



The importance of Error Correction in EFL Contexts: a comprehensive Narrative Review

Amal Ebrahim Hassan Bedalla^{1*}, Mardiya Abobaker Yousef Elzouki²

^{1,2} Department of English, Faculty of Arts, University of Tobruk, Tobruk, Libya

أهمية تصحيح الأخطاء في سياقات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية: مراجعة سردية شاملة

أ. أمل إبراهيم حسن بيد الله^{1*}، أ. مرضية أبوبكر يوسف الزوكي²
^{2,1} قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية الآداب، جامعة طبرق، طبرق، ليبيا

*Corresponding author: amalbedalla@gmail.com

Received: May 09, 2025

Accepted: June 30, 2025

Published: July 10, 2025

Abstract:

Recently correcting students' errors has received significant attention from the perspective of both researchers and teachers. It is foundational component of second language instruction, particularly within English as Foreign Language (EFL) contexts. While some scholars advocate for explicit correction to enhance accuracy, others emphasize implicit methods to increase fluency and learner autonomy. This inclusive narrative review explores the role and impact of error correction in English as Foreign Language (EFL) settings. It synthesizes key findings from various previous studies on error correction strategies, their effectiveness, and their impact on EFL learners' linguistic development. It stresses on some theoretical perspectives on types of error correction methods, including teacher correction, peer, and self-correction as well, and their implications for linguistic accuracy and learner development. Grounded in two theoretical perspectives that inform error correction in EFL contexts. Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985) and Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996).

While corrective feedback has long been an important part of language pedagogy, timing, debates persist regarding its optimal application, and psychological impact. This comprehensive narrative review aims to highlight both the benefits and challenges related with error correction and provide evidence-based recommendations for EFL educators.

This review emphasizes the importance of adopting more balanced and psychologically considerate when applying error correction's methods—those that not only correct learners' errors on language forms but also foster learners' emotional and cognitive development. Future research should explore diverse contexts and incorporate learners' viewpoints to ensure methods promote effective, equitable language education.

Keywords: Error Correction, EFL Contexts, corrective feedback.

المخلص

حظي تصحيح أخطاء الطلاب مؤخرًا باهتمام كبير من وجهة نظر الباحثين والمعلمين على حد سواء. فهو يُعدّ عنصرًا أساسيًا في تعليم اللغة الثانية، لا سيما في سياقات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (EFL). وبينما يدعو بعض الباحثين إلى التصحيح الصريح لتعزيز الدقة، يُشدد آخرون على الأساليب الضمنية لزيادة الطلاقة واستقلالية المتعلم. تستكشف هذه المراجعة السردية الشاملة دور وتأثير تصحيح الأخطاء في سياقات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (EFL). وتُلخص النتائج الرئيسية من دراسات سابقة مختلفة حول استراتيجيات تصحيح الأخطاء، وفعاليتها، وتأثيرها على التطور اللغوي لمتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. كما تُركز على بعض وجهات النظر النظرية حول أنواع أساليب تصحيح الأخطاء، بما في ذلك تصحيح المعلم، والتصحيح من قبل الأقران، والتصحيح الذاتي، وأثارها على الدقة اللغوية وتطور المتعلم. وتستند إلى منظورين نظريين يُرشدان عملية تصحيح الأخطاء في سياقات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية: فرضية المخرجات لسواين (1985) وفرضية التفاعل للونغ (1996). في حين أن التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية لطالما كانت جزءًا مهمًا من علم أصول التدريس اللغوي، إلا

أن الجدل لا يزال قائماً حول تطبيقها الأمثل وأثرها النفسي. تهدف هذه المراجعة السردية الشاملة إلى تسليط الضوء على فوائد وتحديات تصحيح الأخطاء، وتقديم توصيات قائمة على الأدلة لمعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. تؤكد هذه المراجعة على أهمية اتباع أساليب أكثر توازناً واهتماماً بالجوانب النفسية عند تطبيق أساليب تصحيح الأخطاء – تلك التي لا تصحح أخطاء المتعلمين في أشكال اللغة فحسب، بل تعزز أيضاً نموهم العاطفي والمعرفي. ينبغي أن تستكشف الأبحاث المستقبلية سياقات متنوعة، وأن تأخذ في الاعتبار وجهات نظر المتعلمين لضمان أن تعزز هذه الأساليب تعليمًا لغويًا فعالاً ومنصفاً.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تصحيح الأخطاء، سياقات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية، التغذية الراجعة التصحيحية.

Introduction

Error correction in second language acquisition is a source of great concern to instructors and controversy to researchers theorists it is playing a pivotal role in learners' inter-language development. As L2, learners attempt to acquire the complexities of grammatical, syntactic structures, and lexical of a non-native language, producing errors becomes an inevitable part of this learning process. Informed, regular correction of these errors not only enhances linguistic accuracy but also provides learners with critical feedback that guides their language development. Although its significance in real- life classrooms, the optimal methods to corrective feedback remain debated among researchers. Over the past decades, second language acquisitions' scholars have debated on what are the most effective approaches for correcting learner errors. While some argued that explicit correction increase grammatical accuracy, others stated that implicit techniques such as recasts better to support communicative competence. Additionally, many questions remain central to applied linguistics researches such as who should correct errors-teacher or students, when correction should occur, and what types of errors should be prioritized. In addition, further variables on learners must be considered (e.g., proficiency level and motivation) and contextual factors (e.g., instructional goals and classroom dynamics). Thus, educational philosophies have shifted teaching in classrooms settings from teacher-centered approaches which give emphasis to teachers only to learner-centered paradigms which is more communicative method influencing how corrective feedback is perceived and delivered.

This review seeks to provide a comprehensive synthesis of existing research on error correction in EFL settings. By focusing on the theoretical frameworks, methods, challenges, and implications of corrective feedback and explaining the CF implications for language teaching.

1.2-Research Questions

- What are the most common approaches of error correction used in English as Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms? In addition, how do they differ in application?
- What are the perceptions of EFL learners and teachers regarding different error correction methods?
- What pedagogical implications can be drawn from current research to enhance error correction practices in EFL instruction?

1.3-The objectives of the study

- To provide a comprehensive review of the theoretical and empirical literature on error correction in EFL contexts.
- To evaluate the effectiveness of different corrective feedback strategies as direct vs. indirect correction in promoting grammatical and lexical accuracy.
- To investigate learner and teacher perceptions and preferences regarding various types of feedback.
- To identify challenges teachers and learners face in the process of error correction and corrective feedback.

1.4-Theoretical Framework

Errors are universal and occur across a wide range of EFL Errors, they are considered unavoidable and necessary in L2 language learning process. Error correction and corrective feedback is addressed in about every theory of L2 acquisition. This paper is grounded in two basic theoretical perspectives that inform error correction in EFL contexts;

1. Swain's Output Hypothesis (1985): while it doesn't focus exclusively on error correction, it has important implications for it. It stated that learner output particularly when pushed to be accurate, facilitates language development, supporting the need for error correction. This hypothesis supports the idea that error correction is beneficial when follows the learner output which is (noticing gaps), encourages learner to modify or reformulate his/her language, and meaning-focused not just form-focused.
2. Long's Interaction Hypothesis (1996): This hypothesis emphasizes the role of interactional modifications in communication breakdowns. It argued that language acquisition is facilitated through interaction modifications which occur during communication breakdown. Corrective feedback within this

interactive framework helps learners recognize and adjust their errors and emphasizes and strongly supports the role of corrective feedback during communicative interactions. These theoretical foundations highlight the importance of output and interaction in error correction. They provide a basis for understanding how corrective feedback functions not only as a mechanical process in classroom but as an essential part of communicative and cognitive language development.

2-Literature Review

The field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) considers error correction a critically important area of study, primarily due to its profound effect on language acquisition and the enhancement of linguistic competence among learners. Empirical research has consistently shown that error correction may have a positive impact on language development and progress, particularly when it is timely, consistent, and appropriately at the same time. Ellis et al. (2005) stated that focused CF on specific grammatical forms led to enhanced accuracy over time. Also, Sheen (2007) found that EFL learners who received metalinguistic as a type of feedback indicated greater long-term gains in grammatical accuracy than those who received recasts. That is, when teachers use recast with students' error, some students consider it as repetition of their utterance especially in low- beginning levels.

This thorough narrative review is designed to survey existing research regarding the significance of error correction in EFL contexts, with particular attention paid to the efficacy of different correction techniques, learner preferences, and the resulting influence on grammatical accuracy. "In the field of second and foreign language education, the practice of correcting learner mistakes has garnered considerable academic interest. This process, known as corrective feedback (CF), encompasses the various responses given by educators, fellow students, or even the learners themselves to linguistic errors, with the aim of fostering more precise language usage. A thorough grasp of what errors are and their function is crucial for developing successful correction methods."

The past several decades have witnessed a substantial proliferation of studies on Written Corrective Feedback (WCF), primarily seeking to answer the fundamental question: 'How effectively does WCF enhance the linguistic precision of student writing?' (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009, 2010; Farrokhi & Sattarpour, 2012; Sheen, 2007; Shintani & Ellis, 2013; for a summary of recent work, see Chong, 2018). A significant number of these investigations have scrutinized the impact of direct and focused WCF on the writing performance of L2 university students. Specifically, findings from these quasi-experimental designs, often incorporating pre-tests, post-tests, and occasionally delayed post-tests, have consistently demonstrated that direct and targeted WCF positively influences students' grammatical accuracy at the word level (e.g., English articles, prepositions, the simple past tense) in their written output. Moreover, by comparing the linguistic accuracy of specific grammatical features between control groups and treatment groups, these studies suggest that students who received WCF generally outperformed those in control groups who did not receive grammatical feedback. A distinct line of inquiry within this field compares the effectiveness of various WCF types. To date, research indicates that WCF delivered in a more explicit and corrective manner (i.e., direct WCF) is more conducive to student uptake than more instructional forms of WCF (e.g., metalinguistic explanations) (Shintani, Ellis, & Suzuki, 2014)."

Chong (2019) conducted a comprehensive systematic review of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) research in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as Foreign Language (EFL) contexts [1]. This study aimed to synthesize the latest developments in WCF research, identify current research trends, and provide an agenda for future studies. The review was based on a content analysis of 41 primary studies published between 1997 and 2017 in SSCI-indexed journals in the fields of TESOL, language learning, technology, and education.

Using the Leximancer text extraction tool, 22 word-level concepts were identified and grouped into five main themes: types of WCF, types of writing tasks, participant demographics, research designs/methods, and types of errors. Based on this systematic review, two research tasks were identified to provide an agenda for future research in this field. This study significantly contributes to understanding the overall landscape of error correction research and provides a systematic framework for categorizing studies and identifying areas that require further exploration.

3-Methodology

This study adopts a narrative review methodology to synthesize existing literature related to error correction in English as a Foreign language contexts (EFL). A narrative review approach selected due to its suitability for providing a comprehensive and interpretive account in order to provide clear explanation of current perspectives and findings in this field. The selection of studies was guided by relevance, credibility, and contribution to the field of corrective feedback and error correction. Using peer-reviewed journal articles and scholarly publications, with particular attention given to works published between 1997 and 2025. Databases such as ERIC, JSTOR, Science Direct, and Google Scholar were used to identify key sources. No statistical meta-analysis was conducted. The review focused on studies that explored: 1-Theoretical perspectives related to error correction in second language acquisition. 2-Empirical findings on the effectiveness of various corrective feedback approaches. 3-

Learner and teacher perceptions of error correction practices. 4-Practical challenges and pedagogical implications in EFL classrooms.

This method allowed for the addition of various viewpoints and the development of a comprehensive understanding of corrective feedback within EFL contexts.

3.1 The Importance of Errors in EFL contexts:

Brown (2000), define an error as "a linguistic form or combination of forms which, in the same context and under the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts." Errors reflect how learners are internalizing the language and they are viewed as valuable indicators of learning process. Scholar have proposed two main perspectives regarding of the significance of learner's errors. The first perspective maintains that even with ideal teaching conditions and strategies, errors are inevitable and unavoidable due to inherent limitations in instructional methods and pedagogical approaches. According to this view, errors made by learners reflect the natural imperfections within teaching practice. The second perspective suggests that errors are an intrinsic aspect of human cognition, asserting that as long as we exist in an imperfect world, the occurrence of errors is inevitable regardless of teaching quality. This highlights the complex interplay between instructional design and cognitive imperfection in shaping learners' linguistic or conceptual development. In conclusion, errors made by learners are not just signs of failure but essential elements of the acquisition process. They are essential to guide teaching and reflect development toward accuracy and fluency in both first and second languages.

3.1.1-Enhancing Linguistic Accuracy

The primary goal of error correction is to enhance learners' grammatical and lexical accuracy. Ellis (2009), corrective feedback facilitates the development of a more accurate inter-language structure by directing learners' attention to linguistics form. Focused error correction enables learners to recognize their errors, revise incorrect forms, and consolidate correct language structures. Over time, this contributes to improved language output and the internalization of target forms which is particularly significant in EFL contexts where explicit instruction often serves as the main source of input.

Valizadeh (2020) investigated the impact of two distinct comprehensive written correction strategies on the syntactic accuracy of written English among EFL learners. This quasi-experimental research utilized a pretest-treatment-posttest-delayed posttest methodology and included 90 Turkish EFL students. After confirming their similar second language proficiency levels via the Oxford Quick Placement Test, participants were allocated into three distinct groups first one receiving direct corrective feedback, the second group receiving Metalinguistic correction and a control group that received no Feedback. The investigation spanned five weeks. During this time, the experimental groups composed argumentative essays in class, subsequently received general feedback, and then revised their corrected essays. In contrast, the NF group's feedback was limited to aspects of content, spelling, and organization, with no corrections provided for grammatical inaccuracies. The findings from both the immediate posttests and the delayed posttests (conducted two weeks later) demonstrated that both the direct and metalinguistic groups achieved significantly better results than the NF group. However, no statistically meaningful difference was observed in the effectiveness between the DCF and ME strategies themselves. Consequently, this study offers robust empirical support for the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in enhancing the grammatical precision of EFL learners.

The reviewed studies underscore the significant importance of error correction in EFL contexts, highlighting various aspects of its effectiveness and application. Chong's systematic review provides a comprehensive framework for understanding research trends in WCF, while Zhang et al.'s study sheds light on the importance of learn preferences in the error correction process. Additionally, Valizadeh's study offer empirical evidence for the effectiveness of comprehensive corrective feedback in improving syntactic accuracy. Collectively, these studies indicate that error correction is not merely a pedagogical practice but a crucial component in the development of linguistic competence among EFL learners. However, further research is still needed to explore best practices in error correction that consider diverse educational contexts and individual learner preferences.

3.1.2-Supporting Inter-language Development

When teaching a language as foreign or second language; errors should not viewed merely as failures, but rather represent as developmental stages in second language acquisition. They offer valuable learning opportunities, when addressed appropriately. According to Selinker (1972), the learner's inter-language is a dynamic system that progresses through exposure to input and corrective feedback. In this process, error correction plays a mediating role, particularly when feedback aligns with the learners' current developmental stage. Timely and repeated correction helps in restructuring erroneous language patterns and refining communicative competence.

3.1.3-Fostering Learner Autonomy

Corrective feedback also assists the metacognitive function by encouraging learners to reflect on their language use. Self and peer corrective feedback strategies, especially when implemented in a supportive environment,

promote greater learner autonomy and linguistic awareness (Ferris, 2006). The process of noticing and self-monitoring are essential for language development that enabling learners to transfer correction strategies to new contexts.

3.1.4 -Influencing Learner Motivation and Confidence

Although corrective process can be highly beneficial, its impact on learners' affective domain should not be underestimated or overlooked. Constructive and consistent corrective feedback often serves as a source of motivation and enhances learners' confidence, particularly when delivered in a supportive and non-threatening environment. In contrast, excessively critical or inconsistent correction may induce anxiety and reduce learners' willingness to participate. Schulz (2001) states that most EFL learners, appreciate and value error correction and perceive it as an essential part of effective instruction, provided it is administered in a respectful and encouraging manner.

3.2 Methods of Error Correction

Errors are prevalent across a wide spectrum of EFL contexts and various types of errors have been identified in literature. Several studies have emphasize the macro-level classification of errors including lexical errors, phonological errors, grammatical errors, and semantic errors (Abi Samra, 2003; Althobaiti, 2014; Ferris, 2013). In contrast, other research has explored micro-level aspects of error correction such as the verb tense errors, word order, use of articles spelling, punctuation, word choice, and capitalization, (Alhaysony, 2012; Al-Jarf, 2008; Darus, 2012; Truscott, 2008).

The field of error correction has evolved significantly with increasing emphasis on its facilitative role in the language learning process. Initial debates centered around whether or not students' errors should be corrected and followed by discussions concerning which errors to correct. After that, attention shifted towards determining the appropriate methods, timing, and agents of correction on how errors should be corrected, when, and by whom, Russell (2009). This growing recognition on the importance and the pedagogical value of learners' errors promoted researchers to investigate the nature of these errors and their underlying causes. Such inquiring have explore the potential benefits of error correction for language development which has come to be known as "error analysis." Ellis (2005).

Effective error correction in EFL classrooms call for a careful selection of strategies that make parallel with learners' proficiency levels, instructional goals, and also classroom contexts. Over the past decades, academics have identified and analyzed various approaches of providing corrective feedback with different educational implications. These methods are categorized into explicit and implicit strategies and also can be broadly categorized based on who provides the correction (teacher, peer, or learner), and whether it occurs in oral or written form.

Frequently, correcting learners errors by their teachers still the most common approach in EFL contexts. It typically occurs during controlled exercise or post-practice reflection. Teachers correct learners' errors either immediately or delay correction until after the task is completed. Immediate correction on a student's error, though helpful for form-focused instruction, it might interrupt the flow of communication in oral practice. On the other hand, delayed correction allows for uninterrupted discourse but may reduce the salience of errors.

Examples of teachers' correction;

Explicit correction: The teacher directly indicates that an error has been made by the learner by repeating the learner's error and supplies the correct form.

S: Yesterday Joe and Bill ah went to ah Bill's grandmother and visit their grandmother

T: and visit—you need past tense

S: Visited, yes. (Ellis et al., 2006, p. 362)

Implicit correction, the teacher simply recast the verb in the past tense, Recasts; The teacher reformulates only the incorrect utterance without directly emphasizing on the error.

S: "Yesterday two boys visit their rich uncle"

T: "Visited"

S: "Visited their rich uncle". (Ellis et al., 2006, p. 362)

Elicitation: The teacher prompts the student to self-correction by pausing or asking guiding questions signing to the error.

Metalinguistic: where the teacher provides comments or questions related to the nature of the error without giving the correct answer directly (e.g., "Do we use future tense here?")

Peer correction involves learners to identify and address each other's errors, typically during pair or group work. This technique promotes learner cooperative learning and critical language awareness. It is particularly effective in classrooms that emphasize collaborative learning and where students have been trained to provide constructive and meaningful feedback. EFL teachers use this method in oral and written tasks to enhance learners to work in collaborative way. Lyster,&Sato (2012) stated that peer correction not only assistance to the student receiving feedback but also improves the linguistic accuracy of the peer providing it, as both parties engage in reflective thinking about the use of language. Amara, N (2015). (cited from Edge,1990) emphasized some benefits of peer

correction; first, help Ss to engage in teamwork, students will learn from each other and gain more knowledge. "Both learners (who made the error and who corrects) are involved in listening to and thinking about the language's form."

Self-correction encourages learners in independently recognizing and rectifying their own errors, often with minimal teacher intervention and prompting. This process facilitated through some techniques such as reflective questioning, errors highlighting, and the use of checklists. That is, using such method may encourage learners to monitor and evaluate their own language output. Self-correction can be facilitated through techniques such as:

Reflective questioning (e.g., "Is that verb in the correct tense?") highlighting errors without any correction, using guided editing tasks or the checklists for writing assignments. Oral correction typically includes the use of recasts and metalinguistic prompts in order to help learners reformulate their utterances. While written feedback employs both direct and indirect methods such as using error codes or underlining. Research indicates that indirect feedback, combined with opportunities for revision can result in significant and greater long-term improvement in writing accuracy.

Common methods Include direct error correction: giving the correct form directly on the student's text. Indirect correction: Indicating the presence of errors by underlining or symbols without providing the correction directly. Error codes: Using regular symbols to categorize types of errors (e.g., "VT" for verb tense. Research conducted by Ferris & Roberts (2001) argued that indirect correction combined with revision opportunities may leads to long-term improvement in the accuracy of writing compared to the use of direct correction alone.

A study on the most effective CF techniques by Simel and chali, (2025) which surveyed 86 EFL undergraduate, assessing five types of CF; direct, indirect, metalinguistic, peer, and self-corrective feedback. The study use questionnaires, interview and class observation and found that using direct correction helps in improving linguistics and writing accuracy while indirect method support deeper understanding and self-discovery. Another study conducted by Ammar and Spada (2006) examined EFL learners in 6TH grade intensive classes on the effectiveness of types of CF by comparing the effects of prompts and recasts on the use of possessive pronouns. The study found that the learners in high proficiency level benefitted similarly from both types of corrective feedback. In contrast, learners in low -proficiency level, the prompts were more effective than the recast. That is, learners who have already initiated the acquisition of the target linguistics feature, the output-prompting feedback tends to be more effective than input-providing feedback.

An experimental design study by Loewen and Erlam (2006) investigated the effective of two types of CF on 34 EFL learners in New Zealand school. The study compared the effects of implicit correction in the form of recasts and explicit correction in the form of metalinguistic on EFL adult learners' acquisition of the use of past tense-ed. Results show no significant effect for treatment on the immediate post-tests. However, Ss who received explicit CF outperformed the control group and the group who received implicit CF on the delayed post-tests. That is, explicit correction immediate clarity which led to significant improvement in basic errors. It is not easy to reach clear conclusions about which type of corrective feedback is more effective than others many variables are involved as individual difference factors and contextual factors which teachers should count.

3.3Challenges in Error Correction

Corder (1967) stated that correcting learners' errors serves three essential functions: first, errors provide teachers with insight into the learners' current level of language development and indicate areas that require further instruction and tell what remains to be learned. Second, they offer evidence of how language is acquired and reveal strategies employed by learners during the acquisition process in learning a language. Third, errors are considered an integral component of the learning process itself, as they are viewed as a mechanism through which learners internalize and develop linguistic competence. The correction of learners' errors is widely seen as a method of feedback that informs students about their language use. While essential to the learning process, error correction—particularly in speaking and writing.

Thus, while error correction is widely regarded as an essential instructional strategy in ESL and EFL contexts, its implementation presents many practical and pedagogical challenges. These challenges derived from various factors such as learner differences, methodological concerns and contextual constraints. Here are some various factors including learners' differences, background constraints, and methodological concerns that teacher should concern about when correcting errors. Understanding these limitations is essential for developing effective learner-centered corrective practices.

3.3.1-The Anxiety of learners and Affective Filters

One of the most commonly reported concerns is its potential to increase learners' anxiety levels in making errors. According to Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis, emotional variables as fear of making mistakes or receiving tough criticism on errors can constrain language acquisition. In settings where giving corrective feedback on learners errors orally on in written tasks is seem to be as punitive or excessive, learners may become

hesitant to participate and engage in classroom activities, thereby reducing their opportunities for communication and hindering their linguistic development.

3.3.2-Timing and Frequency of Correction

Determining the appropriate time and the frequency of correcting errors in EFL classrooms is another concern. Correcting too often during communicative tasks may interrupt the flow of interaction and delay the development of fluency. However, delayed correction can result in missed learning opportunities. Teachers must make the right decisions about when to correct based on the goals of the activity, the learner's proficiency level, and the classroom atmosphere. For instance, if the errors are grammatical, or pronunciation errors, providing immediate correction is better. That is, learners will not be able to remember anything for post-correction.

3.3.3-Learner Preferences and Expectations

Not all learners respond to corrective feedback in the same manner. While some prefer direct and explicit correction to feel more secure during their learning process, others may favor less intrusive approaches. A paper published by Schulz, (2001) shown discrepancies between teachers' and learners' beliefs regarding to error correction. These differences are shaped by various factors, including pedagogical practices, cultural backgrounds, and workload. In linguistically diverse classrooms, meeting all learners' expectations can be particularly complex.

A study was conducted by [Lee, \(2013\)](#), stated that EFL learners in advanced – level of English language prefer explicit corrections as the best type of corrective feedback and metalinguistic as the least preferred type of correction on their errors. Such result is inconsistent with previous papers, which stated that metalinguistic feedback was chosen by most secondary ESL learners in Singapore ([Oladejo, 1993](#)). In a research involving 395 ESL learners various proficiency levels and 46 teachers, Breeze and [Roothoof, \(2016\)](#) argued that most learners were more willing in receiving direct kinds of CF such as explicit corrections and metalinguistic while the teachers preferred using implicit type as elicitation. Moreover, another study by [Rahimi's and Zhang \(2014\)](#) involved 160 Iranian EFL learners with 80 high anxiety and 80 low anxiety learners, the result stated that the learners strongly prefer the use of metalinguistic feedback and explicit error corrections regardless of their level in anxiety. On the other hand, [Wang's and Zhu \(2019\)](#) in another paper within on Chinese EFL classrooms setting, the participants informed that they are more willing in receiving prompts such as repetition and metalinguistic feedback rather than receiving direct corrections. Generally, it can be concluded that from these researches EFL learners preferences of types of corrective feedback are influenced by the teaching and learning contexts and process, they tend to be more motivated to receive metalinguistic correction which seem to be positive about implicit feedback in general.

Additionally, a study involved 117 university students from a Thai EFL setting, employing a mixed-methods approach that included both questionnaires (quantitative) and interviews (qualitative). Analysis of the questionnaire data revealed a general inclination among learners towards more explicit WCF methods (such as metalinguistic explanations and direct corrections) for most error types, irrespective of their proficiency or FLE levels. Interestingly, while high-proficiency learners found less explicit WCF (like underlining or error codes) somewhat beneficial, their lower-proficiency counterparts did not share this view. Similar patterns were observed across different FLE groups. Furthermore, the level of FLE appeared to influence how students valued the scope of WCF. Insights from subsequent interviews indicated that variations in learner preferences were primarily attributable to factors such as the linguistic features of their first language, their existing knowledge of the target language, emotional responses, and the teacher's role. This study underscores the critical importance of incorporating learners' perspectives and preferences when designing and implementing error correction strategies.

3.3.4-Teacher Expertise and Workload

Teachers' beliefs, experience, and , training significantly shape when and how error correction should be apply. Instructors play a crucial role in determining how and when the correction should be implemented in language classrooms. Teachers who lack sufficient training may adopt inconsistent or ineffective corrective feedback strategies. Moreover, the process of identifying and addressing students' errors— particularly in writing work — requires significant time and effort which usually adding to teachers' already demand workloads. When combined with teachers' existing heavy workloads, especially in large classes, providing and delivering individualized feedback becomes increasingly challenging and even more difficult.

3.3.5-Risk of Overcorrection and Fossilization

Overcorrection on EFL learners, particularly in the early stages of language learning, may overwhelm students and lead to confusion. In contrast, insufficient or inconsistent feedback can contribute to the fossilization of errors—a process whereby incorrect language forms become fixed and resistant to change in the learner's language use (Han, 2004). Lastly, effective correction thus requires consistent and developmentally appropriate strategies to avoid both extremes.

4-Critical Analysis

A critical examination of the literature reveals both the benefits and complexities of error correction in EFL contexts. While several studies support the efficacy of corrective feedback in improving linguistic accuracy, findings vary based on factors such as feedback type, learner proficiency, and contextual dynamics.

Empirical research reveals that explicit corrective feedback, including metalinguistic explanations leads to greater grammatical accuracy in written tasks. For example, Sheen (2007) found that learners who received metalinguistic feedback demonstrated significant long-term gains in grammatical accuracy compared to those who received recasts. Similarly, Valizadeh (2020) conducted a quasi-experimental study involving 90 Turkish EFL learners, examining the effectiveness of direct and metalinguistic corrective feedback. The results showed that both methods significantly improved learners' syntactic accuracy compared to a control group, though no statistically significant difference was found between the two feedback types.

Bitchenner and Knoch (2009, 2010) investigated the long-term effects of written corrective feedback (WCF) on advanced L2 writers and found that direct, focused feedback led to improvements in the accurate use of English articles and verb tenses. Likewise, Shintani and Ellis (2013), through controlled experimental designs, demonstrated that metalinguistic feedback had a positive impact on learners' explicit knowledge of grammar.

Chong (2019) conducted a systematic review of 41 studies on WCF in ESL/EFL contexts published between 1997 and 2017. The review categorized the studies into themes based on feedback types, writing tasks, learner demographics, research methods, and error categories. Chong emphasized the need for future research to consider learners' perspectives and contextual variability to better inform instructional practices.

Ammar and Spada (2006) examined the relative effectiveness of prompts and recasts among sixth-grade EFL learners and found that prompts were particularly beneficial for learners with lower proficiency levels. In contrast, both high and low-proficiency learners benefited similarly from recasts.

Loewen and Erlam (2006) explored the effects of implicit (recasts) versus explicit (metalinguistic) feedback on adult EFL learners' acquisition of the past tense. Their findings revealed that while no significant differences were observed in immediate post-tests, explicit feedback was more effective in the delayed post-test, indicating its lasting impact on learner accuracy.

These studies collectively support the idea that corrective feedback, particularly when they met learner needs and delivered with consistency, plays a critical role in language development. However, the variations in methodology, learner profiles, and instructional settings underscore the necessity for flexible approaches to error correction.

5-Implications and Recommendations

The practice of error correction in EFL classrooms carries several important implications for teaching methodology, curriculum design, and teacher training. Given its impact on learner development, it is essential that stakeholders approach correction as a pedagogically intentional process.

Teachers should strive for a balance between fluency-oriented communication and form-focused accuracy. Task type and learner level should guide decisions regarding when and how to correct.

Learners benefit from being explicitly taught how to give and receive feedback. Training students in peer and self-correction fosters autonomy and deepens metalinguistic awareness.

Not all errors can or should be corrected. Teachers are encouraged to focus on global errors—those that interfere with meaning—rather than on local errors that do not impede comprehension.

Using varied and contextualized feedback strategies enhances effectiveness. Oral feedback can be integrated naturally into communication, while written correction can involve a mix of direct and indirect techniques.

Feedback should be frequent, consistent, and supportive. Positive reinforcement helps maintain motivation, and cyclical learning processes involving drafting and revision are especially beneficial.

Conclusion

Error correction is an essential component of effective EFL instruction and in the process of learning. While it assists the development of grammatical and lexical accuracy, it is also contributes to learners' wider linguistic competence and confidence. Despite the related challenges in correction learners' errors, study supports the view that well implemented corrective strategies lead to positive educational outcomes. An effective and well-informed method to error correction requires teachers to remain sensitive and attentive to learners' developmental stages, individual preferences, and contextual factors surrounding the learning environment. When corrective feedback is provided delivered in a timely, respectful, and pedagogically appropriate manner, it becomes valuable tool in the promotion of second language acquisition. Teachers should employ clear and flexible plans when correcting errors and make additional contributions to the EFL classroom teaching and learning. Future research is encouraged to further investigate and develop innovative correction techniques across diverse linguistic and cultural settings.

References

1. AbiSamra N. (2003). "An analysis of errors in Arabic speakers' English writing" Mourtaga K. (Ed.), Investigating Writing Problems among Palestinian Students Studying English as a Foreign Language, unpublished doctoral dissertation.
2. Alhaysony M. (2012). "An analysis of article errors among Saudi female EFL students: A case study", Asian Social Science, Vol. 8, No. 12, pp. 55–66, available online at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n12p55>.
3. Ammar, A., & Spada, N. (2006). One size fits all? Recasts, prompts, and L2 learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543–574.
4. Althobaiti N. (2014). "Error correction in EFL writing: The case of Saudi Arabia, Tai University", paper presented at the 17th Association International de Linguistic Appliquée World Congress 2014, Brisbane, Australia.
5. Amara, N. (2015). The Importance of Correcting Students' Errors in EFL. Published by Journal of Languages and Translation Vol 01 Issue 01/ January 2021, Department of English, Hassiba Benbouali University, Chlef.
6. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The Contribution of Written Corrective Feedback to Language Development: A Ten-Month Investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 193–214.
7. Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the Linguistic Accuracy Level of Advanced L2 Writers with Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 207–217.
8. Brown, H. (2000). Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc. (Ed.), Investigating-writing problems among Palestinian students studying English as a foreign language. Unpublished doctoral dissertation.
9. Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *IRAL*, 5, 161-170. 8. Corder, S. P. (1974). Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition. London: Longman.
10. Chong, S. W. (2019). A Systematic Review of Written Corrective Feedback Research in ESL/EFL Contexts. *Language Education & Assessment*, 2(2), 70-95. <https://www.castledown.com/journals/lea/article/view/lea.v2n2.138/273>.
11. Darus S. (2012). "Error analysis", in: Peter Robinson (Ed.), The Routledge Encyclopedia of Second Language Acquisition, New York: Routledge, pp. 213–215.
12. Ellis R. and Barkhuizen G. (2005). "Error analysis: Analyzing learner language", in: R. Ellis & G. Barkhuizen (Eds.), Analyzing Learner Language, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 51–71.
13. Ellis, R. (2009). Task-Based Language Teaching: Sorting out the Misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19, 221-246.
14. Farrokhi, F., & Sattarpour, S. (2012). The effect of direct written corrective feedback on improvement of grammatical accuracy of high-proficient L2 learners. *World Journal of Education*, 2(2), 49–57.
15. Ferris D. R. (2013). Treatment of Error in Second Language Student writing (2nd ed.), Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press retrieved June 5, 2014, from Project MUSE database.
16. Han, Z-H. (2004). Fossilization: Five central issues. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 212-42.
17. Lawrence Jun Zhang, Muhammad Rahimi. (2014) EFL learners' anxiety level and their beliefs about corrective feedback in oral communication classes, system Volume 42, 2014 ISSN 0346-251X.
18. Lee, E.J. (2013). Corrective feedback preferences and learner repair among advanced ESL students. *System*, 4, (1), 217-230.
19. Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Corrective feedback in the classroom: An experimental study. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 19(1), 1–14
20. Lyster R, Saito K, Sato M. "Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching*. 2013; 46(1):1-40. Doi: 10.1017/S0261444812000365
21. Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error Correction in ESL: Learner's Preferences. *TESL Canada Journal*, 10(2), 71. <https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v10i2.619>
22. Roothoof, H., & Breeze, R. (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective-feedback. *Language-Awareness*, 25(4), 318–335. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2016.1235580>
23. Russell, Victoria, 2009. Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): where do we stand today? VL - 6 - Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching. SP - 21- 31.
24. Reiko, Yoshida (2008), Learners' Perception of Corrective Feedback in Pair Work. Volume 41, Issue 3, Pages 525-541 10.2167/la429.0 JO - LANGUAGE AWARENESS <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1259479.pdf>
25. Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions Concerning the Role of Grammar Teaching and Corrective Feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85, 244-

258.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0026-7902.00107>
26. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *Product Information International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10, 209-241.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/iral.1972.10.1-4.209>
 27. Sheen, Y. (2007). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and Language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255–283.
 28. Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(3), 286–306.
 29. Shintani, N., Ellis, R., & Suzuki, W. (2014). Effects of written feedback and revision on learners' understanding and use of two English grammatical structures. *Language Learning*, 64 (1), 103–131.
 30. Simel, T & Chali, G., (2025). Effectiveness of error correction techniques in writing classes: Perspectives of EFL undergraduate students and teachers. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*.10.30574/wjarr.2025.25.2.0517
 31. Truscott J. and Hus A. Y. (2008). “Error correction, revision, and learning”, *Journal of Second Language Writing*, Vol. 17, pp. 292–305.
 32. Valizadeh, M. (2020). The Effect of Comprehensive Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Learners' Written Syntactic Accuracy. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 11(1), 1-10.
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1259479.pdf>
 33. Zhang, T., Chen, X., Hu, J., & Ketwan, P. (2021). EFL Students' Preferences for Written Corrective Feedback: Do Error Types, Language Proficiency, and Foreign Language Enjoyment Matter? *Frontiers in Psychology* 12, 660564
<https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/psychology/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.660564/full>
 34. Zhu, Y., & Wang, B. (2019). Investigating English language learners' beliefs about oral corrective feedback at Chinese universities: a large-scale survey. *Language Awareness*, 28(2), 139–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2019.1620755>