

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

## Peer Correction: The Relationship between Teachers' Practices and Learners' Attitude in ESL/EFL Writing Skills

Amensisa Wakuma Rundassa

Lecturer, Department of English and Literature, Arsi University, Ethiopia

### Abstract:

*This study focuses on how error correction is practised at Arsi University. Accordingly, ten (n = 10) English teachers and one hundred twenty-eight (n = 128) learners have been participated. In this regard, thus, the prime objective of this study is to investigate if there is a significant relationship between teachers' peer correction implementation and students' attitude during instructions. It seeks common ground for the dilemma of error correction practice; therefore, in this study, English teachers and learners across the university and departments were selected by using purposive sampling method. As long as its importance is concerned, the study employed the following three tools: unstructured interview, closed-ended questionnaire, and focus group discussion. To reach a conclusion, the SPSS software has been used and the results shows that there is a strong relationship ( $r=+0.9$ ) between teachers' practice and students' attitude towards peer errors correction. In addition, the statistical data shows that the p value is significant ( $p < .05$ ). As of its parts, the descriptive statistics shows that all the interviewee were male and their age ranges from 37 to 53 years ( $M= 46$ ). Moreover, their teaching experience ranges from 15 to 30 years in which ( $M= 22$ ). In the interview data, again, among (n=10) teachers, (n=6) of them seldom practice errors correction and unlike those teachers, however, (n=4) of them never practice errors correction. At last, the study further explains the way to wipe out dilemmas for teachers' practice and students' attitude on the technique.*

**Keywords:** Peer, mistake, error, attitude

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background

Error correction in writing classes has been far from the boundaries of teachers' and students' comfort circles at least for the following three preliminary factors: language conventions, practice based on principles, and learners' attitude. At a point, they all have come to concern so that writing instructions can be judged based on laid expectations. In English, where at least spelling is conventionalised, too much error runs readers out of patience and can't be tolerated at tertiary level. Thus, in English as Second Language or as Foreign Language (henceforth ESL/EFL) writing skills rely on a number of general rules that govern the language.

Errors correction seems teachers' compelling and avowing agenda in writing instructions. In practice, the concept peer correction is also given various names to fit contexts. These are peer editing, peer feedback and peer review. "Peer correction," as its name implies, is a mechanism whereby students work in pairs using teacher's lesson on writing skills. Thus, Student A edits or looks up for any errors of Student B's text and vice versa. Then the teacher collects and checks to what extent everyone is trying to assist each other. Larsen-Freeman (2000:68) explained the meaning of peer correction as when students help another student as far as he or she is experiencing difficulty; however, it is central that any help or assist be offered in a cooperative manner, not a competitive one. Thus, the teacher is to monitor the aid so that it is helpful, not interfering. Apart from this, Henikel (2011:61) explains that peer correction allows learners opportunities to correct their fellow learners' errors, and this has been more extensively practiced in the case of writing.

The third important but more fundamental factor is learners' attitude. Learners must know that errors as an inevitable part of language acquisition or learning. Then, they actively test their learning hypotheses. By their own vehement desire, indeed, they can figure out that errors shouldn't be pervasive in their linguistic productions (Larsen-Freeman, 2000, p.51, Brown, 2000, p.79).

In this advance, for example, F. Freed (1991) said, "There is still more to learn about the role of error correction in language learning" (p.25). Given this background, thus, this paper addresses teachers' implementations and learners' beliefs with the heart of peer correction. Errors should be avoided through controlled opportunities for production. In a similar way, there are four strong reasons for peer correction: the first one is to the classroom practitioner. He/she gets a lot of important information about the ability of his/her learners. The second, learners listen and think about the language. The third, learners used to the idea of learning from each other and the third, they correct their peer's language without hurting each other's feeling (Richards, 2006, p.4, & Edge, 1997, p.26).

Ellis (2003:15) addresses the apparently conflicting ideas of errors made by suggesting three plausible reasons. Firstly, they are evident and obvious feature of learner language. Rather the big question is 'Why do learners make errors?' Secondly, errors are important indicators for teachers. They know errors genre that help them for their future lesson. Thirdly, learners try to correct their own learners if they able to identify their own errors.

To recap all, error correction in L2 (i.e. English as a Foreign or Second Language (ESL/EFL)) writing is bound with various factors; however, peer correction, is an option that helps learners analyse the linguistic aspects like grammar, spelling, punctuation marks, paragraphing features etc. Such a technique paves ways for far reaching effect of grasping language rules and teacher's perseverance practice. Moreover, learners inevitably develop positive attitude to manifest their linguistic competences. As hinted above and explained more later, a number of empirical evidences identified the values of peer correction as they stand with various educational implications.

### 1.2. Research Problem

Apparently, and not coincidentally, there is a notable increase in the evasion of errors correction in writing classes. Of all things, at least, the portion of a writing lesson that should have focused on error detection, analysis and treatment have been dramatically relinquished. If not, how were L2 teachers (i.e. teachers of a Foreign or Second Language (ESL/EFL)) practising? Merely teachers take the responsibility of correcting myriads of learners' errors as if they were left of the slightest importance. This long-standing trend, therefore, has become a restraining barrier to instructions. At a time when students rarely partake for error correction, by far, teachers are overburdened by doing. Indeed, the issue of securing bipartisanship in the classroom inevitably lighten the burden and secure the lesson for long lasting. This plain truth, at the very least, needs the exploration of alternative possibilities. Thus, the researcher is compelled to look for alternative strategies. Finally, among the most popular alternatives, peer correction has become the centre of attention for this study.

As of a thing relinquished and abandoned, in most instances, teachers undermine the roles being played by peer correction. By far and large, thus, teachers carry out everything by themselves. Enthusiastic as the researcher is the trend arises the questions of why, if any, to his mind. For instance, why teachers can't get rid of this very old habit? Why do they always want to take in charge of do in everything themselves? These questions have been of a concern in writing tasks. To offer a glimpse of the particular concern, thus, teachers must acknowledge for the inappropriate roles they play. Taken as a whole, the problem needs serious attention. Thus, teachers must avoid dominating roles being played during error corrections. In a very real sense, then, the move of correcting written errors needs a complete paradigm reversal.

The overriding concern of the research was therefore to distinguish in case there are distortions or barriers in treating errors with the help of peer correction. For this, the researcher must conduct a sort of investigation pertaining to teachers' implementation and learners' attitudes or beliefs. In addition, learners' attitude is a companion that needs investigation. The subtlety of the issues is believed to be a challenge, though findings of the study will reveal the outcomes. On account of this, the principal focus of this research was, thus, to scrutinize and anticipate the problem. In this context, probably teachers, who teach English at Arsi University, have contributed an opinion to the problem. These are lack of time coupled with particular interest of the students. Learners often withdraw from working together due to various reasons. To sum up, this fundamental problem is becoming a particular concern to the researcher since the magnitude of the problem enormously affects writing instructions.

### 1.3. Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study had three folds:

- To study the relationship between teacher's practices and learners' attitude towards the implementation of peer correction in writing skills instruction.
- To arrive at a mutually agreeable solution to the disputes about the nature of error correction in the study of peer correction.
- To identify the theoretical and methodological recommendations for peer correction.

### 1.4. Research Questions

Two research questions guided the analysis:

- What are the current teachers' practices of peer correction in writing instructions?
- How does teachers' classroom practices influence students' attitude?
- Is there any significant relationship between teacher's practice and students' attitude about peer correction?

### 1.5. Hypothesis of the Study

- Ho1: There is no significant relationship between ESL teachers' error correction practices and learners' attitude of error correction.
- Ho2: There is a significant relationship between ESL teachers' error correction practices and learners' attitude.

### 1.6. Significance of the Study

The significance for the study is twofold: first, it fills the research gap in the field, and second, it finds common ground for L2 teachers (i.e. teachers of a Foreign or Second Language (ESL/EFL)) the disputes encountered in the course of errors correction. On top of this, the study is an attempt to show an area of huge potential to be explored for writing skills.

Further, the findings will help teachers and learners get clear image on relationships that exist between students' attitude and teachers' practice in the attempt of peer correction implementations.

### 1.7. Delimitations of the Study

The study is delimited to Arsi University. Thus, it is difficult to replicate the result of the study in another context. Moreover, it only explores the roles of peer correction in ESL/EFL learning, and data were collected only from first year learners who have been taking Basic Writing Skills course with a mean age of 20.

### 1.8. Operational Definitions

As of its parts, the following words are worth defined:

- Attitude: a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner.
- Error: deviations in usage which result from gaps in learners' knowledge of the target language (Ellis, p. 139)
- Mistake: a mistake is made by a learner when writing and which is caused by lack of attention, fatigue, carelessness, or some other aspect of performance or Deviations in usage that reflects learners'
- inability to use what they actually know of the target language (Ellis, p. 141)
- Peer: a person who is the same age or who has the same social status.
- Peer correction: is asking learners in the class to correct each other's errors.

## 2. Review of Literature

As said by Joniker & Pennink (2010), "Research cannot be done without theory" (p.62). Hence, this chapter theorises facts or relevant theoretical frameworks on error correction that focuses specifically on peer correction. For this reason, it tries to present active and current empirical evidences that stress on teachers' routine operations and students' affective factors. Herein, then, this chapter helps us to recall developments on the following five components: errors analysis, existing dilemma, learners' attitude, teacher's classroom practice, and errors as a source of feedback.

### 2.1. Error Analysis

An important concept in the course of errors correction is error analysis. Knowing what to correct is, in the first instance, requires professional expertise. Then it will become easier to identify or stipulate linguistic errors being produced by learners. Teachers, therefore in their practices explore the nature of errors. In due course of time, they understand and consider the essential underpinning for students' cognitive level. As has been well documented in Bussmann (1998:378), error analysis in second language acquisition deals with errors of various linguistic categories like level of proficiency, levels of linguistic description, form type and causes. In spite of their significance, all are going to be harder to reach and harder to articulate in this paper.

### 2.2. The Existing Dilemma

Error correction hasn't been out of theoretical dilemma throughout the history of ELT. Penst on (2005) said, "It is as well to state here that many teachers do not believe in correcting. In truth there is not enough conclusive research evidence to justify prescriptive methods in this regard" (p.108). However, regardless of the controversies, as Freed (1991:112) explained, there are still more to learn about. It is an important one both theoretically and pedagogically. Accordingly, nowadays, more researchers are toiling in reviewing the history of the argument and rethink on the area. To sharpen clarity, is error correction with the help of student's peer or else be precluded or included as a valid classroom technique? Which alternative should we choose?

By virtue of the dichotomy, however, the arguments have some valid inputs in terms of teacher's practices and student's learning. For instance, Bussmann (1998) states, "Errors correction in two ways: the degree of communication breakdown and the tendency towards fossilization" (p.378). Thus, Long & Doughty (2009) explained error correction practices as careful as possible. Therefore, errors are part of a developmental process or are they something destructive and pernicious, so that they need to be corrected immediately. Thus, this many-sided issue had a history in language instruction. As the days went by, even, linguists didn't take their eyes off from such a dichotomous issue. They tried to sharpen clarities on the bases of the rationales that are given in the empirical researches.

The issue of error correction with or without using peer correction hasn't always been happy ending among teachers. For instance, different scholars affirm as rather than studying errors in isolation, it is better to see learners' language development as system. The idea springs out of various pedagogical implementations. Writing frames like taking peer correction focuses on the process of writing. This include scaffolded writing, group writing tasks, drafting and re-drafting with the teacher as adviser and editor, might provide a useful way forward" (Stern, 1991, p.137, Field, 2005, p.27). Altogether, in the view of this practical dilemma, it is better for seeking solutions in the midst of the arguments.

### 2.3. Learners' Attitude

Attitude plays vital role in language acquisition. In second language acquisition, learners benefit from positive attitudes. By contrast, negative attitudes may lead to decreased motivation. In the unfolding social circumstances, because of decreased input and interaction, there will be unsuccessful attainment of proficiency. Yet the teacher needs to aware those positive and negative attitudes for further action. As has been indicated in there is a highly likely second language acquisition that attribute to learners' attitude. Learners' attitude covers a wide range of issues and can influence the

motivation to learn. In addition, it affects their expectations about language learning, their perceptions about what is easy or difficult about a language, as well as the kind of learning strategies they favour (Brown, 2000, p.183, Richards & Lockhart, 2007, p.165).

#### 2.4. *Teacher's Classroom Practices*

Teachers would assent principles that determine the internal structure of lessons. Indeed, Richards & Lockhart (2007:130) suggest for activities that involve receptive skills should precede those that involve productive skills. Thus, teachers should primarily on the way students roughly hold positive attitude towards the given instructions and their attitude. However, with those existing principles, at university level, students are expected to write with a fair level of fluency and proficiency. The desire to enable students to achieve this proficiency level provokes teachers' opinions. Teachers play vital roles Erben, Ban, & Castaneda(2009:18) point out the roles that are played by ESL teachers. They encourage students on how students can notice their errors, use English and the function of English., which plays a very important role in their language development" (p.18). By far and large, thus, teachers must be cautious about errors detection, analyses and corrections.

Concerning the roles being played by ELT teachers, it is difficult to imagine how any teacher could operate without taking into a set of understandings in pertaining to how languages can be and are learnt. Further, how and what teaching is all about are essential to notice. Accordingly, teachers during instructions should make students aware editing checklists so that they know what to do during correction or editing. To recap, error plays such a major role in teachers' conceptualizations of learner language. For this reason, those who are not aware of learners' errors and those do not know how to make use of them in their judgements about teaching can be significantly handicapped (Harmer, 2003, p.189, Kendall & Khuon, 2006, p.16).

#### 2.5. *What Kinds of Errors are Important?*

All errors are indicators for the level of difficulty of a particular exercise or activity. Penston (2005:108) said that errors in language learning become a great extent of manifestations for students' progress along the path of learning. Thus, teachers should keep in mind that some students like to experiment the language so that error making is inevitable while other students prefer to wait until they develop confidence.

On top of this, large larger number of errors indicates that the particular exercise is too difficult for the learners; by contrast, fewer errors of a specific kind may signal to the teacher that learning has taken place. On top of this, errors help teachers as a diagnostic device. By paying attention to the types of errors made and classifying them, teachers develop an image of learners' language. (Trappes-Lomax & Ferguson, 2002)

By the same token, for instance, MacAndrew & Lawday (2002:5) indicated, misspelling, which is a part of students' error, is important since consistently poor spelling impedes communication. So do the punctuation marks. Poor punctuation marks pose unnecessary problems for the reader. The benefit of peer correction is, thus, a point of reference for success in students' learning. While working in pairs, students can provide feedback on each other's linguistic production so that they notice their level of fluency. Moreover, learners can learn more from their peers in the form of formal or informal assessment. With the help of this mechanism, thus, students work together and get feedback in a more relaxed way from their partners (Falchikov, 2001, Ramsden, 2002).

By way of contrast, the above analysis is less likely acceptable by other linguists. Students' errors shouldn't be considered as a means of assessment for the teacher. For instance, students' errors should serve as part of their proficiency development rather than for teachers' evaluation. Therefore, assessment should not concentrate on the pupil's errors (Trappes-Lomax & Ferguson, 2002, Brindley, 2005).

#### 2.7. *What Kind of Reasonable Challenges*

Apart from the dilemma stated above, errors correction is paradoxically bounded with multiple challenges. For instance, the desire for engagement, the ability to complete tasks one at a time, the help being provided by the teacher etc. Above all, empirical evidences overtly verify challenges that stir up the following question. If errors are normal and inevitable, if corrections can be effective with the help of teachers and students, wherein lies the challenge after all? To answer this kind of question, yet we need to answer questions like what sorts of errors are considered as normal and tolerable and what sorts should or must be corrected. It is therefore a challenge to deal with what is known as error gravity.

Hence, error gravity is the seriousness of errors committed by learners themselves. For it to be effective, thus, the action entirely demands teacher's error analysis skills. The concept comes to enforce some criteria for analysis like intelligibility, acceptability, and irritation. For instance, error is a local error if it doesn't prevent a message from being understood. In particular, if the barrier is usually due to a minor violation of one segment of a sentence. Thus, a reader can make an accurate guess about the intended meaning (Tovakoli, 2012).

In contrast to the above analysis, thereof known as a global error in which communication is hindered based on the degree of errors being committed. In its crudest form the idea states that the error can prevent the reader from comprehending and interpreting the message. Hence, from his study, developments of language skills and practices have been advancing at an alarming rate.

To summarise all, during writing instructions, error correction with the help of peer correction is overtly hampered by a variety of challenges. To neutralize these challenges, thus, it requires the mutual cooperation of teachers and students.

### 3. Research Methodology

So far, we have looked at the theoretical underpinnings of the research; nonetheless, this chapter presents the methodology part of the study. Inasmuch as the underlying reasons, thus, it includes the following: research design, research population or respondents i.e., learners and English teachers, data collection instruments, sample size, data collection tools, i.e., unstructured interview questionnaire, closed-ended questionnaire and focus group discussion and at last tool's validity & data analysis procedure are included.

#### 3.1. Research Design

The empirical investigation traces both qualitative and quantitative research designs which were inherently based on concurrent design. Thus, data were gathered and merged through descriptive and correlational designs to rectify the aim of the study. Thus, the researcher used a certain teacher for face-to-face interviews and students for FGD. Closed-ended questionnaire was prepared separately for both groups. More importantly, this study design was selected so that it was appropriate fit to the complex nature of error correction.

The justification, from its preliminary stage, was emanated from the following two basic reasons. The first one was the purpose of the research. Indeed, it explored teachers' practices and students' attitudes. The second one was to make valuable predictions about those issues. Therefore, both methods were taken as priority for the study undertaken.

#### 3.1.1. Research Population

As far as its population is concerned, the study was conducted at Arsi University. For this, the sampling technique was non-probability or purposive sampling method due to the following two basic reasons: It is less expensive and convenient to implement. Accordingly, 10 (ten) English teachers were selected based on their expertise and authority in the subject. They are all male and teach similar subjects. On top of this, six groups of learners (n =128) were asked to participate as a sample. They were selected from the available population voluntarily from five colleges and a School of Law. The data were analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative ways. Finally, the analysis was provided under results and discussion.

#### 3.1.2. Sample Size

The study encompasses English teachers who teach English and learners who took Basic Writing Skills course during freshman program. The justification for the size of the population is shortly given below.

##### 3.1.2.1. English Teachers

In order to gain understanding of teachers' practices, in peer correction context, English teachers were believed to be the part of the research. As hereinbefore mentioned, thus, (n=10) were participated in the study. This number was taken from the total number of on duty teachers, i.e., nineteen (n=19). Among this, only ten (n=10) of them are selected actively operating or teaching English. As a matter of chance, all of them were males and they are experienced teachers. Thus, teachers who are on study leave are excluded for practical reasons. As shown in the following table, their field of study is calculated as follows:

Field of Study				
		Educ. Level	Frequency	Percent
Education	Applied Linguistics	PhD	3	30.0
	Linguistics	M.A	1	10.0
	TEFL	M.A	6	60.0
	Total			10

Table 1: Number of Teachers by Their Education Level

Thus, variables (Appli Li, Ling, and TEFL) characterize the field of specialization and variables (PhD & M.A) identify the level education or qualification of the respondents. Of the total population, thus, 30% of them qualified at PhD level while 30% at Masters Level. Their maximum service year is smallest service year is twelve (12). They were cooperative and voluntarily took part to fill out the questionnaire and answer interview questionnaire.

Their degree of error correction implementation with the help of peer correction was assessed with the help of interview and a 5-point Likert scale questionnaire (Questionnaire item: Error correction is essential during writing lessons. 1= Strongly Agree, 2= Disagree, 3= Undecided, 4= Disagree and 5= Strongly Disagree).

##### 3.1.2.2. Learners

To select the intact group only 15% of the student population was selected using cluster sampling. The method was used for reasons its easiness, economy and practicability. All learners were, thus, chosen from the university. As hereinbefore mentioned, they were clustered into six based on their institution: College of Health Science (n=32); College of Agriculture and Environmental Science (n=27); College of Business and Economics (n=22); School of Law (n=15); College of Social Science Humanities (n=20) and College of Education and Behavioural Science (n=12). Thus, those figures were tallied (n=128).

No	Colleges	Gender	Total No. of Participants	% of The Respondents
1	CoHS	M	17	25
		F	15	
		T	32	
2	CoAES	M	11	21
		F	16	
		T	27	
3	CoBE	M	14	17.2
		F	8	
		T	22	
4	School of Law	M	4	11.7
		F	11	
		T	15	
5	CoSSH	M	13	15.6
		F	7	
		T	20	
6	CoEBS	M	3	9.5
		F	9	
		T	12	
Total number		M	62	100%
		F	66	
		T	128	

Table 2: Number of Learners by Their Colleges

As can be seen, the above table provides a record of learners' gender and number of populations. Therefore, among the learners, 62 (48.4%) male and 66 (51.6%) female of them have provided their response through closed ended questionnaire and FGD one after the other.

### 3.2. Data Collection Instruments

In order to depict the reality of the problem three various data sources were utilized: Closed-ended questionnaire, Guided or Semi-structured interview and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). Closed-ended questionnaire were used for both teachers and students separately. In-depth interview and Focus Group Discussion was administered to students. All of these instruments were selected to produce the pragmatic account of the study.

#### 3.2.1. Closed-Ended Questionnaire

Both teacher's and student's closed-ended questions have two parts: Background information which is known as biodata and body of the questionnaire. Part two is about attitude. The questionnaire was, thus, designed as to treat many measures of many variables in the study. In this regard, it was thought as to treat them by using approximate interval. Questions were then put in a rating scale composed of five Likert- scale so that a high Cronbach's alpha can reasonably be treated in the analyses. The respondents were easily weighing the degree of their attitude. Since the attitudinal scale was in a five-point category that ranges from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', the stem of each question has been rewritten to maximize clarities to respondents.

#### 3.2.2. Teachers' Unstructured Interview

The second instrument the researcher employed was Unstructured inter viewing. The questions were ahead prepared and more of open-ended by their nature. The interview presented face-to-face with English teachers who were teaching at Arsi University. All of them were asked voluntarily to give the required feedback to the interviewer. The interview questions were short listed and redesigned for several times to suffice its contents. Enquiries about teachers' background information, their practices and the likes were included. In the background section, variables linked to sex, age, and areas of specializations were assessed.

The mode of interview was a single face-to-face in which each interview was lasted for approximately ten minutes on average. This is believed to allow both the interviewer and the interviewee to discuss issues point-by point. Specially, teachers explained their sincere experiences or practices. Soon after the interviews were wrapped up, the interviewer slotted key points into their categories. At last, data were interpreted taken place.

#### 3.2.3. Learners' Focus Group Discussion

In the focus group discussion about 12learners were involved in a group, and totally 10groups participated. The participants discussed questions that were directed to them and they reminded some points they thought important. This was done at different settings. In the discussions, the focus was always been error correction with the help of a peer.

### 3.3. Data collection Procedure

There were two development procedures in succession: the pilot study and the collection of reference materials. The pilot study was to test tools like closed-ended questionnaire, in-depth interview questionnaire and Focus Group Discussion questionnaire. Accordingly, some of them were distributed to teachers and learners to gather feedback. Then, the researcher made an amendment on the contents and the structure of the tools. For instance, learners needed clarifications on some basic concepts like 'error' and 'peer'. For some of them the word peer was a new word and what they know was the word 'partner' as a substitute of the word 'peer'.

The second development was the search of relevant books and the accumulation of literary sources from web search engines. Since peer correction has been a long-standing issue in ESL/EFL, ample and detailed developments were downloaded from trusted sources. At last, much of the works of prominent figures have been selected and brought together in a folder. To help clarify the evidence, the list of explored books, publication papers, and journals were indicated under the section entitled as references.

### 3.4. Tools Validity

As has been discussed, tools validity is to suffice of the content of the instruments. Thus, the construct validity was viewed in terms the variety and numbers of questions for the questionnaire, interview questionnaire and focus group discussion. Their contents were enriched with the necessary and appropriate topics. This was done based on contemporary issues or current developments on errors and their correction mechanisms.

### 3.5. Data Analysis and Procedures

As indicated by Creswell and Plano Clark (2007), "Data analysis in mixed methods research consists of analyzing the quantitative data using quantitative methods and the qualitative data using qualitative methods" (p. 128). As indicated by Dey (1993), "Qualitative data deals with meanings, whereas quantitative data deals with numbers" (p.18). As far as procedure is concerned, both are in subsequent discussion. Central to error correction, thus, as explained by Ellis (2003), "The first step in analysing learner errors is to identify them" (p.15). Thus, the identification and data analysis require in the following ways.

Qualitative analysis, which was subsequently followed by quantitative analysis, employed two different ways: Teacher's unstructured interview and FGD. During the unstructured interview, each teacher was contacted at least twice in case he comes with different ideas or changes his first verbal data. The interview lasted ten minutes in average for each teacher. After that, the data was coded and indexed mainly based on open coding techniques suggested under grounded theory. In the open coding practice, thus, key ideas are indexed based on category of errors. Teachers were asked whether they can identify and categorize students' errors in the course Basic Writing Skills. Among ten ( $n=10$ ) teachers, 7 (70%) of them do not while 3 (30%) of do so. As they say, though the errors recognition and category vary, from their saying the category made was as errors of addition, omission, selection and ordering.

Focus Group Discussion provides valuable data from the students. The participants were, therefore, divided into a group ( $n=6$ ). Time taken for each group was from 7 -10 minutes. In discussions held with them, students honestly explained that they should have done well in writing activities. However, they couldn't perform as was expected by their teachers didn't know how things get done. Gradually, after explanations were offered to them by their teachers, they developed remarkable interest for error correction with the help of peer correction. Thus, during writing instructions they try to. This considerable interest coupled with heightened expectations; however, hampered by various constraints.

In quantitative data, data collected with the help of closed-ended questionnaire has been analyzed using SPSS software. In order to pursue the action, the researcher took the following three major steps: data organization, discussion and interpretation. The researcher, then, organized the data by editing and classifying them. Afterwards, the data were checked and re-checked for its usefulness and completeness. At last, the data were interpreted using statistical figures.

## 4. Results and Discussions

This chapter presents results from application of peer correction options in the teaching learning theories suggested in various studies. In effect, results & discussions are being presented as follows:

### 4.1. Results

Errors correction is a complex phenomenon that requires complex and long-term dealings. Therefore, the result of the study, perhaps, has many implications to ESL/EFL teachers. The null hypothesis of the study indicates as there is no significant relationship or association between ESL teachers' practices and learners' belief in the utilization of peer correction. To prove this, SPSS software was used and the result shows that there is a strong relationship between teachers' practice and ( $r= +0.9$ ). Since the statistical software was used to test the null hypothesis which was a statement about the population, the outcome is to reject or not to support the null hypothesis and to accept or support the research hypothesis. In the research, thus, the null hypothesis was rejected. In addition, the result of the statistical data shows that the p value is significant, this is ( $p <.05$ ). This shows that there is a true difference in error correction implementations.

As of its parts, the descriptive statistics (later discussed in detail) entirely shows that all teachers who took part of the interview were male and their age ranges from 37 to 53 years ( $M= 46$ ). In addition, their teaching experience ranges from 15 to 30 years in which ( $M= 22$ ). In the interview data, among ( $n=10$ ) teachers, ( $n=6$ ) of them said that they rarely practice errors correction and no priority is accorded in instructions. Unlike those teachers, however, ( $n=4$ ) of them defined their action as 'not at all'. They said it is in conflict of the reality until students are capable of doing it. Here, the

serious concern, at any given time, is the question of principle. A principle is, then, a rule that teachers rely on to build their good practice.

During interview, if the interviewee strays too far from the theme of the question, the interviewer asks a specific question to bring back the conversation on track. The interview data cast light on the absurd practice or mismatch of theory and practice. Six (n=70%) of them rarely adhere to theories of implementing peer corrections in their writing instruction. The reason they raised were basically landed on the dispute of errors correction. By virtue of this, three (n=30%) of them believe in its implementations. But in their discussions, they raised their concern as error correction, in general, seems as putting the cart before the horse. For instance, whenever students are writing within short period of time, they will be exposed to errors like spelling (additions or omissions), capitalization (proper names, titles, at the beginning of sentences), grammar (sentence structure) etc. So, time is crucial factor for writing, revising and then editing own works before they hand on their first hand text to a partner. Again, after they have received colleague's texts, students need to have the analytical skills to correct in case errors exist based on given editing checklist.

On top of this, teachers doubt the feasibility of peer correction in two ways. The first is related to time constraint. At the University, English courses are semester based. They see peer correction technique implementation as time consuming. Thus, where there is a time constraint to cover the portion, teachers unlikely allocate enough time to use it. By way of contrast, all courses, especially Basic Writing Skills course is designed whereof students culminate at least much of their academic deficiency in terms of writing skills.

The second is related to knowledge gap. The majority of the students couldn't spot errors from what is correct properly. They raised their concern since such a proper and lively way for investigative learning can be hampered by students' lack of knowledge at any time. To secure the activity, teachers usually take in charge to correct by themselves. Despite the level of contents, thus, the final responsibility remains with the teachers. By accepting responsibility and showing concern, whether or not it is a paradoxical, it is yet true that this potential problem cannot be overcome without the genuine involvement of the students. Besides their teachers only take them in a larger basis commitment plays crucial role for in the course work.

The FGD was used to collect data from students. In response to the question, "Do you like working in peers?" their response was 57% say 'Yes', and 43% say 'No'. They were asked to justify. Those who said 'No' were generally prefer individual work to peer work since individual work gives freedom of pace and decision making. Hence, the results show that the majority of the students tend to work in peers. However, in their explanation, teacher's follow up is vital to track them on the right direction.

To put it in a nutshell, students are rarely asked to correct each other's work. Hence, sometimes they took in charge of peer correction as if they were knowledgeable and capable to do things. On top of this, for mistakes and errors they commit; however, they mentioned the knowledge gap they have during text development. Timing is a critical factor that influences teachers' implementations. In spite of time constraints, however, teachers endeavour so as to let their students understand the general linguistic elements (spelling, capitalization, phrase, clause, coherence, logical sequence, subject-verb agreement, run-on, fragment, dangling modifier, etc) during writing practices.

S.N	Items	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
1	Practice error correction in writing tasks	3.70	.823	-.806	1.237
2	Give error correction exercises to students	4.30	.823	-.687	-1.043
3	Students enjoy correcting peer's written texts	3.30	.823	-.687	-1.043
4	Peer correction consumes teacher's time	4.10	.875	-1.465	3.613
5	Teachers use learners' errors for further planning	3.60	.843	-.389	.370
6	Teachers must allow students for self-error revision	4.20	.632	-.132	.179
7	Peer correction rarely helps students to learn from one another	3.40	.699	-.780	-.146
8	The curricula do not invite teachers & students for peer correction	4.30	.674	-.434	-.283
9	Errors must be corrected all the time	3.00	.666	.000	.080
10	Peer correction helps teachers to assess or evaluate students	4.60	.516	-.484	-2.277
11	Students hate peer's criticism	2.20	.918	.601	.396

Table 3: Teachers' Data (Descriptive Statistics)

As can be seen from the Table 4 above, the analyses revealed that the data were normally distributed with values for the skewness and kurtosis within an acceptable range of -1 to +1, except item 1, which had skewness of -1.23 and kurtosis of 1.98. For this reason, 001 was excluded from further analysis.

No.	Items	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
1	Errors should be corrected as much as possible	1.84	.830	1.239	1.981
2	Individual work is better than peer work	3.12	1.284	-.245	-1.259
3	Peer correction is important in writing activities	1.95	.812	.894	.767
4	Peer correction rarely helps learners to learn from one another	2.50	1.184	.477	-.698
5	Learners should write correctly in order to avoid punishments	2.72	1.170	.237	-1.072
6	Learners' hand writing is illegible for taking peer correction	2.70	1.227	.162	-1.202
7	I can successfully be coached or helped by my peers	2.10	.938	.726	.041
8	I enjoy correcting or editing my friends' texts	2.41	1.139	.706	-.490
9	I hate criticisms of my peers during paragraph writing	2.91	1.197	.056	-1.003
10	Learners do not have the right to correct their partners texts	3.55	1.156	-.711	-.314
11	I am afraid I can't concentrate during peer correction.	3.31	1.182	-.428	-.878
12	Peer correction is boring & I don't like it.	3.43	1.188	-.602	-.485
13	Teachers offer learners clear procedure during peer correction	2.15	1.178	1.029	.200
14	Teachers encourage learners to use their own ideas in their writing	2.04	1.111	1.181	.848
15	Teachers assess learners by utilizing peer correction	2.34	.998	.873	.450

Table 4: Students' Data (Descriptive Statistics)

To characterize the important data from Table 4 above, students do not have such an encouraging interest for error correction & to work with their peers as the mean average for both 1.84 and 3.12 respectively. Since the prime objective of the research is to interpret the attitude, they have to peer correction, it can be inferred that they do not have as such sound interesting to the technique.

#### 4.2. Discussion

Insofar as Table 3 above depicts, a range linguistic aspect was statistically analysed to show the magnitude of effects they have error correction courses. Of all the needs the research has, let us return to the question of relationship between teachers' practice and students' attitude in error correction during writing skills. Hence it is evident that there is a positive relationship ( $r = + 0.9$ ) in the effective implementation of teachers' practice and students' attitude to peer correction. As teachers' error correction practice increases, there is a highly likely for students to work with their peers. Against this conceptual backdrop is also leads positive outcome. If teachers do not practice, students will less likely practice peer correction during writing classes.

On error correction issues, what has come up in several of the interviews is type of error committed by learners. Teachers specifically justify the genre of errors they encountered with were as grammar, spelling, punctuation, capitalization etc. As shown in students' table data, grammatical errors take the balance though others also pose an enormous effect to linguistic production.

### 5. Recommendations and Conclusions

The study has used existing researches which are reliable and rigorous. Based on the findings of the research, the following recommendations and conclusions are made.

#### 5.1. Recommendations

Although the recommendations of the study never became law, they nevertheless kick-start attempts to fend off controversies. Thus, the feasible and practice recommendations are as follows:

##### 5.1.1. To Teachers Should

Avoid needless or over-lengthy explanations

- Take a few minutes for orientation son stages. For instance, first, they have to write individually and they do not show their text to each other. After they have completed their own work, they exchange their text so that students get enough feedback. Finally, the teacher will report on the given feedback;
- Set clear criteria at the outset so that students can act accordingly;
- Give clear modelling that are error free;
- Command with clear instructions that include 'everyone', 'all of you' or 'get into pairs';
- Give them every opportunity to work their way the very top;
- Give timing warnings towards the end of writing and editing one's own and correcting peer's text;
- Have appropriate control over their own practices to minimize errors;
- Redress or give a revision on some of the listed errors before leaving the classroom;
- Insist on implementing error correction with help of peer correction;
- Avoid using red pen since it likely creates "red-pen syndrome";
- Avoid correcting overtly since overcorrection may discourage students;
- Gather mistakes of linguistic productions so that they can list and plan for remedial teaching;

## 5.2. Conclusions

Altogether, the findings of the study indicate fundamental notions for both ESL teachers and learners. There is no universally agreed idea on the practice of error correction; however, teaching-learning process is a dynamic activity that needs up-to-date information. As far as writing is concerned, thus, teachers should let students evaluate the extent of their own and their peer's performance.

Because of the increasing level of expectations, learners should try every possible technique so that they can improve their linguistic production in writing skills. In an effort to ensure this, teachers must understand the roles they play in monitoring and giving feedback in error or mistakes corrections activities. Thus, whenever the contents of instructions elicit corrections, teachers are necessary to coach students. In due course, thus, they need to act with patience and judgement during editing; therefore, the instruction will become more fruitful.

## 6. References

- i. Aggarwal, J. (2005). *Teacher and Education in a Developing Society*: 4<sup>th</sup> ed. VIKAS PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD.
- ii. Atkins, J. & et al. (1995). *Skills Development Methodology: Part 1 & Part 2*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Printing Press.
- iii. Bahatt, B. (2002). *Modern Methods of Teaching: Concept and Techniques*. New Delhi: KANISHKA PUBLISHERS
- iv. Borich, G. (2007). *Effective Teaching Methods: Research based practice* 6<sup>th</sup> ed: New York. Pearson Education Ltd.
- v. Brindley, S. (2005). *Teaching English*. London: Routledge Broughten, G. & et al. (2003). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language*. 2nd edition. London & New York: Routledge.
- vi. Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. San Francisco: Longman.
- vii. Bussmann, H. (1998). *Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London & New York: Routledge Candlin, Ch. & mercer, N. (2001). *English Language teaching in its Social Context*. London: Open University.
- viii. Carter, R. & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages*. Cambridge: CUP
- ix. Corder, S. (1982). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: OUP Cowie, H. & Wallace, P. (2000). *Peer Support in Action: From By standing to Standing by*. London: Sage Publications
- x. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- xi. Cumming, A. (2006). *Goals for Academic Writing: ESL learners and their instructors*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company Dey, I. (1993). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User – friendly Guide for Social Scientists*. London: Routledge
- xii. Doyle, T. (2008). *Helping Learners Learn in a Learner- Centred Environment: A Guide to Facilitating Learning in Higher Education*. Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- xiii. Edge, J. (2001). *Essentials of English Language Teaching*: Longman. 8<sup>th</sup> impression. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- xiv. Edge, J. (1997). *Mistakes and Correction*. London: Longman Ellis, R. (2003). *Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- xv. Erben, T., Ban, R. & Castaneda, M. (2009). *Teaching English Language Learners Through Technology*. New York: Routledge.
- xvi. Falchikov, N. (2001). *Learning Together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.
- xvii. F. Freed, B. (1991). *Foreign Language Acquisition Research and the Classroom*. Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company
- xviii. Field, K. (2005). *Issues in Modern Foreign Languages Teaching*. London and New York: Routledge. Fry, H., Kettridge, S. & Marshall, S. (2009). *A Handbook for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education: enhancing academic practice*. New York and London: Routledge.
- xix. Hall, G. (2011). *Exploring English Language Teaching: Language in Action*. London & New York: Routledge Harmer, J. (1987). *Teaching and Learning Grammar*. London: Longman.
- xx. Harmer, J. (1999). *How to Teach English: An Introduction to Practice of English Language Teaching*: London: Longman.
- xxi. Harmer, J. (2003) 'Popular Culture, Methods and Context'. *ELT Journal*, 57/3: 288–94. Heigham, J. & Croker, R. (2009). *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. Macmillan: Palgrave.
- xxii. Henikel, E. (2011). *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. New York: Routledge.
- xxiii. Hergenhahn, B. & Olson M. 2009. *An Introduction to Theories of Learning*: 8<sup>th</sup> edition. London: Pearson International Edition
- xxiv. Johnson, K. (2005). *Expertise in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: PALGRVE MACMILAN
- xxv. Joniker, J. & Pennink, B. (2010). *The Essence of Research Methodology: a concise guide for Masters and PhD students in Management science*. London New York: Springer.
- xxvi. Joy, D. (2016). *Intersectionality in Educational Research*: 1<sup>st</sup> edition, Virginia: Sterling József, H. 2001. *Advanced writing in English as a foreign language: a corpus-based study of process and products*. Budapest: Lingua Franca Csoport.
- xxvii. Kendall, J. & Khuon, O. (2006). *Writing Sense: Integrated Reading and Writing lessons for English Language Learners*. Portland: Stenhouse Publishers. P.16
- xxviii. Kiracou, Ch. (2009). *Effective Teaching in Schooling: Theory and Practice*. London: Stanley Thornes

- xxx. Klapper, J. & A coleman, J. (2005). *Effective Learning and Teaching in Modern Languages*. New York: Routledge
- xxxi. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP Leavy, P. (2017). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed Methods, Arts-Based, and Community-Based Participatory Research Approaches*. New York London: THE GUILFORD PRESS Myers, D. (2010). *Psychology*: New York: Worth Publishers
- xxxii. Maxom, M. (2009). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language for Dummies*. Chichester: Willey MacAndrew, R. & Lawday, C. (2002). *Cambridge First Certificate Writing*. Cambridge: CUP.
- xxxiii. Patricia, O. & Collins, J. (2003). *The Greenwood Dictionary of Education: Forwarded by Catherine Snow*. London: Greenwood Publishing Group
- xxxiv. Penston, T. (2005). *A Concise Grammar for English Language Teachers*. Ireland. TP Publications Pilar, M. (2007). *Investigating Tasks in Formal Language Learning: the authors of individual chapters*. Canada: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- xxxv. Ramsden, P. (2002). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London & New York: Routledge. Richards, J. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge: CUP Richards, J. & Lockhart, Ch. (2007). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: CUP
- xxxvi. Richards, J., Schmidt, R., Kendrick, H. & Kim, Y. 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education.
- xxxvii. Robitaille, J. & Connelly, R. (2007). *Writer's Resources: From Paragraph to Essay*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Boston: THOMPSON WARDsworth.
- xxxviii. Santrock, J (2004). *Educational Psychology: 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. London: McGraw-Hill Higher Education Saville- Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: CUP
- xl. Stern, H.H. (1991). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP Sunden, G. (2006). *Improving Student Writing Skills*. USA: Shell Education
- xli. Tovakoli, H. (2012). *A Dictionary of Language Acquisition: A comprehensive Overview of key terms in First and Second Language Acquisition*. Tehran: RHANAMA PRESS Trappes-Lomax, H. & Ferguson, G. (2002). *Language in Language Teacher Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company Ur, P. (2009). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: CUP.
- xlii. Wragg, E.C. (1999). *An Introduction to Classroom Observation: 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. London: Routledge Falmer Zacarian, D. & Haynes, J. (2010). *Teaching English language learners across the content areas*. Alexandria: ASCD

## Appendix

### Acronyms

The following acronyms are used in this article:

CLT	Communicative Language Teaching
CoAES	College of Agriculture and Environmental Science
CoBE	College of Business and Economics
CoEBS	College of Education and Behavioural Science
CoHS	College of Health Science
CoSSH	College of Social Science and Humanities
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
L2	Second Language
TEFL	Teaching English as a Foreign Language
TESL	Teaching English as a Second Language

Table 5: Acronyms