
ReSciLac

Revue pluridisciplinaire Lettres, Langues, Arts,
Communication, sciences humaines et sociales
ISSN : 1840-8001

1^{er} semestre 2025
(juin 2025, vol.10)

Université d'Abomey-Calavi
©SODYLARY, 2025



Indexation : Worldcat, Stanford Libraries, Penn Libraries, Zeitschriften Datenbank

Preuve de l'indexation

- <http://www.worldcat.org/title/rescilac-revue-des-sciences-du-langage-et-da-la-communication/oclc/957341200>

- <https://searchworks.stanford.edu/view/11844535>

Indexation ReSciLaC (WorldCat)

The screenshot shows the WorldCat website interface. At the top, there is a search bar with the text "Ouvrages" and "Cherchez des livres, articles et plus". Below the search bar, there are navigation links: "Accueil", "Bibliothèques", "Sujets", "Listes", "À propos", and "Pour les bibliothécaires". The main content area displays the title "ReSciLaC revue des sciences du langage et de la communication" with the author "Université d'Abomey-Calavi". It also lists the genre as "Zeitschrift", the ISSN as "1940-8001", and the OCLC number as "957341200". A sidebar on the right offers an "Emprunter" button for the "Universitätsbibliothek J. C. Senckenberg, Zentralbibliothek (ZB) près de Bénin", noting a distance of 4555 kilometers.

Indexation ReSciLaC (Stanford)

The screenshot shows the Stanford SearchWorks catalog entry for "ReSciLaC : revue des sciences du langage et de la communication". The page includes a search bar with "All fields" and "books & media" selected. Below the search bar, there are navigation links: "Help", "Advanced search", "Course reserves", and "Selections (0)". The main content area displays the title "ReSciLaC : revue des sciences du langage et de la communication" with the publication information "Abomey-Calavi, Bénin : Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Faculté des Lettres, Arts et Sciences Humaines, [2015]-". It also lists the physical description as "volumes ; 21 cm". The "At the library" section shows the "SAL3 (off-campus storage)" with "No public access" and a list of stacks with their availability status. The "Description" section includes "Creators/Contributors" (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Faculté des lettres, arts et sciences humaines Issuing body) and "Subjects" (Sociolinguistics > Africa > Periodicals, Linguistics > Africa > Periodicals, Philology > Africa > Periodicals, Linguistics, Philology, Sociolinguistics).

Université d'Abomey-Calavi
Faculté des Lettres, Langues, Arts et Communication
Laboratoire des Sciences du Langage et de la Communication
SODYLARY / UAC – 2025

ReSciLaC Vol.I0

I^{er} semestre 2025 (juin), vol.I0

Directeur de publication

Prof. Moufoutaou ADJERAN (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Rédacteur en Chef

Prof. Aimé Dafon SEGLA (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Comité de rédaction

Dr (MC) Guillaume CHOGOLOU (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Comité scientifique et de lecture

Prof. Aimé Dafon SEGLA (CNRS, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Akanni M. IGUE (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Céline PEIGNE (INALCO, Paris)

Prof. Christophe H. B. CAPO (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Pascal O. TOSSOU (Université d'Abomey-Calavi)

Prof. Gratien Gualbert ATINDOGBE (Buea, Cameroun)

Prof. Jean Euloge GBAGUIDI (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Kofi SAMBIENI (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Laré KANTCHOA (Université de Kara, Togo)

Prof. Maxime da CRUZ (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Tchaa PALI (Université de Kara, Togo)

Prof. Bernard KABORE (Université Joseph KI-ZERBO, Burkina Faso)

Prof. Bangré-Yamba PITROIPA (Université de Koudougou, Burkina Faso)

Prof. Romuald TCHIBOZO (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Djoko Luis Stéphane KOUADIO (Université Félix Houphouët-Boigny, Côte d'Ivoire)

Prof. Laurent-Fidèle SOSSOUVI (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Innocent Sourou KOUTCHADE (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Etienne K. Iwikotan (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Dame NDAO (Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Sénégal)

Prof. Alain Christian BASSENE (Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Sénégal)

Prof. Mamadou DRAME (Université Cheikh Anta Diop, Sénégal)

Prof. Kuessi Marius SOHOUE (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Constant KPAO SARE M. (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Joseph N. SAHGUI (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Désiré MEDEGNON (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Prof. Mapkehrou Rogatien TOSSOU (Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Bénin)

Adresse

Unité de recherche en Sociolinguistique, Dynamique des Langues et Recherche en Yoruba

Laboratoire des Sciences du Langage et de la Communication (LaSciLCom)

Université d'Abomey-Calavi.

laboratoiresociolinguistique@yahoo.fr

Site : <https://revues-uac.org>

Consignes aux auteurs

Modalités de soumission

Les articles doivent être envoyés au directeur de publication à l'adresse suivante : **laboratoiresociolinguistique@yahoo.fr** ou **directement à partir du site de la revue** (<https://revues-uac.org/>).

Chaque proposition est évaluée par deux instructeurs anonymes dans un délai d'un mois (les propositions sont anonymées pour la relecture). Un article proposé pourra être refusé, accepté sous réserve de modifications, accepté tel quel. Les articles peuvent être rédigés **en français, en anglais, en allemand, en espagnol et en yoruba**.

Ils doivent comporter un résumé de 20 lignes maximum en français et en anglais, ainsi que 5 mots-clés en français et en anglais. Le nombre de pages ou de caractères d'un article n'est pas limité. En revanche, un minimum de 8 pages est requis.

Présentation des contributions

Mise en forme

Format A4 ; Marges = 2,5 cm (haut, bas, droite, gauche) ; Reliure = 0 cm ; Style normal (pour le corps de texte) : Police Centaur 15 points, sans couleurs, sans attributs (gras et italiques sont acceptés pour des mises en relief) ; paragraphe justifié, pas de retrait, pas d'espacement, interligne simple.

Titre de l'article : Police Centaur 16 points, sans couleurs, majuscules, gras ; paragraphe centré, pas de retrait, espacement après = 18 points, pas de retrait de première ligne, interligne simple.

Titre 1 : Police Centaur 14 points, sans couleurs, gras ; paragraphe gauche, espacement avant = 18 points, espacement après = 12 points, pas de retrait, pas de retrait de première ligne, interligne simple.

Titre 2 : Police Centaur 13 points, sans couleurs, italique ; paragraphe gauche, espacement avant = 12 points, espacement après = 6 points, pas de retrait, pas de retrait de première ligne, interligne simple.

Titre 3 : Police Centaur 13 points, sans couleurs, italique ; paragraphe gauche, espacement avant = 12 points, espacement après = 3 points, pas de retrait, interligne simple.

NB : notes de bas de page, numérotation continue, 1...2...3... ; Police Centaur 10 points, sans couleurs, sans attributs (gras et italiques sont acceptés pour des mises en relief) ; paragraphe justifié, pas de retrait, pas d'espacement, pas de retrait de première ligne, interligne simple.

Références bibliographiques : Police Centaur 14 points; paragraphe justifié, pas d'espacement, interligne simple. Retrait d'une tabulation à partir du début de la deuxième ligne de chaque référence.

Exemples :

Blakemore, D. 1992. *Understanding Utterances*. Oxford : Blackwell Publishers.

Braconnier, C. 1993. Quelques aspects du passif mandingue dans saversion d'Odiène. *Linguistique Africaine* 10 : 29-64.

Casali, R. 2008. ATR harmony in African languages. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 2/3 : 496–549.

De Korne, H. 2007. The pedagogical potential of multimedia dictionaries. Lessons from a community dictionary project. The 14th annual stabilizing indigenous language symposium in Michigan on 1-3 June 2007. Consulté le 1er février 2012 sur <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~jar/ILR/ILR-11.pdf>.

Présentation

ReSciLaC (Revue des Sciences du Langage et de la Communication) est une revue de l'Unité de recherche en Sociolinguistique, Dynamique des Langues et Recherche en Yoruba (UR-SODYLARY) du Laboratoire des Sciences du Langage et de la Communication (LaSciLCom) de l'Université d'Abomey-Calavi (UAC). ReSciLaC est une revue pluridisciplinaire en Lettres, Langues, Arts, Communication. Elle accueille des contributions abordant un grand nombre de champs d'études des sciences humaines et sociales.

ReSciLaC permet de faire la diffusion de travaux de jeunes chercheurs ou de chercheurs confirmés en sociolinguistique, en linguistique, en didactique des langues, en communication, en littérature, en philosophie du langage, en sciences de l'éducation, en sociologie, en histoire des sciences et techniques, en histoire de l'art, en histoire contemporaine, etc.

L'objectif de ReSciLaC est d'encourager des discussions scientifiques et théoriques les plus larges possibles portant aussi bien sur les sciences humaines, les sciences sociales.

Ethique et authenticité

Pour lutter contre le plagiat, nous utilisons l'application en ligne **Grammarly – plagiarism-checker** pour vérifier les contenus des articles publiés. Un code QR pour la revue. Ce code QR personnalisé contribue au renforcement de la sécurisation et de l'authentification des articles.

SOMMAIRE

SCIENCES DU LANGAGE & LETTRES

1. CONTACT DE LANGUES ET EMPRUNTS LINGUISTIQUES DANS LES PRATIQUES DU FRANÇAIS PAR DES ÉTUDIANTS DE L'UNIVERSITÉ CHEIKH ANTA DIOP DE DAKAR, **Ngari DIOUF**.....2 - 18
2. LES « CORPS DES LAMENTATIONS » DANS SYNGUE SABOUR, PIERRE DE PATIENCE D'ATIQ RAHIMI, **Arouna COULIBALY**19-30
3. ANALYSIS OF PERSUASIVE LINGUISTIC ELEMENTS ON PRODUCT DESCRIPTIONS: A STUDY OF SELECTED PRODUCTS ON JUMIA'S E-COMMERCE PLATFORM, **Emmanuel Selorm GLIGBE & Charlotte SEMONNO**.....31-43
4. STÉRÉOTYPE D'ÊTRE AFRICAIN EN FRANCE : UNE LECTURE DE LE GONE DU CHAÂBA D'AZOUZ BEGAG, **Akudo Ogechi UGWUMBA**44-50
5. SYNTHÈSE DE QUELQUES EXPERIENCES POUR REUSSIR LA CORRECTION DES PRODUCTIONS ECRITES EN CLASSE DU FRANÇAIS LANGUE ETRANGERE, **Orindu Sunny OPARA & Anthonia Nkeiruka NWAOKWEANWA**51-59
6. L'EXUBERANCE COMPORTEMENTALE DE L'ANCIEN COMBATTANT, SIRIMAN KEÏTA DANS LE LIEUTENANT DE KOUTA DE MASSA, **Makan DIABATE & Alidieta DRABO**.....60-72

LANGUES

7. ROLE OF ERROR CORRECTION IN PROMOTING LANGUAGE SKILLS IN EFL CONTEXT: A CRITICAL REVIEW, **Koaténin KOUAME**.....74-87
8. NO FUTURE FOR THE INNOCENT: GENDER, WAR, AND THE DESTRUCTION OF CHILDHOOD IN PAT BARKER'S *THE SILENCE OF THE GIRLS*, **Nonnougou SILUE**88-99

SCIENCES DE L'INFORMATION ET DE LA COMMUNICATION

9. INTERNET, MOYEN DE CONQUÊTE ET D'EXERCICE DU POUVOIR D'ÉTAT EN AFRIQUE, **Bi Kahou Albert DJE, Katcha Richmond KOUACOU & Jean-Michel Kouakou Kan N'GUESSAN**101-113

Langues

ROLE OF ERROR CORRECTION IN PROMOTING LANGUAGE SKILLS IN EFL CONTEXT: A CRITICAL REVIEW

Koaténin KOUAME

Université Alassane Ouattara (Côte d'Ivoire)

kkoatenin@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores the realm of error correction in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education, offering a comprehensive overview. Beginning with the significance of language skills development, the literature review critically examines the evolution of correction methodologies, identifies gaps in existing research, and raises divergent views on the teachers' role. The study provides a theoretical framework synthesizing linguistic, cognitive, and socio-cultural perspectives, emphasizing the need for a balanced and context-dependent approach to error correction. It concludes with a call for further research to explore optimal correction timing, the psychological impact(s) of correction approaches, and the integration of technology in language education, advocating for continual refinement of error correction practices in the learning of English in EFL context.

Keywords: Accuracy, Error Correction, EFL Education, Fluency, Language Skills Development, Pedagogical Practices

Résumé

Cet article explore le domaine de la correction des erreurs dans l'enseignement de l'anglais langue étrangère (EFL), offrant une vue d'ensemble complète. Commencant par l'importance du développement des compétences linguistiques, la revue de littérature examine de manière critique l'évolution des méthodologies de correction, identifie les lacunes dans la recherche existante et relève les points de vue divergents sur le rôle de des enseignants. L'étude apporte une contribution théorique en synthétisant les perspectives linguistiques, cognitives et socio-culturelles, soulignant la nécessité d'une approche équilibrée et dépendante du contexte pour la correction des erreurs. Il se conclut par un appel à des recherches futures pour explorer le moment optimal de correction, l'impact psychologique des approches de correction et l'intégration de la technologie dans l'enseignement des langues, préconisant une amélioration continue des pratiques de correction des erreurs dans l'apprentissage de l'Anglais langue étrangère.

Mots-clés: Précision, correction des erreurs, enseignement de l'anglais langue étrangère, fluidité, développement des habiletés linguistiques, pratiques pédagogiques.

Introduction

In the dynamic landscape of English language education, the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context plays a pivotal role in shaping linguistic competencies among learners. As an ever-expanding global lingua franca, English proficiency is not merely a desirable skill but a crucial asset, opening doors to academic, professional, and cross-cultural opportunities. Within the context of EFL education, the cultivation of language skills stands at the forefront of pedagogical endeavors, serving as a cornerstone for effective communication and academic success. This article is a critical exploration of a fundamental facet of EFL instruction, error correction, and its profound implications on language skills development. The essence of language acquisition lies not only in the impartation of knowledge but also in the refinement of linguistic abilities, including speaking, writing, listening, and reading skills. Also, this paper explores the importance of language skills in

English learning. It focuses on understanding the correction of mistakes and how it contributes to a better learning of this language.

The objective of this study is twofold. First and foremost, we aim to emphasize the important role of error correction in the language learning process. In doing so, we will survey existing literature, exploring historical perspectives, empirical studies, and theoretical frameworks that have shaped the discourse on error correction in EFL contexts. By examining diverse viewpoints and empirical findings, we seek to provide a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of error correction and its implications for language skills development. Secondly, this article aspires to contribute to the theoretical underpinnings of error correction in EFL education. Building upon existing scholarship, we propose a theoretical framework that not only summarizes traditional linguistic perspectives but also integrates insights from cognitive and socio-cultural theories. Our aim is to offer a nuanced perspective that goes beyond the dichotomy of correction for accuracy versus fluency, presenting a holistic theoretical contribution that resonates with the complexities of language acquisition in diverse EFL settings.

1. Definition of error correction in language learning and Theoretical Underpinnings of Error Correction

1.1 Definition of error correction in language learning

Error correction in language learning refers to the process of identifying and rectifying mistakes made by learners in their language production. Scholars such as R. Ellis (1994) and P. M. Lightbown and N. Spada (2006) have extensively discussed this issue. The first author emphasizes the importance of error correction in facilitating language acquisition, arguing that providing learners with corrective feedback helps them notice and internalize correct linguistic forms. The second advocate for a more nuanced approach, suggesting that error correction should be selective and tailored to learners' needs and proficiency levels. In the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) setting, error correction typically involves various techniques such as explicit correction, recasting, and providing metalinguistic explanations (R. Lyster & L. Ranta, 1997). These strategies aim to create a balance between promoting accuracy and maintaining learners' motivation and confidence in using the language.

1.2 Theoretical Underpinnings of Error Correction

Linguistic theories play a foundational role in shaping our understanding of error correction. Noam Chomsky's Universal Grammar framework provides insights into the inherent structures of language acquisition. In the context of error correction, Chomsky's assertion stipulates that errors may reveal the underlying mental processes of language learning (N. A. Chomsky, 1959). He suggests that errors are not merely deviations but potential indicators of deeper cognitive mechanisms. Additionally, Stephen Krashen's Input Hypothesis posits that language learners benefit most from correction that falls within their "zone of proximal development" (S. D. Krashen, 1985). This idea implies that effective error correction should align with learners' current language development stage, promoting growth without overwhelming them with corrections beyond their grasp.

From a cognitive perspective, Lev S. Vygotsky's sociocultural theory emphasizes the role of social interactions in cognitive development. In the realm of error correction, the following Vygotsky's insight clearly mentions that "learning is an inherently social process, and cognitive development is facilitated by interaction with more knowledgeable others" (L. S. Vygotsky, 1978) suggests that collaborative correction methods may enhance language development. Sociocultural theories also underline the importance of feedback in scaffolding learners' linguistic abilities. According to Lantolf, "socio-cognitive interaction, involving both learner-learner and learner-teacher exchanges, is essential for language development and error correction" (J. P. Lantolf, 2000). This perspective emphasizes the socio-cultural dimensions of language learning and the integral role of interaction in the correction process.

2. Historical perspectives on error correction in language teaching

The evolution of error correction methodologies in language teaching has been a subject of extensive scholarly scrutiny, reflecting the shifting paradigms in language education over time. A comprehensive examination of the historical trajectory reveals a nuanced interplay of theories, pedagogical approaches, and educational philosophies that have shaped how errors are addressed in the language learning process. One early approach to error correction is included in the behaviorist tradition, where errors were viewed as undesirable habits to be systematically eradicated. Behaviorist theories, such as those championed by B. F. Skinner, emphasized repetitive drills and positive reinforcement, often neglecting the underlying cognitive processes involved in language acquisition. As Skinner asserted, errors are not only to be regretted but must be vigorously eliminated (B. F. Skinner, 1957). However, the limitations of a purely behaviorist approach became increasingly apparent as scholars recognized the cognitive dimensions inherent in language learning. Chomsky's work on Universal Grammar challenged the notion of errors as mere behavioral deviations, asserting that errors, far from being random, may provide valuable insights into the innate structures of language acquisition (N. A. Chomsky, 1959). This paradigm shift paved the way for a more nuanced understanding of errors as integral to the language learning process.

In the communicative era, the focus shifted from error elimination to error negotiation within meaningful contexts. The communicative approach, as advocated by Sandra Savignon, emphasized the importance of communication over accuracy. This approach acknowledged the inevitability of errors, with Savignon noting that errors are natural byproducts of communicative attempts and should be seen as stepping stones rather than stumbling blocks (S. J. Savignon, 1983). Contrasting with the communicative stance, the cognitive-interactionist perspective proposed by Michael Long recognized the role of explicit correction in facilitating language development. For Long, selective and judicious error correction, particularly when coupled with negotiation of meaning, can promote accuracy without impeding communication (M. H. Long, 1983). This viewpoint marked a departure from the communicative approach's reluctance to intervene in learners' errors.

The current era witnesses a pluralistic landscape where eclectic approaches to error correction coexist. John Truscott, a vocal critic of the efficacy of error correction, argues

that “correction does not guarantee learning, but may rather hinder it by diverting attention from meaning to form” (J. Truscott, 1996). This skepticism has fueled ongoing debates about the optimal balance between providing corrective feedback and fostering a supportive learning environment. In a nutshell, the evolution of error correction methodologies mirrors the broader shifts in language education paradigms. From behaviorism's emphasis on eradication to the communicative approach's acceptance of errors as natural, and the cognitive-interactionist perspective's nuanced integration of explicit correction, one can qualify error correction as dynamic and multifaceted. This assertion serves to emphasize the progression of error correction in language teaching approaches. It illustrates movement from behaviourism's discounting of error, via a more process-oriented focus from the communicative approach, which ‘allowed’ error as part of learning, to more strategically-sensitive cognitive-interactionist perspectives of correction, and shows that the correction of error is not some fixed parameter, but shifting and malleable according to teaching methods and theoretical constraints. As language educators investigate this complex issue, the challenge lies in adopting an approach that recognizes the intricate relationship between errors, learning, and effective communication.

3. The role of error correction in language skills development: pros and cons

3.1 The role of error correction in language skills development: the case of speaking skill

Error correction in the development of language skills, particularly in the context of speaking, has been a subject of extensive research. This literature review deals with the impact of error correction on oral proficiency and explores strategies for effective correction in speaking activities. Studies have consistently highlighted the positive impact of error correction on enhancing oral proficiency. R. Ellis (2008) asserts that providing corrective feedback in speaking activities can contribute significantly to the improvement of learners' pronunciation, grammar, and overall oral communication skills. This suggests that error correction plays a crucial role in refining the spoken language, helping learners to articulate their thoughts more accurately. Furthermore, Micheal Long's Interaction Hypothesis emphasizes the importance of negotiation and feedback in language acquisition. He contends that corrective feedback, when provided within the context of meaningful interactions, can lead to observable gains in oral proficiency (M. H. Long, 1996). This highlights the dynamic nature of error correction within conversational settings, where meaningful engagement fosters language development. Contrastingly, John Truscott challenges this view, advocating a more cautious stance on the impact(s) of error correction. For him, the empirical evidence supporting the direct positive impact(s) of corrective feedback on speaking proficiency is inconclusive and warrants critical examination (J. Truscott, 2007). His perspective prompts a nuanced consideration of the effectiveness of error correction in oral proficiency development.

The effectiveness of error correction in speaking activities hinges on the strategies employed for the purposes of improving learners' spoken accuracy with regard to grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary; strengthening overall communicative competence through assisting learners in identifying and self-correcting errors during authentic conversational exchanges; and also for supporting sustained learner confidence and motivation. D. R.

Ferris (2002) emphasizes the importance of recast, metalinguistic, and explicit correction techniques. These strategies vary in their directness and the extent to which they draw attention to errors. Ferris suggests that a combination of these techniques, tailored to individual learner needs, can be most effective in terms of promoting long-term language development and improving learners' ability to self-monitor and correct their own errors. Moreover, R. Lyster (2004) advocates for the use of “recasts” in corrective feedback, arguing that implicit correction through recasting, when done appropriately, can lead to increased accuracy in learners' speaking without disrupting the natural flow of communication. This emphasizes the potential subtlety of correction strategies that maintain the fluidity of conversation while addressing errors. However, M. Swain (1985) brings attention to the importance of learner involvement in the correction process of their spoken language output. More specifically, she argues that if learners are actively involved in noticing, reflecting and correcting their oral errors in interaction, they are more likely to internalize correct forms and enhance their spoken accuracy and fluency. This is consistent with her output hypothesis: that producing language and getting feedback is crucial for second language learning. She states that encouraging self-correction and peer-correction during speaking activities empowers learners to take an active role in their language development. This highlights the transformative potential of involving learners in the error correction process, fostering autonomy and metacognitive skills.

3.2 The role of error correction in language skills development: the case of writing skills

Error correction in language education, specifically in writing, has generated varied perspectives on its influence on writing proficiency and the efficacy of different correction approaches. This literature review critically examines the influence of error correction on writing proficiency. Research, such as that by Dana Ferris, highlights the positive influence of error correction on writing proficiency. She argues that effective error correction contributes significantly to the improvement of syntactic structures, vocabulary use, and overall written expression (D. R. Ferris, 2010). This perspective emphasizes the potential for error correction to positively impact various dimensions of writing skills.

Contrastingly, John Truscott challenges the traditional emphasis on meticulous correction. For him, the empirical evidence supporting the direct positive impact of corrective feedback on writing proficiency is inconclusive and warrants critical examination (J. Truscott, 1999). His position introduces skepticism about the direct and universal benefits of error correction in writing. Also, some scholars, like Dana Ferris, advocate for a balanced and holistic approach to written error correction. For D. R. Ferris (2003), a combination of explicit correction, peer feedback, and self-correction aligns with diverse learning preferences and contributes to comprehensive writing skill development. This supports a multifaceted strategy that addresses a range of linguistic issues. However, John Truscott challenges the notion of meticulous correction, emphasizing the importance of global issues. He thinks that giving priority to global issues over detailed correction may enhance the overall quality of writing (J. Truscott, 1996). This position warns against an excessive focus on meticulous details, suggesting that prioritizing broader aspects may be more beneficial. Moreover, N. Shintani (2013) suggests focusing error correction on specific linguistic elements such as verb tense, article use, subject-verb agreement,

prepositions, plural forms and noun ending. He argues that targeted correction on specific elements may result in more effective language acquisition in writing. While advocating for specificity, this position may overlook the interconnected nature of language skills. In a nutshell, the literature historiography reflects a dynamic discourse on the influence of error correction on writing proficiency, encompassing both positive and critical perspectives. Differentiated approaches highlight a spectrum of opinions, advocating for a balanced, global, or targeted strategy based on the learners' needs.

3.4. The role of error correction in language skills development: the Case of listening and reading skills

Error correction in the context of receptive skills, encompassing listening and reading, has been a subject of nuanced discussion in language education. This literature review critically examines both the implications of error correction on receptive skills and the challenges associated with maintaining a balance between correction and comprehension. Research suggests that error correction in receptive skills can positively impact language development. J. Anderson (2016) emphasizes that well-timed correction in listening and reading activities can enhance learners' awareness of language structures and contribute to improved comprehension over time. This suggests a positive correlation between correction and language awareness in the receptive domain.

Contrastingly, M. Swain (2000) raises concerns about the potential negative impact(s) of correction on receptive skills. She contends that excessive correction may divert learners' attention from meaning to form, hindering their overall comprehension and engagement with the text. This perspective highlights the delicate balance required to avoid impeding the natural flow of receptive skill development. To address the challenge of balancing correction without hindering comprehension, some scholars advocate for strategic approaches. For C. Wallace (2012), providing feedback after initial comprehension, rather than interrupting the process, allows learners to engage with the content before focusing on specific language elements. This strategy aims to strike a balance by prioritizing initial understanding. However, J. Truscott (2017) expresses caution about interrupting the flow of receptive activities for correction. He argues that frequent interruption for correction may disrupt the natural progression of reading or listening, potentially diminishing learners' engagement with the material. This perspective underlines the potential drawbacks of correction practices that interrupt the organic process of skill development, which refers to the natural, uninterrupted flow of understanding and meaning making as learners engage with a text or spoken input. The synthesis of these perspectives suggests a need for a judicious and context-dependent approach to error correction in receptive skills. While correction can contribute to language awareness, excessive intervention may impede comprehension. A balanced strategy, such as delayed correction or focused feedback, may offer a middle ground, fostering language development without undermining learners' engagement with the material. In other words, successful error correction in receptive skills need not compromise comprehension or motivation. Delayed correction, where feedback is given after the reading or listening task rather than during it, respects the learner's cognitive process by allowing uninterrupted engagement with meaning. Similarly, focused feedback

targets specific recurring issues or patterns rather than attempting to correct every minor error, which helps avoid overwhelming the learner.

4. Challenges and controversies in the practice of error correction

4.1 Potential drawbacks of error correction in language education

Error correction in language education, while widely recognized for its benefits, is not without potential drawbacks. This literature review critically examines two significant concerns associated with error correction: the overemphasis on accuracy versus fluency and the psychological impact on learners. Proponents of accuracy-focused error correction argue that it cultivates precision in language use. D. R. Ferris (2002) contends that correcting errors supports the development of grammatical accuracy, which is crucial for effective communication and language proficiency. This viewpoint suggests that a focus on accuracy can lay a solid foundation for language skills. On the flip side, John Bitchener warns against an overemphasis on accuracy. For him, excessive correction may hinder learners' fluency development, as constant self-monitoring can disrupt the natural flow of communication (J. Bitchener, 2008). This highlights a potential drawback, suggesting that an exclusive focus on accuracy might impede the development of fluency.

In addition, John Truscott raises concerns about the potential negative psychological impact of correction. He points out the fact that frequent correction, especially in a public setting, can lead to anxiety and embarrassment, potentially hindering learners' willingness to participate (J. Truscott, 1999). This perspective highlights the delicate balance required to ensure that correction practices do not adversely affect learners' confidence and engagement. Conversely, some researchers stress the positive psychological outcomes of error correction. R. Lyster (2004) notes that appropriate correction, when delivered constructively, can motivate learners to actively engage in the learning process, fostering a positive attitude towards language acquisition. This position emphasizes the possible motivational benefits of error correction. The synthesis of these perspectives calls for a contextualized balanced approach to error correction. While accuracy is vital, an exclusive focus on it may hinder fluency development. Similarly, while correction can be motivational, it should be administered judiciously to avoid causing psychological distress. Creating a balance between accuracy and fluency, and ensuring corrections are constructive rather than punitive, is crucial for creating a positive and effective learning environment.

4.2 Controversial issues in the field of error correction

4.2.1. Divergent views on the role of the teacher in error correction

The role of the teacher in error correction is a complex and stands as a debated aspect of language education. This section critically examines divergent views on the teacher's role, incorporating both pros and cons, and synthesizes these perspectives to provide a comprehensive understanding. To begin with, some scholars advocate for a teacher role that fosters learner autonomy. For B. Norton (2000) empowering learners to take an active role in error correction can enhance their metacognitive skills and self-directed learning abilities. This perspective emphasizes the potential benefits of a teacher acting as a guide, allowing learners to identify and rectify errors independently. Contrarily,

J. Truscott (1999) expresses reservations, arguing that excessive emphasis on learner autonomy in error correction may result in incomplete or inaccurate self-corrections, potentially reinforcing errors. This viewpoint underlines the potential drawbacks of relying solely on learner autonomy, suggesting a need for guidance and verification.

Another perspective asserts that teachers should be authoritative correctors to ensure accuracy. For example, R. Ellis (2009) contends that teachers, with their linguistic expertise, play a crucial role in providing accurate and timely correction to guide learners towards linguistic precision. This viewpoint shows the importance of teacher intervention for accurate language acquisition. Conversely, scholars like Dana Ferris caution against overreliance on teacher-centric correction. She argues that an overly authoritative correction approach may create dependency, hindering learners' development of self-correction skills (D. R. Ferris, 2003). This viewpoint raises concerns about potential negative consequences of a teacher-centric approach, including reduced learner agency. The perspective put forth by Dana Ferris (2003) and others extends beyond the immediate classroom dynamic and speaks to broader concerns about learner autonomy and long-term language development. Over-reliance on teacher-centric correction, which identifies only the teacher as an authority for pointing out and correcting errors, can promote a passive learning attitude, which reduces the likelihood that learners will engage in autonomously monitoring and improving the quality of their language use.

The synthesis of these divergent views suggests a balanced approach that incorporates elements of both teacher guidance and learner autonomy. Combining the teacher's linguistic expertise with opportunities for self-correction can create an environment that fosters language development while avoiding over-reliance on either party. This naturally brings us to the question of the balance between error correction and language use for positive purposes.

4.2.2. Balancing error correction with positive reinforcement

The integration of error correction and positive reinforcement in language education is a delicate task that involves navigating the fine line between guiding learners toward accuracy and fostering a supportive and motivational learning environment. This literature review examines the pros and cons of balancing error correction with positive reinforcement, culminating in a synthesis that advocates for a nuanced and strategic approach. Scholars argue that a balanced approach to error correction contributes to enhanced learning outcomes. For D. R. Ferris (2010), striking a balance between correction and positive reinforcement ensures that learners receive constructive feedback while maintaining motivation and engagement. This perspective highlights the potential synergy between error correction and positive reinforcement in creating a conducive learning environment. Also, positive reinforcement is recognized for its psychological benefits. J. Hattie (2012) notes that positive feedback contributes to a positive learning atmosphere, promoting self-efficacy and a growth mindset among learners. This growth of mindset emerges when students come to see mistakes not as signs of failure, but as important learning opportunities. As per C. Dweck's (2006) theory, echoed in Hattie's work, learners are helped to believe that their abilities can be developed through dedication and hard work and that feedback on attainment should be given in relation to current

understanding. When teachers emphasize progress, acknowledge effort and reframe mistakes as part of the learning process, students develop resilience, become creative risk-takers, and are more motivated to become an active participant in their learning. Over time, it cultivates a mindset where learners view challenges and feedback as opportunities for growth rather than as barriers, ultimately strengthening their motivation and long-term performance. This supports the idea that a positive learning environment can foster a mindset that embraces challenges and views errors as opportunities for growth.

Critics warn against the potential dilution of corrective feedback when combined with positive reinforcement. According to J. Truscott (1999), the simultaneous delivery of positive reinforcement may soften the impact of corrective feedback, reducing its effectiveness. This viewpoint raises concerns about the clarity and impact(s) of corrective feedback when paired with positive reinforcement. Another challenge is the need for individualized approaches. Moreover, for R. Lyster (2004), balancing error correction and positive reinforcement requires a nuanced understanding of individual learner preferences and needs, which can be a demanding task in diverse learning environments. This highlights the complexity of tailoring feedback to the unique characteristics of each learner. From these reflections, it is possible to think about a strategic and context-dependent approach that capitalizes on the benefits of both error correction and positive reinforcement. In other words, combining corrective feedback with positive reinforcement, when applied judiciously and considering individual learner profiles, can create a dynamic and motivating language learning environment that fosters growth and proficiency.

5. Practical implications and recommendations

5.1 Application of theoretical insights in the EFL classroom.

In the pursuit of effective English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction, it is essential to apply theoretical insights that promote a comprehensive language learning experience. In fact, to enrich the learning process, educators can integrate theoretical insights from communicative language teaching approaches, such as the interaction hypothesis. Proposed by M. Long (1983), it is a theory of second-language acquisition, which states that the development of language proficiency is promoted by face-to-face interaction and communication. It implies that second language learning is greatly facilitated by social interaction, particularly when communication breaks down and learners are forced to focus on negotiating meanings. By incorporating these insights, classroom activities can be designed to encourage meaningful interactions among students. These interactions provide valuable opportunities for language use, allowing for subsequent error correction within authentic contexts. Also, an important aspect of effective language learning involves the integration of task-based learning activities. Such activities not only promote fluency but also emphasize accuracy. Educators should design tasks that foster collaboration, enabling students to engage in communication while creating a platform for targeted error correction.

This dual focus on fluency and accuracy contributes to a more holistic language learning experience. Moreover, drawing on socio-cultural perspectives, educators can actively contribute to creating a positive and supportive classroom atmosphere. By

emphasizing the importance of a growth mindset, where errors are viewed as integral to the learning process, resilience and motivation among learners are fostered. This approach not only encourages students to embrace and learn from their mistakes but also enhances their overall language learning experience.

5.2 Strategies for effective and balanced error correction

In the realm of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) instruction, fostering language proficiency goes beyond traditional teaching methods. Three strategies are here suggested for effective and balanced error correction. They are: differentiated correction techniques, timely and contextual feedback and the promotion of learner self-correction. Firstly, to address the diverse needs of individual learners, it is imperative to tailor error correction techniques. To address the diverse needs of individual learners, error treatment should be customized to learners' proficiency levels, cognitive styles, and affective factors. As R. Ellis (2009) remarks, learner factors, such as anxiety, motivation and language awareness must influence the type and amount of corrective feedback utilized. Understanding these differences is essential in providing feedback that is effective and developmentally appropriate.

A number of existing methods supports differentiated Correction. Positive evidence, in the form of negative feedback where the teacher correctly specifies the error and its correction, is particularly helpful to beginners with their need for clarity and organization (R. Lyster & L. Ranta, 1997). Higher-level learners, however, may profit from metalinguistic feedback, i.e., feedback that offers language-related information without providing the actual correct form and thus prompting the learners to think and process more deeply (A. Ammar & N. Spada, 2006). Recasts, the teacher's modification of an error as a correction incorporated into a proper sentence, are useful for keeping the conversation flowing and yet providing corrective input, particularly in fluency-oriented activities (M.H. Long, 1996). Furthermore, teachers need to watch and be reactive to the changing needs of the learners (Bingöl, 2005). As Bitchener and Ferris (2012) posit, feedback with a contextual element relevant to individual learners' progress is more likely to lead to uptake and long-term learning. Some students may respond positively to peer correction in a collaborative environment and other may need private/individualized feedback, particularly when the affective filter is high.

Adopting a nuanced approach involves combining direct correction with metalinguistic feedback. Metalinguistic feedback enhances learners' ability not only to have access to the correct form, but also to infer for themselves the underlying general properties, and this will lead to a more competent learning. This device encourages both immediate or procedural accuracy and future language processing, that allows procedures to be internalised and applied independently in communicative practice (R. Ellis, 2009; R. Lyster & L. Ranta, 1997). This comprehensive strategy not only targets accuracy but also places emphasis on fluency. By customizing correction methods, educators create a learning environment that caters to the unique linguistic challenges each student faces. Secondly, error correction is most effective when provided in a timely manner and within the context of communication. It is essential to ensure that feedback aligns with the purpose of the activity. Constructively framing corrections shifts the focus from mere

mistake identification to a constructive pathway for improvement. This approach not only enhances understanding but also cultivates a positive attitude towards learning from errors. Thirdly, empowering learners to actively participate in their own error correction process is a key aspect of language development. In other words, encouraging the adoption of strategies such as peer correction and reflection activities enhances metacognitive skills in that learners are made to reflect about the way they think and to focus on their language production more consciously. As Vandergrift and Goh (2012) explain, when learners engage in peer correction, they must analyze language critically, identify errors, and articulate why a form is correct or incorrect, processes that strengthen self-monitoring and error detection abilities.

Through these practices, learners become more self-aware, taking ownership of their language learning process as they intuitively monitor, evaluate and manage their own output. When students engage in peer correction and reflection they are not treated as passive recipients of feedback but are tasked with making decision, justifying corrections, and using language rules in a conscious manner (R. L. Oxford, 2011). Peer correction, in particular, fosters a collaborative learning environment, where students play an active role in supporting each other's language development. In the ever-evolving sphere of language education, the refinement of error correction strategies is integral to enhancing the efficacy of pedagogical practices. This section provides suggestions for future research and pedagogical approaches that look into optimal correction timing, the impact of error correction on motivation, the effectiveness of correction approaches, and the role of technology.

5.3. Suggestions for future research and pedagogical practices in error correction

Four paths for future research can be suggested. First, a research could prioritize the exploration of optimal correction timing in different language learning contexts. Examining whether immediate correction or delayed correction proves more beneficial for long-term language development will offer valuable insights. Such findings can help educators tailor feedback timing to different tasks and learner profiles, ultimately enhancing instructional effectiveness and learning outcomes. Second, another study could investigate the psychological aspects of error correction. Examining how various correction strategies influence learners' motivation and confidence could guide pedagogical practices. Third, conducting comparative studies to assess the effectiveness of various error correction approaches is essential for shaping to fulfill specific objectives. Research(es) should focus on teacher-centered, learner-centered, and hybrid models, identifying which strategies are most successful in fostering both accuracy and fluency. This comparative analysis contributes to the development of nuanced and effective pedagogical approaches. Fourth, future research (es) could actively explore the integration of technology in error correction processes. Investigating the effectiveness of computer-assisted correction tools, automated feedback, and online collaborative platforms in facilitating error correction and Language development is crucial because it enables learners to communicate effectively, express ideas clearly, and participate fully in academic, social, and professional settings. Understanding how technology can enhance the correction process may equip educators with innovative tools to meet the evolving needs of modern language learners.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this article investigates the sphere of error correction in the English as Foreign Language (EFL) context, exploring key points, emphasizing a theoretical contribution, and advocating for further exploration and refinement of error correction practices. The study begins by providing a brief overview of the EFL context, highlighting the significance of language skills development. The purpose of the article is to emphasize the crucial role of error correction in language learning and introduce a theoretical contribution to the existing discourse. Through a critical literature review, we analyse the evolution of error correction methodologies, identified gaps in the literature, and look into existing research on error correction in the EFL context. The examination of divergent views on the teacher's role(s) and the implications of error correction on receptive skills illuminates the multifaceted nature of this pedagogical concern.

Our theoretical contribution focuses on synthesizing insights from linguistic theories, cognitive perspectives, and socio-cultural considerations. By investigating the role of error correction in language skills development, the aim is to provide a conceptual framework that extends beyond the dichotomy of accuracy versus fluency, highlighting the need for a balanced and context-dependent approach. While our theoretical contribution lays a foundation for a nuanced understanding of error correction, there remains an imperative for further exploration and refinement. The EFL sphere is dynamic, influenced by evolving educational paradigms, technological advancements, and diverse learner profiles. We call for future research endeavors to investigate optimal correction timing, the impact of correction approaches on motivation, and the integration of technology in error correction processes. Additionally, the effectiveness of various correction strategies warrants continued investigation, aiming for a comprehensive understanding that informs pedagogical practices. In a nutshell, error correction in the EFL context is not a static endeavor but an evolving process that demands continual refinement. Through the synthesis of theoretical insights and the acknowledgement of the complexities inherent in error correction practices, we hope to inspire educators and researchers to contribute to the ongoing dialogue, ultimately enhancing language learning experiences for EFL learners worldwide.

References

- Ammar, A. & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28(4) : 543–574.
- Anderson, J. 2016. Error Correction in the Language Classroom: What Do Students Want? *ELT Journal*, 70(1) : 13–24.
- Bitchener, J. 2008. Evidence in Support of Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2) : 102-118.
- Chomsky, N. 1959. A Review of B.F. Skinner's *Verbal Behavior*. In A. A. Lumsdaine (Ed.), *Verbal Behavior and Learning: Problems and Processes* (pp. 11-74). California: Stanford University Press.
- Dweck, Carol S. (2006). *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York: Random House.

- Ellis, R. 2008. A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2) : 97–107.
- Ellis, R. 2009. Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1) : 3-18.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ferris, D. R. 2002. *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. 2003. *Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second-Language Students*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. R. 2010. Second Language Writing Research and Written Corrective Feedback in SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2) : 181–201.
- Hattie, J. 2012. *Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Krashen, S. D. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Lantolf, J. P. 2000. Introducing Sociocultural Theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Li, Q. 2020. Artificial Intelligence in Education: Promises and Implications for Second Language Learning. *ReCALL*, 32(3) : 241-258.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. 2006. *How Languages Are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Long, M. H. 1983. Native Speaker/Non-Native Speaker Conversation in the Second Language Classroom. *Applied Linguistics*, 4(2) : 126-141.
- Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. Ritchie & T. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. 1997. Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1) : 37–66.
- Lyster, R. 2004. Differential Effects of Prompts and Recasts in Form-Focused Instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26(3) : 399–432.
- Norton, B. 2000. *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity, and Educational Change*. Harlow: Longman.
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Language Learning Strategies*. Pearson Education.
- Savignon, S. J. 1983. *Communicative Competence: Theory and Classroom Practice*. California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Shintani, N. 2013. The Relative Effects of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on L2 Writing Accuracy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 47(1) : 84-108.
- Skinner, B. F. 1957. *Verbal Behavior*. Acton: Copley Publishing Group.

- Swain, M. 1985. Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in its Development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Swain, M. 2000. The Output Hypothesis and Beyond: Mediating Acquisition through Collaborative Dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Truscott, J. 1996. The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2) : 327-369.
- Truscott, J. 1999. The Case for “The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes”: A Response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2) : 111-122.
- Truscott, J. 2007. The Effect of Error Correction on Learners' Ability to Write Accurately. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(4) : 255-272.
- Truscott, J. 2017. The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2) : 111-122.
- Vygotsky, L. S. 1978. *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Wallace, Catherine (2012). *Critical Reading in Language Education*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.