12. *Johnson R., Preston B., Floyd O.* Teaching the Second-Language Testing Course through Test DevelopmentbyTeachers-in-Training. – Teacher education quarterly, 1999. – P. 71-82.

13. *Kleinsasser R. C.* Transforming a postgraduate level assessment course: A second language teacher educator'snarrative. – Prospect, 2005. – Vol. 20. – P. 77-102.

14. *Kvasova O. A.* Case of Training University teachers in Developing and Validating Classroom Reading Test Tasks. In Tsagari D. (ed.) Classroom-based Assessment in L2 Contexts – Cambridge Research Publishing, 2016. – P. 54-74.

15. *Kvasova O., Kavytska T.* The assessment competence of university foreign language teachers: A Ukrainian perspective. – Language Learning in Higher Education. 2014.Volume 4, Issue 1. P. 159–177.

16. *O'Loughlin K.* Learning about second language assessment: Insights from a postgraduate student on-line subject forum. – University of Sydney Papers in TESOL, 2006. – Vol. 1. – P. 71-85.

17. *Stiggins R. J.* Evaluating classroom assessment training in teacher education programs. – Educational Measurement : Issues and Practice, 1999. – Vol. 18 (1). – P. 23-27.

18. *Taylor L.* Communicating the theory, practice and principles of language testing to test stake holders: Some reflections. – Language testing, 2013. – Vol. 30 (3). – P. 403-412.

Квасова О. Г. Курс підвищення компетентності у мовному тестуванні для викладачів університетів України.

У статті пропонується обґрунтування потреб у курсі підвищення кваліфікації у мовному тестуванні викладачів іноземних мов, що працюють в університетах України. Схарактеризоване поняття "компетентність у мовному тестуванні та оцінюванні", на основі чого визначений предмет навчання у межах курсу. Описані зміст та структура курсу. Наведений приклад одного із модулів курсу, який був пілотований автором статті у кількох університетах країни. Висновки, зроблені на підставі даних пілотування, можуть слугувати підґрунтям для подальшої дослідницької роботи у цьому напрямку.

Ключові слова: компетентність у тестуванні та оцінюванні, курс підвищення компетентності у мовному тестуванні, зміст і структура курсу.

Квасова О. Г. Курс повышения компетентности в языковом тестировании и оценивании для преподавателей университетов Украины.

В статье предлагается обоснование потребности в курсе повышения компетентности в языковом тестировании преподавателей иностранных языков, работающих в университетах Украины. Охарактеризовано понятие "грамотность в языковом тестировании и оценивании", на основе чего определен предмет обучения в таком курсе. Описаны содержание и структура курса. Представлен один из модулей курса, прошедший пилотную апробацию в нескольких университетах страны. Выводы, сделанные на основе данных пилотирования, могут быть использованы в дальнейших исследованиях проблемы.

Ключевые слова: компетентность в языковом тестировании и оценивании, курс повышения компетентности в языковом тестировании, содержание и структура курса.

Kobylianska I. V.

ERROR CORRECTION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING

This article analyzes approaches and methods in foreign language teaching which relate to the correction of errors committed by the learner of a second language, in this case English. The difference between the term error and mistake as understood by linguists is established. The types of error which are typically committed by the learner, error analysis, the error treatment and various techniques available to the teacher providing positive feedback are considered. The final part of article describes the ways in which errors might be corrected in the language learning situation and considers the diversity of approaches is taken up in the Common European Frame work.

Keywords: *learners' errors, treatment of errors, classifying errors, corrective feedback, positive feedback.*

Over the last decades few issues in L2/FL learning and teaching have attracted as much controversy as the role of grammar instruction and error treatment in the second language classroom. Error treatment is a source of a great deal of discussion -arguments for or against its efficacy- and even some controversy about the best way to approach the issue of corrective feedback. The main reason for this controversy is to know how to increase the effectiveness of corrective feedback in the communicative classroom, or rather, how to integrate feedback on errors into communicative language teaching. Error correction research has exclusively focused on teachers' corrective feedback strategies, although much less has been done to find out about learner uptake (that is, student responses immediately following the feedback). Whilst there are those who consider grammar correction a bad idea or that it does not work when insisting on its possible harmful effects on interlanguage development, there exists nowadays an overall consensus on the idea that feedback on grammar correctness is necessary because learners need to receive information about ungrammaticality. Likewise, corrective feedback has always been considered to be one of L2 teachers' main duties. A review of literature shows that both grammar and error treatment have always been the major concern for language teachers [2, p. 62].

Second language learning is generally a complex and time-consuming process. Given the view of language learning as a creative construction process it seems then reasonable to assume that L2 learning without errors is something unconceivable, that is, errors are an integral part of language learning. There is no doubt that corrective feedback, that is, the feedback teachers give to students when correcting their production, contributes to facilitate L2 knowledge construction. Likewise, the expectation of being corrected constitutes one of the most important learners' preferences. When and how errors should be corrected has always been one of the main dilemmas for language teachers as decision-makers. Indeed, decisions about what, when and how to correct errors may be problematic for those committed to encouraging communicative interaction in the class.Today in classrooms around the world the issue of error treatment is extensively discussed.

Certainly, many studies have been carried out for years. The main way of investigating the development of L2 acquisition is by analysing diverse samples of learner language, focusing particularly on their errors when learning an L2 and how these deviant forms or structures change over time (Ellis, 1997). Hence, errors and mistakes need to be analysed carefully because they may provide us with some of the keys to the understanding of *second language acquisition* (henceforth SLA), offering guiding evidence on how the new language is actually learned and what strategies or procedures L2 learners employ when discovering the L2 [1].

Learners' errors have always been of interest to both language teachers and researchers. Despite its speculative nature, Error Analysis (henceforth EA) is still widely used in most language classrooms to investigate specific questions in SLA. Undeniably, language teaching benefits from the findings of linguistics, including EA in many ways, that is, language instruction cannot separate itself from the findings of EA. In fact, EA is closely related to the study of error treatment in language teaching. The fact is that EA dominated the field of SLA research for a long time despite its limitations and weaknesses. It must also be claimed that EA is based on the theory of language learning as a process of cognitive development. Unlike Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis which acknowledged that LI was the major source of error in SLA, one of the significant conclusions reached in EA studies was that the majority of errors did not come from interference caused by the native language influence, but were rather "interlanguage-intemal" errors [4].

The fact is that it is not easy to account for the sources of errors, that is, why these were made.

The **aim of the article** is to analyze errors typically made by learners of English and providing effective feedback on error to L2 learners in classroom.

What can we learn from errors?We can discover a lot. Let us now consider the different reasons for focusing on learners' errors. Analysis of L2 learner's errors may help us to discover learner's common difficulties and problems when processing the new language data as well as identifying the cognitive strategies or mechanisms employed such as overgeneralization and

simplification when learning the new language. Through EA L2 researchers can discover more about the psycholinguisticprocesses involved in the L2 learning. The fact is that the evidence or information on errors helps FL teachers, researchers and L2 learners as well and constitutes significant data for all of them [4].

It is important that the teacher tries to separate the errors from mistakes when attempting to decide what form of remedial correction is to be made to help the EFL learner. Is the learner committing an error because he or she is attempting to produce language forms or structures which have never before been encountered in the target language, or is the language form incorrect due to a slip of the tongue or tiredness or for other reasons which may afflict even the native speaker from time to time?

How can we distinguish between errors and mistakes? It may seem obvious to state that if a learner consistently makes the same mistake we are to assume that he or she has not learned the correct usage of the particular form or structure and is committing an error. If the student sometimes makes a slip in performance and at other times uses the form correctly then this would indicate a mistake. If the student's attention is drawn to the slip and self-correction takes place, then we assume the student made a *mistake*. If, however, the student is unable to provide self correction for his own inaccurate usage then an *error* has been committed. H. Douglas Brown gives further precision to the term "mistake":

"A mistake refers to a performance error that is either a random guess or a slip in that it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly. All people make mistakes in both native and L2 situations. Native speakers are normally capable of recognizing and correcting such lapses or mistakes... These hesitations, slips of the tongue, random ungrammaticalities and other performance lapses in native speaker production also occur in L2 speech. Mistakes, when attention is called to them can be self-corrected [2]".

The Oxford Dictionary of English gives the following definitions of the terms "error" and "mistake":

- Error: the state or condition of being wrong in conduct or judgement.
- Mistake: an action or judgement that is misguided or wrong-something,
especially a word, figure or fact which is not correct; an inaccuracy [1].

As we can see, from the above definitions, the two terms, error and mistake can almost be considered as synonymous in everyday English usage.

Errors are sometimes classified according to vocabulary (lexical error), pronunciation (phonological error), grammar (syntactic error), misunderstanding of a speaker's intention or meaning (interpretive error), production of the wrong communicative effect, e.g. through the faulty use of a speech act or one of the rules of speaking (pragmatic error). In the study of second and foreign language learning, errors have been studied to discover the processes learners make use of in learning and using a language [1].

L2 teachers tend to know what types of errors learners are prone to make when discovering the new language because errors are, to a certain extent, predictable in some way. Through errors L2 teachers can infer how much their students have learned and, consequently, they discern their learning progress. To put it another way, errors let them know how far towards the goal the learner has progressed and what remains to be learned, that is, what is lacking in his or her linguistic competence. Similarly, errors can be seen as a means of feedback because they provide useful information on how effective both language teaching methodology and teaching styles are. Furthermore, errors indicate the points that require further attention. It must be also added, as Ellis and Barkhuizen claimed, that "an understanding of how learners learn an L2 should inform how teachers teach". Similarly, SLA researchers may also see how the L2 learning proceeds and develops over time. In analysing learner language errors we can better understand the process and sequence of acquisition of English as a second/foreign language. In fact, learner errors provide useful feedback which can help us to identify specific and common areas of difficulty, that is, linguistic deviations constitute useful indicators of the potential sources of learning difficulty. By analysing their errors we may even discover those features of language which are causing serious learning problems or difficulties to L2 learners. They also give an indication as to whether learners

are ready to learn what the teacher wants to teach them next. Thus, learners' errors provide highly useful evidence of how L2 is being learned or acquired at a particular stage of language learning. Finally, L2 learners can learn a lot from errors as well [5, p. 33].

EA constitutes an objective procedure for analysing second language data from samples of learners' language so as to explain the possible causes of errors learners make when discovering the new language. It aims to discover and explain what learners really know about the new language being learned in an effort to understand how they process the new language data. However, we need to bear in mind the fact that what L2 learners know does not necessarily correspond to what they actually do when attempting to communicate in the new language. Therefore, we need to distinguish between what learners know and what they can actually do. It seems then reasonable to go beyond the purely descriptive level and to seek an explanation for certain linguistic phenomena. Language teachers have been doing this for years but recently, partly as a result of increased interest in psycholinguistic research, successive attempts have been made to make more systematic and formal analyses of errors in the belief that errors, if studied systematically, can provide valuable insight into the language learning process. Therefore, it seems reasonable to undertake systematic analyses of learners' errors.

EA is generally carried out in successive stages because it involves first collecting errors, studying them, classifying them in various ways and suggesting possible causes. In order to analyse learners' errors, it seems reasonable to start first with the recognition process, followed then by the error description process. It is true that identifying an error goes beyond explaining what an error is. The first step in analysing learner errors is to identify them but recognition is not easy. The fact is that most L2 teachers usually detect learners' errors without great difficulty because these are prone to particular mistakes. In fact, learners tend to use their linguistic resources in predictable ways which does not mean that we can then identify all learners' errors [5].

When describing and classifying learners' errors in linguistic terms, we may discover those features of the new language which are causing serious learning problems among learners.In this sense, Corder suggested that we should analyze those errors that occur repeatedly. This way only systematic errors would be taken into consideration. Concerning this issue, Ellis stated that "Classifying errors in these ways can help us to diagnose learners' learning problems at any stage of their development". Then we come to the next step – explanation stage [3].

Once errors have been identified and described, they need to be explained and finally evaluated. Thus, identifying the cause of an error can be highlyproblematic. As a matter of fact, explanation of errors is still largely speculative because of our limited knowledge of the psychological and neurological processes involved in language learning. The same error could be looked at from various points of view. Hence, it is difficult to determine whether a particular error was caused by mother tongue interference or because of the confusion of the rules of the target language.

Once we have decided to give an explanation from a particular point of view, we can start classifying the errors. But there are a number of problems in classification as well. The main problem one faces when classifying errors is that one particular error can be classified in several ways. The fact is that it is not always possible to assign an error to only one level of description. Errors may be classified according to the level of language: phonological errors, lexical errors, syntactic errors and so on. From linguistic data alone, it is often impossible to determine what kind of error a learner is making [5].

Whenever a language is learned or acquired one is faced with the problem of errors which appear when rules have not been perfectly learned or are temporarily forgotten. The fact is that errors cannot be ignored at all or otherwise they may become fossilized or become permanent. Priority should then be given to those errors which may seriously hamper communication and understanding because the fact is that some errors are more serious than others. It is very well known that errors cannot be seen as serious obstacles to be overcome or erradicated because they constitute an unavoidable feature of language learning, being considered as a part of language creativity as well. These 'unwanted forms' cannot be seen as signs of failure or as something undesirable. In answer to the question whether error-making can be seen as a linguistic 'sin' or a

learning device, the fact in my opinion is that errors, far from being bad, represent a natural and necessary phase of L2 learning. In fact, errors can be claimed to be an essential condition for the development of L2 learning. Given that learning takes time and that nobody learns a language without making mistakes, errors are unavoidable in discovering a new language. Nowadays errors seem to be regarded as sign of achievement or progress in learning, that is, they provide evidence that learners are discovering and internalizing the new language. In addition, they may indicate the level of difficulty in learning. It must also be added that errors actually tend to disappear over time [5].

In analyzing the common errors we noticed that the native language influence in terms of direct literal translation is the major cause of many of their ungrammatical productions. Many, if not, all the subjects tend to translate from native language to english when communicating in english. It seems that it is not easy for them to "think in english" [3].

Do errors upset and discourage EFL teachers? Of course they do. L2 teachers feel obliged to deal appropriately with errors. The question is how and how much? It has been shown that an over-emphasis on error correction can become counterproductive since it may discourage learners, even though too little can be equally negative. In this sense, CEFL (*Common European Framework of Reference for Languages*) described that "mistakes which are mere slips should be passed over, but systematic errors should be corrected". Finally, the fact is that we need to know what types of errors learners make and why when discovering a new language [4].

When teachers hear a mistake they have a number of options regarding how to deal with an error in a FFI (*form focused instruction*) phase of a lesson. Let's imagine a student produces the incorrect sentence: *Yesterday J went in Rome.*The teacher can rely on:

Recasting: reformulate the utterance by giving a corrected model: *Yesterday I went toRome.*This can be done casually without drawing too much attention to the error: "*Oh yes, you went to Rome. Did you enjoy yourself?"*Or attention can be drawn to the error by emphasising the part of the sentence that has been reformulated: "*/ went to Rome"*.

Elicitation: the teacher tries to elicit a corrected sentence by promptingthe student in a variety of ways: by repeating the student's utterance up to the point where the error occurs, hoping for self-correction: "*Yesterday 1 went..***".**

Requesting Clarification: the teacher can ask for clarification about the sentence indicating there is a problem by using **facial or hand gestures** or verbally with expression like "sorry?" or "are you sure?"

Explicit correction: the teacher indicates clearly that there is an error and provides a corrected version: *"No, not 'Iwent* **in** *Rome'.*You have to say "*Yesterday / went* **to** *Rome".*

Metalinguistic feedback: the teacher provides information or comments about the students' utterance: "*Remember that after the verb to go the preposition we use is* **to"** *[4]***.**

Teachers should also give **positive feedback** with facial gestures (smiling, nodding, expressing satisfaction), hand gestures (thumbs up) or verbal comments.

A teacher gets to know students over time and develops the ability to intuitively use different techniques with individual students depending on their learning styles and personality. To some extent feedback is tailored to suit the student.

The treatment of errors is a highly complex process and studies show that teachers are often inconsistent when providing corrective feedback. On the one hand, these discrepancies include mismatches between how teachers believe they should approach errors and how they actually operate in the classroom; inconsistencies also exist in the fact that teachers may correct a specific error at a given moment, and ignore it at a later stage. At the same time, there is, depending on the corrective stance adopted, a wide range of possible alternatives to the provision of feedback. This diversity of approaches is taken up in the Common European Framework, which invites users to reflect on some of the possible procedures, which include the following:

- All errors and mistakes should be immediately corrected.
- Immediate peer-correction should be systematically encouraged to eradicate errors.
- All errors should be noted and corrected at a time when doing so does not interfere with communication.

• Errors should not be simply corrected, but also analysed and explained at an appropriate time.

• Mistakes which are mere slips should be passed over, but systematic errors should be eradicated.

• Errors should be corrected only when they interfere with communication.

• Errors should be accepted as transitional interlanguage and ignored [5].

• In terms of specific forms of corrective feedback, Lyster and Ranta identify six types as well as an additional seventh type called *multiple feedback* which involves a combination of the six mentioned below:

• Recasts, which involve correct teacher reiteration of incorrect utterance.

• Elicitation, which may involve teacher pausing to allow students to continue an utterance, the use of questions to ask how something is said, or requests for reformulation of an erroneous utterance.

• Clarification request, which suggests there is something wrong with the comprehensibility and/or accuracy of an utterance and asks for clarification.

• Metalinguistic feedback, which may include metalanguage and comments which indicate there is an error.

• Explicit correction, which is direct provision of the correct form.

• Repetition, which often highlights the erroneous utterance [2].

In this particular study recasts were found to be used most frequently in the classroom, although, elicitation, clarification request, and repetition were found to generate higher levels of uptake by students. In Doughty and Varela, however, recasts were found to be useful in correcting certain specifically targeted grammatical items. Furthermore, Lyster and Lyster and Mori find that recasts fulfill a number of purposes in addition to the provision of feedback, including the maintenance of communication, focus on content and scaffolded classroom learning.

Other studies suggest that direct forms of correction are more useful. Varnosfadrani and Basturkmen, for example, find that explicit feedback creates more attention, possibly because learners may not readily understand what is erroneous in their utterances when provided with implicit correction. To some degree, these findings are supported in Nassaji, who, on examining the effectiveness of elicitation vs. recast forms of feedback, finds that while both may be helpful, they were more effective when used in a more explicit way. Another form of explicit correction is to be found in metalinguistic feedback. Sheen examined metalinguistic correction and studied the effects of this type of feedback in contrast to a direct-only and a control group. Results showed that while the types of feedback improved learner accuracy, metalinguistic correction offered better results [3].

Numerous studies have shown the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive classroom atmosphere and feedback would appear to be a particularly relevant aspect to consider in this area. Given the fact that certain students are often reluctant to produce oral messages in the FL classroom, it is necessary to avoid situations where students feel too intimidated or embarrassed to speak. Here, simple, common-sense procedures could be applied such as allowing students to finish what they are saying or praising their efforts. All **of**this may take place having previously explained the importance of affect in the language classroom so that students will feel comfortable speaking in class and at the same time also accept incorrect utterances from their peerswithout attempting to ridicule them [2, p. 55].

Undesirable forms of anxiety should be avoided, and perhaps one **of the**most useful ways to do so is to allow students to express themselves in pairs and small groups so that they can build confidence. At the same time, their own contributions to correction through self-repair as part of planned and, perhaps, negotiated spaces in the language programme may enhance the acceptance **of**error as part of language learning and to engage them more fully, both cognitively and affectively in the feedback process [4].

To sum up, the treatment of errors and its close relationship to the affective states of students in the language class offers the teacher an interesting area in which to observe, investigate and develop. By focusing on approaches to feedback adopted in the classroom, the teacher may identify mismatches between his or her own beliefs regarding how, when and which types of feedback should ideally be emloyed and what is actually used. The information gathered from such reflective practices could be helpful for teachers own self-assessment. At the same time, however, given the variety of approaches available and the sometimes conflicting bodies of evidence regarding the usefulness of feedback, the classroom may also represent a space in which teachers may test hypotheses in order to see what works best for them and their students.

Teachers have the ability to avoid the imbalance which sometimes exists between cognitive and affective concerns, where a focus on correction may lead to negative learning experiences which may lead to resentment and eventual abandonment of formal instructional settings. Part of the task of teaching involves creating the necessary conditions for learning to take place. When establishing the bases of a language programme, therefore, it is necessary to take into account not only those areas which deal with the learning, acquisition and communication of the L2, but also the affective domain. Corrective feedback has an important role to play in this area, not only in terms of preventing anxiety and sustaining motivation, but also in protecting students' identities and engaging them in their own learning process.

R e f e r e n c e s :

1. *Ancker W.* Errors and the corrective feedback // updated theory and classroom practice, in English Teaching Forum Online, 2000. – p. 246-257.
2. *Arends R.* Learning to Teach. – Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006. – 397 p.
3. *Bocanegra A.* ET AL (ED): English for Specific Purposes // Studies for Classroom Development and Implementation. – Cadiz: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Cadiz, 2007. – p. 319-329.
4. Council of Europe // Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. C.U.P., 2001. – p. 29-45.
5. *Freiermuth M. R.* L2 Error Correction: Criteria and Techniques // in Second Language Studies, 1998. – Issue 21 (1). – p. 128-142.

Кобилянська І. В. Виправлення помилок у викладанні іноземної мови.

Стаття аналізує підходи та методи викладання іноземної мови, які стосуються корекції помилок, здійснені студентами другою іноземною мовою, в даному випадку англійською. Встановлено різницю між термінами "error" та "mistake" за висловленнями лінгвістів. Розглядаються типи помилок, які зазвичай здійснюються студентами, трактування помилок та різні методи, доступні для викладача для забезпечення позитивного зворотного зв'язку. Заключна частина статті описує методи виправлення помилок у процесі вивчення мови та розглядає різноманітні підходи відповідно до Загальноєвропейського зразка.

Ключові слова: помилки студентів, пояснення помилок, класифікація помилок, коригувальний зворотний зв'язок, позитивний зворотний зв'язок.

Кобылянская И. В. Исправление ошибок в преподавании иностранного языка.

Статья анализирует подходы и методы преподавания иностранного языка, которые касаются коррекции ошибок, совершенных студентами наиностранном языке, в данном случае на английском. Установлено разницу между терминами "error" и "mistake" за высказываниями лингвистов. Рассматриваются типы ошибок, которые обычно осуществляются студентами, трактовка ошибок, различные методы, доступные для преподавателя дляобеспечения положительной обратной связи. Заключительная часть статьи описывает методы исправления ошибок в процессе изучения языка и рассматривает различные подходы в соответствии с Общееевропейскимобразцом.

Ключевые слова: ошибки студентов, объяснения ошибок, классификация ошибок, корректирующая обратная связь, положительная обратная связь.