachers management, and from another side to minimize the teacher talk time to avoid its over use in the classroom for the benefit of the learners proficiency. Xiao yan (2006, p.16)

1.2.3 Modification of Teacher Talk

"When people talk to foreigners, they use a special   variety of simplified speech. They modify grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation mainly" (Lynch1986, p.55). Formerly, teachers talk look at language learners as non-natives and as passive receivers. In classroom interaction, since there is a huge difference in level between teacher and the students, it is the role of the teacher to adjust the speech and modify the input, and adapt it at a certain level that the students can cope with in their actual level. Regarding the students' beginner level and their proficiency the length of the utterances should be shorter accordingly. Henzel (1973), Mizon (1981). (Cited in Xiao-yan 2006, p.24)

1.2.4   Distribution of Teacher Talk

Teacher talk distribution means how does teacher talk function, and to what extent is the teacher's speech directed to individual, or target a group of learners. The presumed effect of the difference in function of teacher talk is that learners are engaged into language tasks in different ways. If teacher devotes large amount of time to explanations and management of instructions, learners will have less chance to produce their target language, and if the teacher spent much

more time in solving exercises or questioning, learners may have less opportunity to evaluate the input given or produce a creative language.

1.3 Learners Behavior in Second Language Classroom

The learner is the significant part in the process of developing second language; we shall have a look on his contribution by focusing on the verbal interaction and the learning strategies.

1.3.1 Language Production

It is well known that the more the learner practice and engage into producing the TL frequently and correctly, the more fluent he will be and the better he will enhance his competence, performance and proficiency as well. This is clearly illustrating the contribution of learners in developing their TL proficiency, Swain(1985, p.248) and Ellis (1980), argued in the favor of this view that in addition to exposure to comprehensible input; learners need to engage in the production of comprehensible output in order to attain native levels of accuracy. In this surface Swain (ibid) emphasizes on the role of the output: "Production may force the learner to move from semantics to syntactic processing".

1.3.2 Learner's Production

According to Chadron (1988, p.98) Learners' production measures have been also been investigated with regard to situational factors that influence quantitatively more and more proficient production. A number of studies such as D.Johnson's experiment in 1983, Pica and Doughty (1985), Cathcart (1986), Porter (1986) have shown that peers interaction encourage the learners' ability to product the TL much better.

Ellis ensures that Successful instructed language learning requires opportunities for output relying on Swain (1995) summaries that:

1. Production serves to generate better input through the feedback that learners' efforts at production elicit.
2. It forces syntactic processing (i.e. obliges learners to pay attention to grammar)
3. It allows learners to test out hypotheses about the TL grammar
4. It helps to automates existing knowledge
5. It provides opportunities for learners to develop discourse skills, for example   by producing 'long turns'.

6. It is important for helping learners to develop a 'personal voice' by steering conversation on to topics they are interested in contributing to

1.3.3 Interaction Between Learners

Although the study of NNS-NNS interaction has been receiving considerable attention, not many studies have been conducted involving a foreign language situation. Learners in foreign language situation have fewer opportunities to practice with native speakers of TL apart from teachers and learners spend a great deal of time talking with other NNSs. Long and porter (1985) raise up the importance of learner-learner interaction regarding to its positive aspects, in addition many studies such as Doughty and Pica(1986) emphasize on the impact in which learner-learner interaction offer more opportunities of talking to students in a process of 'meaning negotiation', according to researchers this encourage the learners and reduce anxiety in a communicative atmosphere.

But kanno (2005) asked a question if learners have the ability to provide useful feedback to other learners and from another side the ability of the receiver learner to make use of it. An examination made by Gass and Varonis (1989) has answered the question and demonstrated that NNS were able to provide corrective feedback. Furthermore Long and Porter (1985) insist on the group work which creates more opportunities of students' talk and desirable environment for creating comprehensible input and output.

1.3.4 Learning Strategies

Learning strategies are the actions learners do in order to master their target language, in other word; they are their preferred way to learn easily. In our research we focus mainly on the verbal learning strategies to be used in classroom participation include the following:

1) Repetition: echo/imitation of a word modeled by another.
2) Use of formalistic expression often serving the function of initiations or continuing a conversation and giving the impression of command of the target language.
3) Verbal attention getter: any means by which the speaker, often attract the attention of another so that to imitate interaction.
4) Answer in unison
5) Elaboration
6) Anticipatory answer

7) Appeal for assistance

8) Request for clarification

1.4 Classroom Interaction in Second Language Acquisition

Putting Krashen's (input) and Swain's (output) hypothesis into practice to enhance learners L2is through interaction; since L2learning is a highly interactive process Richards & Lockhart, (2000, p.138);Which is:"generally seen as essential in providing learners with the quantity and quality of external linguistic input which is required for internal processing, in focusing learner attention on aspects of their L2 which differ from TL norms or goals, and in providing collaborative means for learners to build discourse structure ,and express meanings which are beyond the current level of their linguistic competence." Muriel (2006, p.106). Van Lier (1988, p.77) also consider the interaction as essential for learning process and insist on the engagement ,and the participation in speech events and doing conversations with others .

Interaction in the classroom touch all the aspects the process of learning , but in this paper we shall narrow ourselves to the main shapes by which teachers address learners within the classroom discourse which are Questioning and feedback .

1.4.1 Questioning Behavior

Addressing learners via questions is a kind of attracting learners' attention pushing them to react with verbal responses, which pretty well evaluate learners' progress. Questioning constitute about 2% to 40% of major syntactic types in classroom. Long (1981) argued that questions facilitate interaction if the teacher construct the questions due to the insufficiency of the learner; in order to avoid the failure to respond to the question by using a variety of questioning type ;according to the situation. Through questions of teachers can engage students actively in the lesson at hand, challenging their thinking, and posing problems for them to consider. From a lesson perspective, a question at the beginning can be used to capture students' attention, and provide a focus for the lesson. In addition, frequent and periodic questions can encourage active participation and provide opportunities in the lesson for continued student involvement. Research in this area shows student on-task behaviors are highest during teacher-led questioning sessions Xiao yan (2006).

1.4.2 Feedback

Feedback is an aspect of interaction in the classroom. The domination of the Communicative Approach in the last two decades in which interaction is based on the classroom interaction, consider the feedback as an important factor that can influence the learning process positively since it includes the notion of error correction. According to Chaudron (1988) feedback is "Any teachers' behavior following an error; that mainly attempt to inform the learner of the fact of the error."(p.15). Feedback also is a kind of targeting learners with a modified input after committing an error or a mistake using a certain model or way to correct.

Conclusion

In this chapter we have detailed the communicative classroom nature and how learners are exposed to act during lessons. This last is significant factor which have a big impact on learners' both accuracy and fluency. In this research we are interested in the classroom centered research as an umbrella term, which may support our findings by providing the floor of how things are going on in the classroom; to know the rate of learners participation and to what extent they are practitioners inside the classroom; furthermore, it emphasis in the shared role between the teacher and his learners during the lesson, and distributing the talk to be for the benefit of the learners since enhancing the proficiency is the target goal.

Chapter Two: Error Analysis

Introduction
2.1 Error and Mistake: Conceptual Complexity
    2.1.1 What is An Error?
    2.1.2 Error Vs Mistake
2.2 Types of Errors
    2.2.1 Omission
    2.2.2 Addition
    2.2.3 Selection
    2.2.4 Ordering
    2.2.5 Productive and Receptive Error
2.3 Causes of Errors
    2.3.1 Simplification
    2.3.2 Overgeneralization
    2.3.3 Hypercorrection
    2.3.4 Faulty teaching
    2.3.5 Fossilization
    2.3.6 Avoidance

Introduction

Errors are accepted to be a pointer of the learners' stages level advancements on their way to learn a second language. Which from; the teacher can decide their level of dominance of the language in each system. Many researches were done in the errors field, and since we are interested in learners' performance which contains errors at many linguistic levels, we shall investigate this field also because it is the heart of this research

2.1 Error and Mistake Conceptual Complexity

2.1.1 What is An Error?

Errors are simply the learner's inability to utilize the linguistic structures they have been taught, and numerous teachers grumble about their learners' powerlessness to use the language structures correctly and effectively. However, the majority of scholars and researchers agreed that errors are the deviations from the correct linguistic form when using the language and the

correct form stands for the way the native speakers produce it "Native speaker's norm" or the standard variety of speaking. On this surface H.D.Brown (1994,p.205) provides a similar definition: "Errors are problems that a native speaker would not have", to clarify that errors are noticeable on EFL learners. cited in Lengo, N(1995, p. 20)

Corder (1967,p.168) states: "The error of performance will characteristically be unsystematic, and error of competence is systematic." this definition leads us to identify two different types of errors, first is error of performance and the second is the error sourced from competence. From a pedagogical perspective, judging the error according to the classroom teacher's response towards the learners' production, and also depends on the immediate context of the utterances to give the corrective feedback Goerge (1972, p.2). So according to the nature of the error , the teacher can recognize what type it is in regard to the learners attitude toward his utterance, whether to correct himself or to be erroneous, Edge (1989, p.9) argued with this point of view in his own definition of errors : "An error is what a learner cannot self-correct". It means the learner is not aware of the fact that he is erroneous in his language use because of competence lacks. cited in Lengo,N(ibid)

On the other hand being mistaken is that the learner can self-correct:"A mistake is considered as ill formed utterances which are readily correctable by the learner, when he is aware of them." Corder (1967, p.168).Thus mistakes are related and sourced from learners performance ,that is either a random guess or a slip that prevent them from producing the language correctly although ,they already have the appropriate competence H.D. Brown (ibid). cited in Lengo,N(ibid)

Errors have assumed a vital part in the investigation of language acquisition In general, and in analysing second language acquisition specifically. Scientists are keen in errors, since they are accepted to contain profitable data on the procedures that people use to acquire a given language (Richards 1974; Taylor 1975; Dulay and Burt 1974). (cited in Lengo,N(ibid)

2.1.2 Error Vs Mistake

One of the issues faced language teachers; is how to recognize errors from mistakes, such a need is supported by the fact that errors are of significance for the language acquisition process, both for the teachers and the learners Richads (1974). From the errors that learners commit, teacher can identify their needs. So recognizing an error goes beyond clarifying what an error is. According to Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (1992) learner commits

a mistake, when composing or talking in light of absence of consideration, weariness, carelessness, or some other aspects of performance. Mistakes can be self-corrected when consideration is there. While, an error is the utilization of linguistic aspects in a way that a familiar, or local speaker of the language views it as an inadequate learning, which means that it happens in light of the fact that the learner does not recognize what is right. So it can't be self-corrected.

In a brief distinguishing between the two notions practically; is by checking the consistency of learners' performance. To do so, Ellis (1997) pointed out that in the event that he now and then uses the right frame and now and then the wrong one, it is a mistake. But if not and he kept using it incorrectly then it is an error. The second one is to request the learner to attempt to correct his own mistaken expression .If he could it's a mistake and if not it's an error. cited in Lengo,N (1995(ibid)

2.2 Types of Errors

According to Corder (1973, p.277) Errors fall for four main categories:

2.2.1 Omission

Certain etymological structures might be omitted by the learner, as a result of their unpredictability. In pronunciation, consonant clusters frequently make issues for remote learners, and some of their constituents might be left unpronounced. The distinction, be that as it may, is that native speaker has a tendency to take after existing traditions in speaking, while learners of that language don't. Omission likewise happens in morphology. Learners frequently forget the third person morpheme(s), the plural marker, and the past tense (ed). A learner could say, for instance: A strange thing happen to me yesterday.

2.2.2 Addition

Learners not just preclude components which they view as repetitive; however they likewise include excess components. In phonology, a regular epenthesis, which comprises of the insertion of an extra vowel? A few languages have phonotactic constraints, which permit couple of consonant clusters (e.g. Japanese and numerous African languages). A few languages likewise have phonotactic requirements; on how a word can start (e.g. In Arabic a word must start with a consonant).

In morphology, learners regularly miss use the third person singular morpheme – s- and the plural marker – s- . A learner might say (I considers). Also, (The books is here) rather than (I consider) and -The book is here), respectively. At the syntactic level the learner might create a wrong combination, , utilizing the article with a place name: egg : (The London) rather than (London) .At the lexical level the learner might include a superfluous word, eg: (I stayed there during five years ago) , rather than(I stayed there for five years) .

2.2.3 Selection

Learners make errors in pronunciation, morphology, linguistic structure, and vocabulary, because of the choice of the wrong phoneme, morpheme, structure, or vocabulary item. At the phonological it might be characterized by Interlingua transfer, the learner substituting a recognizable phoneme from the primary language for a target phoneme that is hard to pronounce. English consonants /o/and/D/are frequently mispronounce as/s/, /t/, /f/, or/z/, /d/, and/v/separately.

An error can be made in morphology as an after effect of the determination of a wrong morpheme. For instance, the learner can utilize -est. rather than - er for the comparative, delivering a sentence like (My friend is oldest than me) .But, it seems that impression that morphological errors in English because of choice; are not as continuous as errors in other linguistic spheres, because of the generally little number of inflections and their limited utilization.

In language structure the learner might choose a wrong structure, e.g. :(I want that he comes here) rather than (I want him to come here). This error might be instigated by interlingual transfer or generalization.

At the lexical level learners sometimes choose words which don't completely pass on their expected meaning. A Robin might essentially be alluded to as a Bird. This sort of error is prompted by the strategy of approximation (Tarone 1977), or semantic contiguity (Bialystok and Froelich 1980).

2.2.4 Ordering

Miss ordering can happen in pronunciation by changing the position of specific phonemes, e.g., a speaker might say :(significant) instead of: (significant) .At the morphological level miss ordering of bound morphemes in English is maybe less successive, given their predetermined

number; yet in the case (He's get upping now), the learner joins the inflection - ing particle of the two-word verb get up .

Learners can likewise miss order words as in the sentence, (He's a dear to me friend), where constituents of a single noun expression are part. At the lexical level the learner might switch components of a compound word. Car key may become key car, which might be viewed as a car conveying keys or the most vital car in a caravan.

2.2.5 Productive and Receptive Error

Errors can likewise be classified as productive and receptive. Productive errors are those which happen in the language. Learner's utterance receptive or interpretive errors are those which bring about the audience's misconception of the speaker's goals. Competence in a language can be regarded as composed of productive competence, and receptive competence. These two don't develop at the same rate. It is not uncommon to hear people say that they understand a language better than they can speak it, or the way around.

It is less demanding to investigate productive errors than receptive errors. Examination of productive errors depends on learners' utterances, yet to research receptive errors, one need to take a gander at people's responses to orders, demands, and so on. The way an audience carries on can give us a few signs in the matter of whether s/he has comprehended the message or not. On the off chance that a person reacts as: (I am twelve) to a question such as: (What is your name?) it can be expected that s/he didn't comprehend the meaning of the question (Corder 1973:262). But, there are a boundless number of courses in which receptive behaviour works, some of which are culture-specific. The reaction: (I am twelve) might likewise; outline the questioner's refusal to give his or her name. The researcher's interpretation in a circumstance such as this is not highly contrasting. An interesting or sudden reaction or response with respect to the questioner is not a matter proof that s/he has misjudged the speaker's aims. (cited in Lengo,N .1995)(ibid)

2.3 Causes of Errors

Errors has many reasons and causes to be committed. Usually, learners fail to use the language correctly because of the following common problems :

2.3.1 Simplification

Learners pick straightforward structures, and constructions rather than more mind boggling one. A case of simplification may include the utilization of simple present; rather than the present perfect.

2.3.2 Overgeneralization

This is the use of one structure or construction in one context and extending its application to different settings where it ought not matter. Eg. The utilization of(corned and goed) as the past tense forms of corn and go ,and the exclusion of the third singular person under the overwhelming number of all different unlimited structures as in:(go) it ought to be noticed that rearrangements ,and overgeneralization are utilized by learners as a part of request to decrease their etymological shortness.

2.3.3 Hypercorrection

Sometimes the enthusiastic endeavours of teachers in correcting their understudies' errors actuate the learners to make errors in general.

2.3.4 Faulty Teaching

Once in a while it happens that learners' errors are educator affected ones, i.e, caused by the instructor, teaching, or the educator of presentation. This component is firmly identified with hypercorrection above. Additionally, it is interesting to note that a few instructors are even affected by their students' errors over the course of long educating.

2.3.5 Fossilization

A few errors, specifically in pronunciation, endure for long term and become very hard to dispose.

2.3.6 Avoidance

Some syntactic structures are hard to deliver by a few learners dodge these structures, and use less complex structure.

2.3.7 Inadequate Learning

It is principally brought on by lack of awareness of principles, and rules or under differentiation, and inadequate learning.eg (the omission of the third person singular s as in he want)

2.3.8 False Context Hypothesized

Numerous learners errors can be ascribed to wrong hypotheses, a few learners surmise that is it the producer of the present tense. So they create: (he is talk to the teacher).

2.4 Sources of Errors

As there are numerous portrayals for various types of errors, it is inescapable to move further, and request the sources of these errors. It has been shown in the clench hand part of the study that errors were expected similar to be the result of obstruction of the first language propensities to the learning of second language. But, with the field of error analysis, it has been comprehended that the way of errors embroils the presence of different reasons behind other errors to happen. At that point, the sources of errors can be categorized within two domains: interlingual transfer, and intralingual transfer.

2.4.1 Interlingual transfer

Interlingual transfer is a huge hotspot for language learners. *Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics* (1992) defines interlingual errors as being the after effect of language transfer, which is brought on by the learner's mother language .But; this ought not be mistaken for behaviouristic methodology of language transfer. Errors analysis does not view them as the perseverance of old propensities, but instead as signs that the learner is internalizing, and exploring the arrangement of the new language.

Interlingual errors might happen at various levels, for example: transfer of phonological, morphological, grammatical, and lexica-semantic components of the native language into the target language. These distinctive levels can be clarified with some conceivable errors of Turkish learners.

At phonological level, the sounds that don't happen in Turkish make the understudies mispronounce a few sounds. They endeavour to pronounce "th" of 'thank you' as "t" of 'tea'; or "th" of "they" as "d" of "dean ". Or the consequences will be severe, since Turkish does not let two consonants together toward the start of a word; learners tend to put a vowel between them as in the case of 'situation', rather than "station".

It is additionally conceivable that learners transfer some lexical aspects to the target language. Case in point: the verb 'sigaraiçmek' can be said in single word in English: 'smoke'. That is the reason learners tend to say "drink cigarettes", or "smoke cigarettes".

2.4.2 Intralingua Transfer and Developmental Errors

This sort of errors happens in the learning procedure of the second language at a stage, when the learners have not by any stretch of the imagination procured the information. In addition, errors are likewise brought on by the trouble or the issue of the language itself .as indicated by Richards (1971), intralingual errors are additionally separated into the accompanying classifications.

2.4.2.1 Overgeneralization

The learner makes a deviant structure on the premise of different structures in the target language (e.g: he can sings" where English allows, he can sing and he sings).

2.4.2.2 Ignorance of Rule Restrictions

The learner applies tenets to connection where they are not pertinent (e.g. he made me to go rest "through extension of the pattern "he asked/wanted me to go").

2.4.2.3 Incomplete Application of Rules

The learner neglects to utilize a completely developed structure (e.g: you like to sing? "In place of "do you like sings").

2.4.2.4 False Hypothesis

The learners don't completely comprehend a qualification in the target language (e.g: the use of "was «as a maker of past tense in "one day it was happened").

2.5 Errors Correction

Correction is an imperative part of instructing. There are different strategies for rectifying; each has its upsides and downsides. Examine the distinctive techniques beneath, and attempt to distinguish the strategies you use in the EFL classroom.

2.5.1 Teacher-student Correction

This is presumably the most prevalent technique for correction in the EFL classroom. The instructor helps the understudy by recognizing the issues precisely. The right model is given immediately. The instructor can utilize modelling or highlighting to catch any errors in the early stages, before they are rehashed by the learners. The educator can likewise concentrate on normal errors made as a class as opposed to singling out individual learners, this can prompt

group correction. When working close by the educator, the learner can help in examining the error. But errors remedy can be extremely requesting on the educator, and undermine the confidence of the learners. As an instructor, you ought to attempt not over-spotlight on the negative angles. In the event that you are correcting in the class, know about different understudies, who might get a handle on left, while the correction is occurring .This can prompt loss of hobby, or diversion. Ensure other learners are accomplishing something to keep them concentrated. One critical thing to keep in mind, while correcting an understudy's work is not to highlight each and every slip-up the learner makes, simply correct one specific sort of error that the learner has an issue with .Accordingly, the learner can comprehend their error better. A page brimming with red pen imprints is no great to anybody. Lengo,N(1995).

2.5.2 Student-student Correction

A learner cooperates with one of their companions to redress their mistakes. At a point, when understudies offer correction for each other, it gives some assistance with promoting confidence in learning. This thus urges understudies to listen, and turn out to be more included in the EFL class. The educator gets the chance to check whether the vast majority of the class comprehends, or not. On the off chance that learners are as yet committing bunches of mistakes, and then the instructor can go over the issue areas. There are a few weaknesses to this technique. The understudies offering the correction may not give the right model or recognize the slip-up. There might be miscommunication between the two learners in the event that they are not concentrating. Besides, understudies might be moderate or vague in their revision. Lengo,N(1995, p.20).

2.5.3 Self-correcting

EFL learners correct any oversights they have made all alone. This makes the amendment more critical for the understudy, as they work out their slip-ups for themselves. This supports autonomy from the instructor, and gives the understudy more inspiration and certainty.

On the downside, understudies may not see how to self-correct or be sure about the right model. This could prompt the support of errors. The understudy may not know the oversights. The understudy might likewise over-correct or turn out to be self-conscious about errors. It's better for understudies to utilize self-correcting with another correcting strategy. Thusly, they get the most advantage. Lengo ,N(ibid)

Conclusion

The aims of the studies regarding error analysis can be summarized as follows:

This study has been dedicated to present what error analysis is, and what kind of relationship it has with language instructing, and what commitment it accommodates for language instructing investigations. The points of the studies with respect to error analysis can be condensed as the next lines:

• Error analysis recognizes the systems that language learners use.

• It searches for the answer of the inquiry 'why do learners make errors?'

• It decides the normal challenges in learning and helps instructors to create materials for therapeutic educating.

Chapter Three

The Treatment of Oral Errors:

What Teachers Do

Introduction

3.1 Treatment vs. Repair

3.3 How Teacher React to Learners' Errors

3.3 Deciding Whether to Treat Oral Error

3.4 Deciding When to Treat Oral Errors

3.8 Deciding What Treatment to Provide

3.9 Deciding Who Will Treat Oral Error

3.7 Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition

3.7.4 Definition of the Term

3.7.5 The Role of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition

3.7.3 Types of Corrective Feedback

3.7.4 The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for Language Acquisition

3.7.5 Corrective Feedback Models

3.7.6.1 Chaudron's Model (1977)

3.7.6.2 Sinclair and Coulthard model (1975)

3.7.6.3 Omaggio's Model (1986)

3.7.6.4 Seed House Model (1994)

3.7.6.5 Long's Model (1977)

Conclusion

Introduction

In the previous chapters we discussed the nature of classroom within which the learners are exposed to their target language. We have also investigated the field of error analysis as a floor which brings us to the main area of focus of this research which is error treatment. This last is a process of monitoring and repairing learners during their acquisition process. In this surface we shall discuss the error treatment process, and how it is done to be of a significant impact on learners' oral proficiency, and we shall have a section to discuss the corrective feedback (CF) models suggested by well known scholars.

3.1 Treatment vs. Repair

Dealing with learners' errors can be done via different techniques as it has been found by many studies of Allwright and bailey (1975), Chaudron (1977), Long (1977); that teachers have a wide variety of techniques available for the treatment of errors. Yet, teachers face both conceptual and practical difficulties in the classroom when errors occur, because it is well known that "treatment" and "cure" are conceptually not the same, and consequently they wouldn't be the same in the practical occurrence. That because ,when the teacher treat a previously occurred error immediately to get something right , this may not be a permanent cure, since learners may make repeated errors outside the classroom that have already been treated inside. Among the techniques the teacher need to select an appropriate technique, or way to treat a specific learner, so that to make a change in the behavior of the learners to be permanent, and to make the learner aware of the treatment, and response positively toward it (since we cannot guarantee that error would not be repeated in the future anyway).

3.2 How Teacher React to Learners' Errors

Teachers do have many techniques to react towards one's error, as the previous researches shows, teachers tends to treat errors, but not all errors as they agreed upon. Chaudron (1987) has detailed a model of all the teacher reactions towards the errors, which framed as a series of questions about the learners role, and the time of the reacting move following the students' error, which were originally posed Hendrickson (1978):

1/should learner errors be corrected?

2/ if so, when should learners errors be corrected?

3/which learner errors are corrected?

4/who should correct learner errors?

3.3 Deciding Whether to Treat Oral Error

The question of whether to treat the error or not was raised by Long (1977, p.289). He came to the conclusion that teachers are influenced by many factors when they try to provide the feedback or the treatment for the committed errors, such as the fact that both teacher and learners are non-native speakers, so even the teacher may have problems in noticing the learners' errors, because non detected errors will not be corrected. From another aspect correcting, or ignoring the error depends on the learners grasp of the consistently use of erroneous sentences, and grammatical structures or in the pronunciation level; for example the third person singular's' which is considered a late learned morpheme; in this case it is the role of the teacher to treat such a continuous error to prevent the learner not to be fossilized Krashen (1974).

It is sometimes the wisest thing teacher can do, is to ignore an oral error. Teacher's tends to prompt their student's level in which they make many errors while developing a conversation, those interruptions that teachers made to provide the feedback may not help as much as they harm the student's flow of ideas. Yet , it is all about the desirability of the student him/herself to learn , oral treatment may be given more than one time , but the error occur again in and outside the classroom. Not so far, Cathhart and Olsen (1976) clime that learners want more CF which is typically provided their teachers.

3.4 Deciding When to Treat Oral Errors

As the previous notion of whether to treat errors or not, comes the when to do so. Teachers may delay the feedback in order not to let the student finishes with whatever he/she is saying. Immediate treatment of errors contain some problems as some teachers feel , because it is often involves interruptions that may inhibit the learner's willingness to participate ever again .Vigil and Oller's terms (1976) the affective feedback would be negative .

Delaying or postponing the feedback for longer time is unfortunately as long points out (1977, p.290); the psychology research shows that feedback becomes less effective as the time between the moment of the error and its feedback increase. Fanselow (1977) has argued that the teacher should offer their students the greatest possible variety of treatments, not because we don't know how one way of learning works, but because students generally need to be treated differently anyhow. Yet, teachers still need to keep on trying over again different possibilities to eventually they know how their students think.

Choosing the right and the best type of treatment to provide for their student in order to help second language is one other problem; that face the teachers. Teachers should carefully and wisely pick the way of treatment, so that the student wouldn't be uselessly wasted. Supportive reactions that teachers should give, so that students wouldn't be demoralized and positively been supported.

3.5 Deciding What Treatment to Provide

Notifying the learners of their committed errors can be done through either verbal or non-verbal way. It is here to mention that (Allwright 1975, Chaudron 1977, Salica 1981; Nystron 1983) has all dealt with treating errors , but Chaudon's model (1977, p.38-39) was the most detailed one ,in which he set the reactive moves of teachers towards one error. His research on corrective discourse in French immersion, instruction in elementary school classes in Canada.

According to long, teachers have three choices in deciding what to treat: 1) to inform the learner that an error has been made. 2) To inform the learner of the error location. 3) To inform the learner of the error's identity. Caudron's model spells out in more detailed way how to accomplish these steps. One example of explanation by Chaudron of correction behavior is one of those ways for teachers to indicate the error's cause for the learner and the type as well.

3.6 Deciding Who Will Treat Oral Error

Providing the correction for learners is not exclusive only for the teacher. Although his correction is the most appropriate way to provide the correct utterances, but regarding to the communicative goals of the classroom, it is preferred that it is better be a self-correction treatment by the error or mistake maker because this repair will remain in his/her mind .Allwright and Bailey (1991, p.107), that is to say, to internalize the correct forms learners should try to repair their errors in communication breakdowns ,and produce the target language fluently without guidance from the teacher .

The role of the teacher in a communicative classroom is to help the learners become capable of self-correction (stop teaching let the learners learn), Krashen (1977) suggests the "Monitor" to prevent or repair some errors under some conditions such as to focus on form rather than on communication.

Peer correction also has a significant important in enriching the classroom, because it may encourage the communication since error treatment is a critical issue overwhelmed the learners.

To wisely conduct the treatment process, studies of (Rowe 1969, Holley and King 1974, Fanselow 1977) all state that the teacher should wait for a few moments before interrupt to provide the correction, simply to enable the learners to respond correctly.

Another important point is that in a communicative class it is interesting to focus and give more attention to communication problems and of course much less attention to linguistic accuracy.

3.7 Corrective Feedbacks in Second Language Acquisition

Over the last few years, due to its significant impact on learning languages through classroom interaction, CF becomes a highly controversial issue. It is related to both oral and written discourse, but the focus of this discussion will be on oral production. Meanwhile the meaning of CF will be discussed in addition to the role that it plays in the second language acquisition process.

3.7.1 Definition of Terms

Going across various previous studies terms are used by researchers, and scholars in identifying errors, and providing corrective feedback, the most common are corrective feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback. Researchers deal with these terms with different definitions.

Chaudron (1988) point out that the term CF incorporates different layers of meaning, in his own perspective about the treatment of errors he state : " any teachers behaviour following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error" (p.150). (cited in El Tatawy, M. (2002))

Lightbown and Spada (1999) define (CF) as: Any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect. This includes various responses that the learners receive. When a language learner says, 'He go to school every day', CF can be explicit, for example, 'no, you should say goes, not go' or implicit 'yes he goes to school every day', and may, or may not include metalinguistic information, for example, 'Don't forget to make the verb agree with the subject'. (p. 171-172) cited in El Tatawy, M. (ibid).

Long (1996) offers a more comprehensive view of feedback in general. He suggests that environmental input can be thought of in terms of two categories; that are provided to the

learners about the target language (TL): positive evidence, and negative evidence. Long defines positive evidence as providing the learners with models of what is grammatical, and acceptable in the TL, and negative evidence as providing the learners with direct or indirect information about what is unacceptable. This information may be:

Explicit (e.g., grammatical explanation or overt error correction) or implicit (e.g., failure to understand, incidental error correction in a response, such as a confirmation check, which reformulates the learners' utterance without interrupting the flow of conversation—in which case, the negative feedback simultaneously provides additional positive evidence—and perhaps also the absence of the items in the input. (p. 413) cited in El Tatawy, M. (2002).

3.7.2 The role of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition

In first language acquisition (FLA) children acquire their mother language subconsciously through interaction, therefore (CF) seems to have no role to play in FLA. Concerning SLA some researchers such as Krashen(1982), consider CF to be irrelevant for SLA process by arguing that the conscious input, explicit instruction ,and CF would not increase L2 proficiency ,and emphasizing that SLA should expose to implicit learning. However, other researchers claimed against Krashens' view, so that explicit knowledge can influence implicit knowledge. According to this views, CF may be effective in adult L2 learning. Currently, there is a renewed interest in the effect of form focused instruction, and CF on language acquisition. Suggesting that implicitness only is not enough forL2.But, for successful SLA learning, it may be necessary to learn certain features of the target language consciously, for instance through CF. So far, however, it proves difficult to assess the effect of CF on language acquisition. Below we discuss the important issues in SLA on CF.

3.7.3 Types of Corrective Feedback

CF is defined as responses to learner utterances that contain an error. They are different that have different impact on learners. Lyster & Ranta (1997) distinguish six types in their often-cited classroom observation study:

1. *Explicit feedback*: teacher provides the correct form, and clearly indicates that what the student said was incorrect.

2. *Recasts*: the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error.

3. *Clarification requests*: question indicating that the utterance has been misunderstood or ill-formed and that a
repetition or reformulation is required.

4. *Metalinguistic feedback* contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formed of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.

5. *Elicitation*: teachers try to elicit the correct form by asking for completion of a sentence, or asking questions, or asking for a reformulation.

6. *Repetition*: the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the erroneous utterance.

3.7.4 The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback for Language Acquisition

The effectiveness of CF is indicated on learners' reactions and attitude towards it, which appears in their ability to notice the error, because of the feedback provided by the teacher, and their ability to self-correct. Furthermore Ellis (2007) states a point of view about the effectiveness of implicit or explicit feedback, and since implicit knowledge is to underlie language proficiency, it favored to focus on making an impact on the implicit knowledge, which helps the learner to repair his internal competence for a permanent change.

3.7.5 Corrective Feedback Models

The CF models are common ways or acts used by the teacher to react to learners' errors, that is to provide the correct form of an utterance by the teacher , or to prompt learners to self-correct or peer-correction. This and many act are detailed in models suggested by many scholars such as Chaudron (1977), Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), Long (1986), omaggio (1986), Seed house (1994), which all offer a variety of flexible corrections as follow:

3.7.5.1 Chaudron's model (1977)

The most detailed model (1977) Chaudron proposed a set of features of corrective discourse . Chaudron(1977) adopted the following question about error correction:

1- Should learner error be corrected ?

2- If so , when should learner errors be corrected ?

3- Which learner errors should be corrected ?

4- How should learner errors be corrected ?

5- Who should correct learners errors ?

Chaudron's model is rich of corrective acts which offer the teacher more flexibility an variety in treating learners error according to the appropriateness of the context, moreover its more comprehensible to an extent that it influences the oral proficiency more effectively, and target the fluency of producing the language.

Features or corrective types 'acts'	Description	Example of component of expression
Ignore (F)	Teacher (T) ignores student's (S) error , goes on to other topics, or shows ACCEPTANCE of content .	
Interrupt (F)	T interrupt S utterance(ut) following ERROR or before S has completed	
Delay (F)	T waits for S to complete (ut) before correcting , T usually not coded for INTERRUPT is "marked"	
Acceptance	Simple accepting or approving word (usually as signe of reception of (ut) but T may immediately correcte a linguistic error.	Bon , oui , bien, d'accord
Attention	Attention-getter; probably quickly learned by Ss	Euh, regard, attention aller , mais
Negation (T-F)	T shows negation of part or all of S(ut)	Non , ne ….pas
Provide (F)	T provides the correct answer when S has been unable or when no response is offered	S: Cinquante , uh T: pour cent S : pou cent
Reduction (F)	T (ut) employs only a segment of S (ut)	S: Vee, eee (spelling) T: Vé
Expanssion (F)	T adds more linguistic material to S (ut). Possible making more complete	S: et c'est b1 T : ils ont pensé que c'est bien
Emphasis (F)	T uses stress, imperative repetition , or question intonation , to mark area or fact of incorrectness	S: Mille T: Mille ?
Repetition with no change	T repeat S(ut) with no change of error or omission of error	T : (les auto-routes) n'a pas de feu de circulation
Change and emphasis	But T repeat S(ut) with no change of error, but emphasis . located or indicate fact of error	S: mille T: Mille?
Repetition with change	Usually T simply adds correction and continue to other topics . normaly only when emphasis . is added will correcting change become clear, or will T attempt to make it clear	S: le maison est jaune T: la maison est jaune
Repetition with change and emphasis	T adds EMPH. To stress location of Error and its correct formulation	S: Do tout T: Du touts (stress)
Explanation (T)	T provides information as to cause or	S : Uh ; E ; (spelling 'Gran')
Repeat (T)	T requests to repeat ut with intent to have self correction	
Repeat (implicit)	Procedures are understood that by pointing or otherwise signaling , T can have S repeat	
Loop (F)	T honestly needs a replay on S ut , due to the lack of clarity or certainy of items form	
Prompt (F)	T uses a lead –in cue to get S to repeat ut , possibly at point of error	

Clue (T)	Error or of the nature of its immediate correction , without providing correction	S: les station service sans rare T: sont rare ? au present
Original question(T)	Repeat the original question that led to response	
Alerted question (T)	T alert original question that led to response	
Verification *	T attempts to assure the understanding of correction a new elicitation is implicit or made mor explicit	
Exit	At any stage in the exchange T may drop correction of the Error , though usually not after explicit negation , emph …. etc	

***Table.*1:** Chaudron's Features and Types of Corrective Reactions in the Model of Discourse

3.7.5.2 Sinclair and Coulthard Model (1975)

The study of discourse if developed by a team of research of the University of Birmingham, Sinclair and Coulthard (1975). This model though , is not valid , is a simple of means for the description of classroom events especially teacher pupil-talk . It is a system of grading units .

Code	Act	Function	Realization
Acc	Accept	Shows T has heard correct information	Yes , Good , Fine .
Ack	Acknowledge	Shows a pupil has understood intends to react	Ye , Ok, Now
Z	Aside	T talking to him/herself	Statement, question, command
B	bid	Signals desire to contribute	Miss , Sir , Raised hands.
CH	check	Check progress	Finished , ready question
C	cue	Evokes bid	Hand up , don't call out
CL	clue	Gives Extra information	Statement, question, command
COM	comment	Exemplifies , expand , justifies	Statement /Tag question
CON	conclusion	Summaries	So what we have been doing
D	directive	Request action	Imperative
EL	Eliciting	Request answer	Question
E	Evaluation	Evaluates	Good , interesting , yes .
I	Information	Provides information	Statement
L	loop	Return to points before	Pardon , again .
Code	act	Function	Realization
M	Maker	Marker boundary in discourse	Well , ok , right .
MS	Restatement	Explicitly refers to development of lesson	Statement
N	Nomination	Tells or permits a P to contribute	You , yes , Jane
P	Prompt	Reinforces directive or elicitation	Go on , hurry up!

REA	React	Providing appropriate reply to directive	Non linguistic
REP	Reply	Providing appropriate reply to elicitation	Statement /question mod
^	Silent stem	Highlights maker	Pause
S	Starter	Provides information to facilitate response	Statement , question ,

Table 2 Sinclair and Coulthard Model

Key : T: Teacher , P: pupil ; Table (based on Sinclair and Coulthard 1975 : 40-44) .

3.7.5.3 Omaggio's Model (1986)

Omaggio (1986) describes the most frequent types within each category of error correction

1- **Self Correction with the Teacher's Help**

For Omaggio , this kind of correction is an excellent to address errors self-correction in this turn falls into seven types and which are:

2- **Pinpointing**

The teacher repeats the learner's utterance until the word where the error has occurred and alerts the sound just preceding the error with a rising tone

3- **Rephrasing a Question**

When a student is incapable of responding or respond is incorrected

4- **Cueing**

Used to prompt the student to carry out responding correctly

5- **Explanation of Key Word**

Used to a word confusion and to make the student go straight forward to the needed word or utterance. The teacher may use , as well , gestures , pointing techniques ….etc.

6- **Questioning Techniques**

Used simply when the students utterance is unclear or incomprehensible .

7- **Providing a Model Answer :**

Answering a question that was asked before is a usefull way in the sense that this would provide the learner a model for a correct structure and in his turn he would give his answer

8- **Repeating the Learner's Answer with the Correct Form :**

After repeating the learners' utterance with the correct form , the teacher then repeat the original question or a similar form of it to assess the learner's comprehension of the error.

9- **Peer-correction :**

Omaggio (1986) provides two techniques for peer correction. The first is based on interviews written on cards which the students ask to interview one another . the second is technique is that the teacher can motivate the whole class for providing a corrective when a student stumbles

10- **Teacher Correction :**

Either the teacher, too simply provides the correct answer regarding to many actors such as too short time allotted , lack of other of other method or the teacher paraphrase

3.7.5.4 Seed house Model :

Seed house model (1994)suggested that repair depends on the context and each context has its own particular pedagogical focus and its own typical organization of repair which approximate to that pedagogical focus. Thus he describe the organization of repair within four different contexts in second language classroom

1- **Classroom Mode 1**

Real-world target speech community, repair, here, is the task of the learner only. There are two universal contexts: focus on form and accuracy contexts and focus on meaning and fluency context. But the most efficient way is to adopt focus on both contexts. Learner's interaction and repair should resemble real world interaction.

2- **Classroom Mode 2**

Classroom and speech community use of mixture of repair types and repair trajectory. Repair here is meaningful through enabling learners to express personal relationships, feelings and meanings.

3- **Classroom Mode 3**

Task oriented speech community: What is also common in language classroom is that learners work in pair or in groups, so, it is generally the learner who deals with repair but, what is also common is that self initiated other repair is more frequent in this context than in others.

4- **Classroom Mode 4**

Form and accuracy contexts in this case, repair is mainly the job of the teacher who focused   by correcting, on the accuracy production of the certain linguistic form**.**

3.7.5.5 Long's Model (1977)

Input to Desicon-process	Desicon-making process	Overt behaviours

Input to Desicon-process

Teacher decides to treat error

T notice error

S makes error in **TL**

Teacher decides to ignore error

T dose not notice error

Desicon-making process

Teacher decides to treat error

T decides to delay treatment

T decides to post-pone treatment

T decides to inform s

T decides to inform s

T decides to inform S

Overt behaviours

Him or herself

Via other

Him or herself

Via other

Him or herself

Via other

Yes/No   When   What   Who

Continuum

Decisions Affected
By more permanent factors

Decisions affected by
More ephemeral factors

figure 1: Long's Model of the Decision-Making Process Prior to the Teacher Feedback
Move(1977:289)

Conclusion

This chapter tackled the role of the teacher as a source of corrective feedback and what reaction is there to do. Deciding when and how to correct is a critical issue in classroom events. As an addition to Chaudron's model, we provide other models to compare. Chaudron's model is very detailed, which he listed a various reactions for teachers to choose toward their student's errors.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE FINDINGS AND TENTATIVE INTRPRETATION

Introduction

Among classes of second year English license students, we conducted a survey in the oral expression module about learners' oral proficiency and errors made during class and how and when the teacher interferes to correct those errors. To be able to do that we went with the best way to a careful data collection and analysis, which is to attend several direct lessons with the targeted students .we conducted that on check list showing how the teacher reacted towards her learner's errors at each type level of CF, and how the learners response to the feedback provided. After the collecting of the data, it's the time to analyze them and to complete the finding of the whole lessons.

4.1 Methodology

To conduct this research we went through this following methodology:

4.1.1 Research Population and Samples

Among the English department of Kasdi Merbah University of Ouargla, we have chosen second year English license student, oral module specifically as a case study. They were very active due to their program of oral expression, doing their best to improve their language proficiency. we had the chance to be attending six lessons full of presentations, and communication, we observed them very closely, and they were participating positively, which helps us to collect statistical data about oral errors. According to the check-list of collecting errors made by Chaudron, we observed the different moves and reactions made by the teacher towards her students.

4.1.2 Research Instruments

To collect more data base of oral errors of students, we found that direct observation is the most commonly used way for that. We also opt to conduct interviews with teachers to have more reliable data to be used in our research.

4.2 Analysis of the Findings

Relying on Chaudron's model of corrective feedback, The teacher used many reactions of CF towards ones errors, with paying more attention to the classroom factors, and student affective side. In the findings description we will be detailing each reaction and type with examples within the statistics of the findings. We have attended six (6) classes of oral expression, where we had the chance to fill the check-list of the several reactions and the student's responses to those treatments according to Chaudron's model.

4.2.1 Analysis of the Corrective Feedback in the First Lesson

Table 3: corrective acts in first lesson

Corrective acts	Frequency
Ignore	9.09%
Interrupt	36.36%
Acceptance	9.09%
Attention	18.18%
Prompt	9.09%
Clue	9.09%
Self correction	9.09%

The first lesson of oral expression was quite full of oral errors which are our field of interest. Our observations were based on catching oral errors that students make during a conversation or during a presentation. The teacher in this lesson used six moves according to Chaudron's model. She ignores some errors due to conversation purposes, and she modify in the type of interrupting when there is a heavy error. Self-correction was involved also, and that is because the teacher encourage that, when she ignores some obvious errors, it is a call for the peers to provide the correction. Yet, the first lesson was a set of presentations which errors are most likely to appear.

4.2.2 Analysis of the Corrective Feedback in the Second Lesson

Table 4: corrective acts in second lesson

Corrective act	Frequency
Ignore	36.36%
Interrupt	18.18%
Emphases	9.09%
Repeat	9.09%
prompt	18.18%
Self-correction	9.09%

The second lesson was a bit different, where they used the data-show, rather than preparing the presentation right there. During the classroom interaction, the errors appear in many occasions in different forms and different levels which led the teacher to use five moves of corrective feedback. And as always, the purpose of every lesson differs from other lessons, and

the corrective reactions will differ also. The teacher tends to give clues when she detects an error.

4.2.3 Analysis of the Corrective Feedback in the Third Lesson

Table 5: corrective acts in third lesson

Corrective act	Frequency
Ignore	13.33%
Interrupt	26.66%
Acceptance	6.66%
Attention	11.11%
Repeat	5.55%
Prompt	5.55%
Self-correction	11.11%
Peer-correction	11.11%

The third lesson was different where there have been a peer-correction feedback. They start to interact after each presentation where errors are most likely to appear, and the teacher took the back seat and she let the interaction open which by there, peers got the chance to provide the correction when some of them detect an oral error. , and .She did also interrupted the heavy errors even though she had to cut out the speech, but this kind need immediate interference .And she choose to ignore some of them to avoid interrupting the fluency of the speech and they were slight and do not need interference. Drawing the attention of learners to the error is also a method she preferred to let them depend on themselves (it's not always the teacher who should correct errors).

4.2.4 Analysis of the Corrective Feedback in the Fourth Lesson

Table 6: corrective acts in fourth lesson

Corrective act	Frequency
Ignore	7.69%
Delay	7.69%
Acceptance	30.76%
Clue	15.38%
Self-correction	30.76%
Peer-correction	7.69%

The fourth lesson was different, where the teacher gave more opportunities to learners to speak and interact. . And so on, she continued allowing student to explore the oral language by relying on self-correction method. The teacher balanced between Ignore, Delay, clue, Self-correction methods while correcting her learners. which means they start to interact in a fruitful way. Oral proficiency is to be reached by prompting learners towards a better pronunciation.

4.2.5 Analysis of the Corrective Feedback in the Fifth Lesson

Table 7: corrective acts in fifth lesson

Corrective act	Frequency
Ignore	22.22%
Interrupt	16.66%
Acceptance	11.11%
Attention	5.55%
Prompt	5.55%
Clue	11.11%
Peer-correction	11.11%
Emphases	5.55%

Among the most frequent errors made, the teacher role is still active and functions with correcting students' errors. She made the move of interrupting the speech in this course because students continue committing heavy errors that would slow down their learning process. And she balanced between Acceptance Clue, Peer-correction, Attention, and Prompt towing sometime, just not to cut the flow of ideas when learners are presenting their topics, because the time of the session is limited .and the teacher has a curriculum to follow, so she cannot fix the errors all at once.

4.2.6 Analysis of Corrective Feedback in the Sixth Lesson

Table 8: corrective acts in the sixth lesson

Corrective act	Frequency
Ignore	20%
Self-correction	60%
Peer-correction	20%

In this lesson, most of the correction was by students themselves. Peers also, got the chance to provide correction towards some errors. the teacher chooses the best way to deal with

errors, In this particular lesson she mostly let them for self-correction, but not only using a single method, but she varied between peer-correction and ignorance of the error.

4.3 General Table of Acts' Frequency

Table 9: general acts frequency

Corrective acts	Lesson 1	Lesson2	Lesson3	Lesson4	Lesson5	Lesson6	Results
Ignore	9.09%	36.36%	13.33%	7.69%	22.22%	20%	17.80%
Interrupt	36.36%	18.18%	26.66%	-	16.66%	-	17.80%
Delay				7.67%			1.36%
Acceptance	9.09%		6.66%	30.76%	16.66%		12.32%
Attention	18.18%		20%		11.11		9.58%
Emphases		9.09%			5.55%		2.73%
Repeat		0.09%	6.66%				2.73%
Loop							0%
Prompt	9.09%	18.18%	6.66%		5.55%		6.84%
Clue	9.09%			15.38	11.11		6.84%
Self-correction	9.09%	9.09%	13.33%	30.76%		20%	15.06%
Peer-correction			6.66%	7.69%	11.11%	20%	6.84%

4.3.1 Analysis of the Ignore Type

The teacher is used correct most of the errors, yet she tended to ignore some errors according to communicative purposes. She happens to ignore (17.80%) during the six lessons, regarding that the most of the sessions was presentations the teacher tends to ignore some errors to not interrupt the flow and stretch of speech. Starting by ignoring mistakes of performance such as slips of the tongue, and some time she shows acceptance for soft errors that has less gravity to affect oral proficiency. Ignoring student errors can be justified by: first, it is in oral expression lesson which focus on the communication and fluency, and of course without neglecting grammar accuracy. Second, this type of pedagogical acts is most used in the last lectures of the academic year and there is no time for correcting every error. Third ignoring error is useful in enhancing the interaction in the classroom.

4.3.2 Analysis of the Interrupt Type

The interruption type is somehow frequent, where the teacher interrupts when she feels that there is a need for that. Yet , if she interrupts , she may give the right utterance, and sometimes she draw the attention where something has happened for both , encouraging peer-assessment and the error maker him/herself to figure out the correct form . Allwright and bailey (1991, p.109) has confirmed that if learners put on a defensive by heavy-handed error treatment, they may not be able to notice the gap or the incoming process of corrective feedback.

4.3.3 Analysis of the Delay Type

This type was not so preferred by the teacher. There were some cases of delaying the correction in which The teacher tends to favor the fluency over the accuracy, but she does not ignore ultimately to correct the error later on .Van Lier (1984) points out "… the more the pupils communicative and express themselves freely, the genuine one and more it is beneficial to the learners ''. Not so far Klassan (1991) says that: "one aspect of learner personality is afraid to make a mi stake which hampers communication and slows down learners''.

4.3.4 Analysis the Acceptance Type

Chaudron defines acceptance as when the teacher simply approves, accepts as a sign of reception of utterance. Furthermore, because it is second language classroom learning and we are non-native speakers, being perfect is not an option, but working towards a good and acceptable oral proficiency. CF is to know how to act, and when to react, and showing acceptance to one student error is one of the reaction by Chaudron, the teacher due to our observation was showing acceptance in (12,32%) of the occasions , where she was aware of the errors but she tends to do nothing , but she nods as if she is saying " there is a mistake , but go on ''. This act may give motivation to the students to continue their participating with no fears of the committed mistakes.

4.3.5 Analysis of Attention Type

This type is usually used by the teacher by drawing a focus look on the error maker face with an attention to let the student feel that there is something went wrong with his/her utterance, whether it was a grammatical, morphological or misspelling of utterances and structures. The teacher has faced (9.58%) of the occasions where she used the attention move, yet we were focusing with catching the errors during the activities, and the teacher used to show us which reaction she used once we needed to know which move was of the several CF reactions.

4.3.6 Analysis of the Emphasis Type

According to Chaudron's definition, This type is when the teacher keep on stressing on the incorrect utterances. The teacher used to prefer other types , she happens to emphasis (2.73%) times on a form of repeating the incorrect word as if it is a question ending with a question mark , so that her students be aware of their faults by correcting themselves immediately with saying again the correct form .

4.3.7 Analysis of the Repeat Type

Chaudron defines this type as when the teacher requests the student gently to repeat the utterance with an intention to let the self-correcting. In our observations, this type didn't occur very often due to the fact that the teacher tends to treat the oral errors by repeating herself so that no chance for the same error to be repeated again, she knew that her student are focusing on a communication purposes, which by all means they wouldn't notice at what level they had made the error, she shortcuts that all by providing the correct utterance, while or after the student finishes the statement.

4.3.8 Analysis of the Prompt Type

The purpose of the CF is to enhance learners' second language oral proficiency to a better level, so that Chaudron's (CF) model push the teachers to prompt the students by giving the chance to self-correction. Not so far from the repeat type, prompt is to give a cue to the student to repeat the utterance again whereby he/she would figure the incorrect word or whatever the error is. The teacher happens to use this act (6.84%) in a direct way, which was obvious that her intention is reach the fluency rather on accuracy.

4.3.9 Analysis of the Clue Type

In this type, the teacher provides a clue of the correct area, so that the student would correct him/herself. Also, the type of error would identify the provided clue. This type appears (6.84%); most of them are grammatical errors, or miss using the tense of the verbs. In a form of repeating the structure with another questioning clue, would make the student aware of the incorrectness area, which will give the space for self-correction which is one leading way towards the oral proficiency enhancing.

4.3.10 analysis of the Provide Type

The teacher provides the right answer, when the learners are unable to do so, this type is been used in the very beginning of each lesson, which by the teacher asks or give an mysterious new word and give the floor to her student for discussing and prompting them towards the right answer, since they couldn't find it, she ends up providing them, where they respond positively as

if they were near to find it. She happens to use this move in 4 different occasions. Freimuth (1997) stated that "the last and the least effective way to address errors are for the teacher to provide the correction ''.

4.3.11 Self-Correction

This action was used by the learners themselves, when they knew their errors. The teacher helps students by giving them a space to figure and treat those errors. In our observation, self-correction happens (15.06%) times in different surfaces, the remarkable thing that they did so by no provided move by the teacher. The student during their speech, or presentations or even participating, they notice a wrong utterance whereby they correct, and continue the message they were delivering, and this considers as a signal of improvement on learners' performance.

4.3.12 Peers-assessment

Among the observation, peers seem to be doing a great effort on detecting the errors, and they seem to be good providers of the feedback. Though, the teacher is the one, who mostly correct, but there were some space for peers to show their English language potentials. This indicates that the classroom communication is active, and learners are interacting with each other positively.

4.4 Interpretation of the Findings

The teacher has used ten various types of CF according to Chadron's model. The teacher most of the time correct her student's errors, yet she showed some acceptance to some oral errors. Interruption (17.80%) as the results shows is the first step to correct some errors that must be corrected immediately. Delay (1.36%) type isn't preferred that much, where it has occurred only one time, and that because enhancing oral proficiency is by doing the feedback the time of the errors occurrence. The students do vary to one's abilities and potentials, where the teacher shows attention (9.58%) in a way of focusing on the eyes of the error maker and show some unsatisfied look that means that there is something wrong which lead the student to correct him/herself if they ever notice the error. Emphasising (2.73%) and repeating are if not, didn't applied very often, due to communication purposes. Giving the motivation by enhancing the desire of participation is to be done by prompting (6.84%) and giving clues (6.84%), that, which the students are accustomed with from their teacher. The purpose sometimes is to encourage self-correction (15.06) by doing the previous clues, and emphasising types. The students seem to be doing a great deal of correcting themselves whenever an error is been made with or without the teacher clues. Peers also been very active and they seem to pay attention to their classmates

errors, where they had the chance to correct (6.84%), which is in fact one of the oral proficiency enhancing goals.

4.5 Teacher's Interviews

In addition the classroom observation findings, we conducted interviews with tow teachers of oral expression of second year in the English department of University Kasdi Merbah Of Ouargla, to give more qualitative results that may support the findings.

The Sample

We have interviewed tow of teachers of oral expression of second year English student of Ouargla University.

Description of the Interview

The interview is set of eight questions directed to the oral expression module teachers. They were asked to answer according to their experience in teaching English language. Corrective feedback and its impact on oral proficiency is the dominating concept of the questions. The questions were to bring answers that support our findings.

Administration of the Interview

The interview took place in one of the department classes, where we had the chance to ask our questions. Both teachers were very helpful and they gently answered us right away.

Teacher One

Question1: Which module do you teach?

Answer: She teaches oral expression, ESP, discourse analysis, creative writing ?

Question 2: For how many years have you been teaching oral expression?

Answer: She taught oral expression for six years.

Question 3: Is oral proficiency one of your goals?

Answer: Oral proficiency has to be the goal of every language teacher, mainly oral expression teacher.

Question 4: Do you provide your students with opportunities to communicate more often ?

Answer: She used to prompt and encourage the learners to communicate both in classroom and in another contexts too.

Question 5: What are the errors that occur the most ?

Answer: There is a wide range of error committed in the oral classes. Mostly, errors lie in the phonological realization of the words and expressions i.e. in pronunciation. Besides, students seem to struggle in their ways in ranging utterances grammatically. For instance mixing the word order, misuse of tenses. Other frequent errors are linked to the lack of some competencies which enable the learners to use language appropriately and fluently.

Question 6: What type of feedback do you provide?

Answer: Error correction is a major classroom activity, but correction every single error does not go with the main goal which is improving oral proficiency. Again, the nature of the cause does not allow any type of error to be corrected.

Question 7: Which way do you choose for correcting ?

Answer: Most of the times, she delays her corrections on critical occasions and provides the feedback, and the correction she rarely interrupts the earner to correct them, and sometimes she ignores the errors if it does not cause a communication breakdown. Error gravity is a signal for her to opt for a remedial work. Her feedback patterns vary accordingly. She tries the maximum to withdraw for correcting and encouraging peer-correction and self-correction because they are suitable ways to enhance the speaking skill by increasing the learner motivation, self-confidence and self-esteem.

Question 8: Does your students seem to be showing improvement after your oral treatment ?

Answer: To a great extant her students respond to oral treatment and show improvement by trying to avoid error they have committed, correcting their peers if they committed the same errors, asking for clarifications or for the right answers.

Teacher Two

Question1: Which module do you teach?

Answer: Oral module and English for beginners in private school.

Question 2: For how many years have you been teaching oral expression?

Answer: 2 years in general.

Question 3: Is oral proficiency is one of your goals?

Answer: She respond to this question positively. She believe in that the more fluency is a to be reached, the more oral proficiency is to be the center of the oral class

Question 4: Do you provide your students with opportunities to communicate more often?

Answer: She provides them with 50% of the classroom speech, so that they use the language more.

Question 5: What are the errors that occur the most?

Answer: in grammar, mostly in pronunciation, and misusing words and, structures.

Question 6: What type of feedback do you provide?

Answer: according to each error, and according the error maker him/herself. She provides them gently, whereby; they will benefits from it, inside and outside the classroom, and also according to the student's level and their capacities of learning. Sometimes interrupting is the best way to treat errors, and other times, delaying the treatment is the appropriate way.

Question 7: Does your students seem to be showing improvement after your oral treatment?
Answer: according to student's level, capacities, but the large number of student is and constrain that comes between good level of fluency.

Question 8: Which way do you choose for correcting ?

Answer : She react according the error nature. She gently intervenes if the learner made an error.

Interviews Interpretation

The first and second questions were about the modules they are teaching, and for how many years. The first answer was that they teach oral expression, ESP and Discourse Analysis. Concerning the second answer, each teacher has his own teaching experience. In this case, regarding to the long teaching experience, teachers would be more able to provide positive feedback. Third question was whether oral proficiency is a goal to be reached. the response was positive, so that oral proficiency is to be the ultimate goal to enhance fluency. The teacher believes that oral proficiency has to be the goal of every language teacher, that is to say that our teachers are aware of the role of their correction towards learners. Talking about the amount of talk, and whether the teacher provides the student with opportunities to communicate. In which the teachers tends to provide them with more chances to talk during the oral lesson through interaction, and in other context by creating and construct conversations outside the classroom.

Fifth question was to know the most common errors that teachers deal with, and it seems that over a range of committed errors, phonological, grammatical structures and pronunciation are the most frequent errors. The sixth question was about the type of feedback that they use, both agreed upon the nature of the error that defines the method, both tends to provide the correction gently which means they take into consideration the affective side of the student and the individual differences. Concerning the preferred way of correction, both teachers opt to delay and they rarely interrupt, only in critical occasions. If the errors do not cause a communication breakdown, they both tend to ignore since the goal is to enhance oral proficiency.

The last question is whether students are showing improvements or not, which oral student made a progress where they seem to avoid same errors which means, the corrective feedback was fruitful and learners responds positively.

General Conclusion and Recommendations

On the light of the findings of the observation, many points are to be taken into consideration; concerning the corrective feedback, and the interaction in classroom of second language learning. Error treatment is yet a critical issue; as we widely dealt with as the main concern in classroom observation. It is to say, when an error is there, CF should be provided by the teacher. CF as it has been discussed by those whom we mentioned, is the reaction towards any error from the teacher to the student. English language as our case of study, or other languages or modules are full of corrective feedback, but the density is to be judged due the module purpose, oral expression is not like linguistic module, which its focus is on accuracy rather than fluency which is communication. Those students have shown a great deal of improvement since they did not repeat error they had committed in the classroom.

The impact of the teacher's feedback shows positive results in a way that students do feel that there is what is beyond learning , they knew that the scales of a fluent English is to make errors and mistakes where only there they will be corrected and next time they will remember. Peers do support each other emotionally if the teacher encourages peer-correction. They should be considered with the error maker as an effective part of the learning process, then in treating errors. Suggestions as providing a wait-time for the learner, so that to be able to answer by him/herself, and self-correct. Peers assessment is often a good factor if not to say always, but a good move to improve the oral proficiency. Yet, speaking of the teacher talk and student talk is an important issue in mastering the language, where the teacher is asked to regular the turn-taking, so that student will find the chance to participate. Taking into consideration the affective side of the learner the moment of correcting or the moment they make an error. Providing the correction is an art that teachers learn by time and by experience, student feel shy, and some of them feel bad when making an error where their peers laughs at the error maker, and this underestimate the ability of the error maker, which decrease the amount of his/her participating. The teacher is the one who can turn the CF into entertainment with a bit of changing in the way of providing, which may be more beneficial. Last thing is that those errors which student make are the scale of success towards a better oral proficiency, if the CF has been provided appropriately.

We suggest to reduce the number of students in classrooms, which effect the process of correcting and learning as well, the more the number is large, the less effectiveness of corrective feedback in communication will be. Teachers also must encourage the students to enhance their levels outside the classroom; they need to spend more efforts because the classroom cannot do much if there are no other efforts. In the end, a list of recommendations is to be listed for teachers to read.

As this case study allowed us to experience many things for the reason of bringing something beneficial for EFL teaching, We would like to recommend that every language teachers should tackle the language proficiency depending on the classroom object. The teacher must be aware of the corrective feedback acts, so then his/her correction would be beneficial for learners. The teacher must provide the students with presentations in front of students, whereby errors are very likely to occur, and by then, the correction will be more effective. Students must be aware of the definitions of errors and CF, so they will respond positively towards teacher acts. Spelling games also are very helpful instrument in oral classroom activities. Role play, and free speech are very required to enhance both oral proficiency and public speaking which reduce the occurrence of errors. Oral proficiency is to be reached through practicing the language much more because the classroom only area where to communicat. Eventually, the more learners are communicating, they are exposed to commit errors, but they should keep in mind that we all learn from our errors.

Bibliography

Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: an introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge [England: Cambridge University Press.

Bialystok ,E .and Froelich, M. (1980). *Oral communication strategies for lexical difficulties interlanguage studies Bulleten*.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (3rd Edition). Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.

Cathcart, R. L., & Olsen J. W. B. (1976). *Teachers'and students' preferences for correction of classroom conversation errors*. In J. F. Fanselow& R. H. Crymes (Eds.), On TESOL 45. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Chaudron, C.(1987).*The role of error correction in second language teaching :regional language center*.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge [Cambridge shire: Cambridge University Press.

Corder, S.P. (1967). *The significance of learner errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics.*

Doughty, c. & Pica, T. (1986). *Information gap" tasks, do they facilitate second language acquisition?* TESOL Quarterly.

Duly, H & Burt, M. 1974. *Natural sequences in child second language acquisition. Language Learning*.

Edge, Julian. (1989). *Mistakes and Correction*. London/New York: Longman

Edward G. Carmines,& Richard A. Zeller. (1979). *Reliability and validity assessment*. thousand oaks', CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412985642

Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press..

Ellis, R., and G. Wells. (1980). *Enabling Factors in Adult-Child Discourse. First Language*.

Ellis, R. 2007. *The Differential Effects of Corrective Feedback on Two Grammatical Structures*. In *Conversational interaction and Second Language Acquisition: A Series of Empirical Studies*, edited by A. Mackey. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

El Tatawy, M. (2002) *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition.* Teachers College, Columbia University

Fanselow, J. (1977). *The treatment of error in oral work. Foreign Language Annals*.

GASS, S. M., and E. M. VARONIS. (1986). *Sex differences in NNS/NNS interactions*. In Talking to Learn: Conversation in Second Language Acquisition. Ed. R. R. Day. Rowley (MA): Newbury House.

George, H. V. (1972). *Common Errors in Language Learning*. Rowley, Mass. : Newbury House

Hendrickson, J. (1978). *Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory,research, and practice*. Modern Language Journal.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon.

Long, M. H. (1983). *Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation in the second language classroom*. In M. Clarke & J. Hanscombe (Eds.), On TESOL 징짰 82. Washington, D. C.: TESOL.

Long, M. H. & P. A. Porter (1985). *Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition.* TESOL Quarterly.

Lightbown, P., &Spada, N. M. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lyster, R. & L. Ranta (1997). *Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms*. Studies in Second Language Acquisition.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J. T., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex, England: Longman.

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

Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development*. In Gass, S. and Madden, C. (Eds.), Input in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Newbury House.

Seedhouse, P. (1997). *The case of the missing "no": The relationship between pedagogy and interaction. Language Learning.*

Tarone, E. (1977). *Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report.* TESOL.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The Classroom and the Language Learner. Ethnography and Second-Language Classroom Research*. Harlow: Longman.

Vigil, N. A. & J. W. Oller (1976*). Rule Fossilization: A tentativemodel [J]*. Language Learning..

Xiao, Y. (2006) *Teacher Talk and EFL in University Classrooms*. School of Foreign Languages and Literature Chongqing Normal University & Y angtze Normal University , China.

Appendixe

Teachers' interview

Q1: Which module do you teach ?

Q2: For how many years have you been teaching ?

Q3: Is oral proficiency is one of your goals?

Q4: Do you provide your students with opportunities to communicate more often ?

Q5: What are the errors that occur the most ?

Q6: What type of feedback do you provide ?

Q7: Which way do you shoos for correcting ?

Q8: Does your student seem to be showing improvement after your oral treatment ?

Abstract

In this study, we discussed the impact of oral errors treatment on students' oral proficiency. We have chosen Second Year English students of oral expression module as our case study. Concerning instruments, we opt to choose direct observation and teacher's interview to collect more data that will fulfill the aim of this research. Our interest field is to reveal whether corrective feedback reactions enhance oral proficiency or not. To conduct the observation, we followed Graig Chaudron's model of corrective feedback moves, which the teacher used during the process of correcting.

Key Words : Oral Proficiency , Corrective Feedback , Oral Treatment , Graig Chaudron's model.

ملخص

من خلال هذه الدراسة , ناقشنا تأثير معالجة الأخطاء الشفهية على تحسين المهارة والكفاءة الكلامية. تم اختيار طلاب اللغة الانجليزية للسنة الثانية وتحديدا حصة التعبير الشفهي كحالة دراسية لهذا البحث. تم استخدام الملاحظة المباشرة للطلاب أثناء سير الدرس و استجواب أساتذة هذه المادة كأدوات في هذا البحث. يصب اهتمام البحث في كشف ما مدى تأثير ردود الأفعال التصحيحية و تحسينها لكفاءة الكلامية و للحصول على نتائج أفضل , تم اختيار نموذج جرايج شودرون لردود الأفعال التصحيحية كنموذج رئيسي للحصول على نتائج دقيقة و الذي يستخدمه أستاذ المادة بدوره.

الكلمات المفتاحية : الكفاءة الكلامية , ردود الأفعال التصحيحية ، المعالجة الشفهية، نموذج