Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.*

EFL Saudi Students Attitude towards Language Errors Deduction in Written Exams: Problems and Recommendations

 3
 Amani Salmeen¹

 4
 ¹ Jubail University College

 5
 Received: 8 December 2018 Accepted: 5 January 2019 Published: 15 January 2019

7 Abstract

10

 $_{\rm 8}$ $\,$ Jubail University College follows a strict language deduction policy for written exams in all

9 courses in the English Language Program for bachelor students. 20

11 Index terms—student?s attitude, language deduction, jubail university college

¹² 1 I. Introduction

UC strives for excellence when it comes to its graduates. To achieve that, it regularly reviews and updates its 13 teaching practices and assessment strategies to ensure the fulfillment of its vision and mission to provide quality 14 education. To address concerns regarding some students writing proficiency, especially when it comes to common 15 language errors made by EFL students, it had introduced the language deduction policy in 2015. 20% of the 16 total grade for every formal written exam (Midterm, final examination, and some quizzes) is deducted; resulting 17 in 20 marks deduction out of the overall score of the course-100. This policy applies to all areas of the degree: 18 linguistics, TEFL, Writing, Literature, Translation, and Language Skills. Some advocates of the deduction believe 19 that it is the best way to encourage students to improve their English language proficiency (spoken and written). 20 On the other hand, some teachers think of it as discouraging and impeding students rather than a motivation for 21 change while others believe that the best way is to reduce the deduction percentage in order to boost students' 22 confidence and provide non-punitive alternatives for improving student's language. 23

²⁴ 2 a) Problem Statement

Students' high proficiency in English as a foreign language is the main goal that the English Language Department at JUC is trying to achieve. The mission to produce graduates who meet the demands of the job market and community has inspired the language deduction policy. However, students' attitude towards this policy may cause them to actually refrain from expressing themselves freely. As a result, this study is conducted to help understand the learners' attitude and problems with the language deduction policy as well as provide recommendations to improve students attitude and motivation, which are vital to students improved performance.

³¹ 3 b) Significance of the Study

Understanding students' motivation to be expressive in the foreign language is vital to fulfill the objectives of every language course. Thus, this research is carried out to help identify the issues with the language deduction policy. The findings of this research should help improve students' performance at Jubail University College in terms of written communicative competence and learners' attitude, which in turn improve students overall

36 performance.

³⁷ 4 c) Aims and Objectives

The research focuses on achieving the following aims and objectives: ? To investigate students' attitude toward the language deduction policy ? To identify the problems encountered by the students when it comes to deducting

marks for language errors? To provide recommendations to improve students' performance in exams

5 d) Methodology 41

The primary data was collected through a survey distributed electronically among the students. A total of 32 42 female students from various levels at Jubail University College responded to the survey. Scholarly work, journal 43 articles, and other online sources were used to collect the secondary data. The information gathered from the 44 secondary data was essential in creating the foundation of this research. 45

e) Limitations 6 46

59

60

61 62

63

83

The research has the following limitations: 47

? The research will be limited to Jubail University College's students only. ? The research results will be 48 limited since only 32 students will be subjected. ? The study will focus on female students only. 49

II. Literature Review 7 50

According to Krashen (1992), for EFL\ESL students to acquire the language, it is important to take into 51 consideration the affective factors, such as selfconfidence and motivation (qtd. in Almohaimeed & Almurshed, 52 2018. P.435). Students attitude toward learning is crucial as demotivated students perform poorly and their 53 linguistic competence tends to be lacking as a result of their demotivation. In fact, affective factors are very 54 significant that they are juxtaposed with cognitive skills ??Brown, 2014, P.143). They are very important for 55 learning to take place. Brown (2014) comments: 56

It can easily be claimed that no successful cognitive or affective activity can be carried out without some 57 degree of self-esteem, self-confidence, knowledge of self, and belief in your own capabilities for that activity. 58

Affective barriers will only hinder students' development. In fact, focusing on rewarding rather than intimidation proved to be more effective. In a study to measure the impact of a positive attitude towards reading conducted by Cunningham & Stanovich (2001), children who read for enjoyment performed better (qtd. in ?olgar-Jerkovi?, Jenko & Lipec-Stopar, 2018, p.202). Their interest in reading maximized their learning experience. Moreover, students who have a positive attitude towards learning seem to be more receptive and responsive than those who do not. The question remains whether language deduction is really as effective as it was intended to

64 be; taking into consideration students' attitude and its effectiveness in preventing language errors. 65

According to James (2013), the recognition of errors in students' language may vary form one teacher to 66 another. He refers to a study which took place in Germany by ??enghnhaun (1975) where over 30 error types 67 went undetected by 57% of teachers. This clarifies that some teacher's ability to detect errors might be limited, 68 and some measures have to be taken to address this point. It is assumed that some teachers are more tolerant 69 than others when it comes to detecting language errors. As a result, students' attitude and proficiency might 70 be affected. However, teachers training and courses have come a long way since then, and many EFL teachers 71 undergo extensive training to meet the standards of modern education. This does not mean that the issue is 72 completely solved, but at least the negative effects of it are minimized. ??iparsky (1972) categorizes foreign 73 language learners' errors into two categories. First, errors which appear in the structure of the sentence and 74 could impede understanding, which he refers to as global errors. Second, localized errors, which occur in the 75 secondary structure of a sentence. These errors do not affect the understanding nor hinders communication even 76 if the structure of the sentence is not completely accurate (qtd. in Cheng, 2015). The type of errors that is 77 tackled in this research falls under the second category. Students tend to make the same common language 78 errors among EFL students; namely grammar, punctuation, spelling, word choice, and subject-verbagreement. 79 The question is no longer whether these errors should be tolerated or not as the students are already treated as 80 English major students. The focus is on whether the deduction percentage actually improves learner's attitude 81 and improve the overall academic performance of the students or not. 82

III. Research Results 8

The majority of the respondents (50%) were junior students, which makes it safe to say that their feedback reflects 84 their understanding and perception of the issue and its effect on student performance as well as satisfaction. The 85 students' evaluation of their own performance was taken into consideration. 68.8 % of the students evaluated 86 their level of proficiency as intermediate; 21.9% as advanced and 9.4% as lowerintermediate while none opted 87 for beginner. It is quite clear that the advanced students are far less in number than the intermediate students, 88 which could mean that the majority of the students have gaps in their knowledge of the language. This is evident 89 90 in the teacher's observation of their answers in exams.

91 The majority of students lose many marks for language errors despite providing accurate content, which 92 demonstrates student's weak evaluation of their proficiency earlier in the survey. However, many of the students 93 could be placed as lower-intermediate in a standardized proficiency test, at least based on their performance in written exams, despite being senior and junior students, due to their poor grammar and skills. Based on the 94 survey, students seem to fail to realize the level of performance that is expected from them. 95

When asked about the language deduction policy, 34.4% agreed with it while 59.4% disagreed. It is safe to 96 assume that the higher achieving students do not mind it and may even view it as a welcomed challenge while 97 the weaker students fear its effects on their already low marks. 98

Many teachers constantly encourage students to work on their language; especially in EFL settings where the 99 classroom seems to be the best option to practice the language in an authentic or semi-authentic environment. 100 Strategies and methods of improvement vary, and a good point to start is to understand that it is not a teacher's 101 102 job only but a shared task between both the student and the teacher. In fact, the students' responses support 103 this claim as 53.1% of the respondents seem to agree that improving students spelling and grammar is a shared responsibility between the student and the teacher. Reading seems to be the most common practice among 104 students to improve their language (43.8%). 28.1% relied on online exercises to improve their language while 105 15.6% did not try to address this issue outside of the class. A small percentage opted for watching movies, writing 106 paragraphs, or joined the English Department's Writing Center. The majority of the students seems to be eager 107 to improver; nonetheless, they seem to be lost as what to do. It appears that some students might have problems 108 with being independent learners and do not know how to improve without guidance. Even if that is the case, 109 some appear to fail to approach their advisors ask for help despite having available resources and assistance in 110 the college campus. 111

When asked about the most common type of language errors, a towering 71.9% selected spelling. This could be traced to a number of reasons, some of which are dependence on technology when writing paragraphs or essays, not taking notes during classes, and not practicing outside of the classroom. The second type of mistakes is grammar, which is expected in any EFL environment; however, students should work hard to try to improve their grammar by the available means. According to the survey, students seem to believe that they make grammatical and spelling mistakes in exams due to lack of knowledge and practice, pressure in exams, not revising before submitting their exam paper, lack of reading, and focus on memorizing the subject.

For the students who opted for its ineffectiveness, they claimed that it discourages them from studying as they know that the effort they put into studying might not be fully reflected in their performance. Others think that it only demotivates them without seeing actual improvement while some fail to see the point behind deducting marks. Others thought that deducting marks for language errors is actually beneficial and students should try to improve their proficiency level rather than criticize the language deduction policy.

As alternatives for deducting marks for language errors, students suggested offering classes for weaker students, allowing students to use the language more in the class by doing presentation and activities in the class, reducing the deduction percentage, writing workshops were students write freely and receive feedback without worrying about losing marks, assign weekly readings and letting students write reviews, and mandatory classes for struggling students.

Generally speaking, students seem to worry about their marks more than their language when it comes to language errors deduction. The need for a solution for language errors in students' exams is undisputed. However, according to the students' responses, a revision of the policy and more practical solutions are needed.

¹³² 9 IV. Discussion

To provide a cultivating environment for the students, the ELP has already taken a step this semester by proposing a revision of the language deduction policy. The ELP also provided a Writing Center as well as an Exam Help center to help the weaker students as of this academic year. Students' responses reflected that the majority of them are not well-informed when it comes to the available sources. Many struggle with language errors yet very few students actually show up to the writing center sessions. This issue needs serious consideration.

Student's attitude towards learning is very important as any noticeable progress is linked to their motivation and satisfaction. Although deducting errors might be discouraging, students' main concern seems to stem form the percentage of deduction rather than the policy itself.

While the majority of the respondents claim to read as a way of improving their communicative competence, it is not always guaranteed that it will have a positive outcome. Gass (1988) asserts that acquisition of language requires input, which reading could provide, but she questions the type of input that is needed. Reading is vital for English major students both as a skill and as learning tool; however, not all students respond to reading in the same way. That could be traced to the fact that individual learners have different learning styles and preferences. Nevertheless, For EFL English major students, it is paramount that they read as many texts as possible, or at least the assigned readings. Some students fail to read their assigned novels or articles.

One important issue with the language deduction policy is that it does not provide direct solutions to students' 148 knowledge gaps. While it definitely makes the students aware of their areas of weakness, it does not directly 149 address students' individual weaknesses. The reason could be because it was not designed to do so, but the value 150 of such a step must be The vast majority of the students believe that the policy for deducting marks for language 151 152 errorsespecially in non-writing exams was ineffective in improving students' performance nor encouraged them 153 to do well. On the other hand, 25% agree with the policy and experienced its effectiveness. Few express that 154 it has helped a little, but they got discouraged when they saw their perfect score before the deduction. Few have express that marks should be deducted for grammar only and not for minor spelling or word choice errors. 155 clear to the students. Students need to understand that it is not put in place merely to reduce their marks but 156 to encourage them to work harder to identify their limitations and take action. The Writing Center could be a 157 good place to start, but students must be more aware of its services and actually dedicate the time and effort to 158 attend and participate in its sessions. 159

¹⁶⁰ 10 V. Recommendations

161 ? The Writing Center and the Exam Help Center must collect feedback from the students to address the issue 162 of poor students' attendance and devise a plan to attract more students. ? There should be an entrance exam 163 after the prep year program for students who wish to major in English. For the department to produce highly 164 qualified graduates, only students with a certain proficiency level should be admitted, and those who fail to meet 165 the required proficiency level to enroll in the program should be offered other options to meet the admission 166 requirements. ? More reading based assignments should be provided for students to practice critical thinking 167 and interacting with texts.

¹⁶⁸ 11 VI. Conclusion

The department of English Language takes care of students' needs and as well as tries to meet the demands of the job market. Although the majority of the graduates are highly qualified, there are always areas to be improved. Society is growing and the globalized market's demands are going by the minute. This is mostly the cause to continually assess teaching and assessment practices and review them.

173 Students today are more conscious of their goals. They are more involved as classes become more learner-174 centered. The engagement of the student ensure a fulfilled objective and a qualified graduate. The study has 175 concluded that while this policy is a step in the right direction, it needs to be assisted by other tools to achieve 176 the desired goals.

- 177 [Jerkovi? et al. ()] , I ? Jerkovi? , N Jenko , M L Stopar . 2018.
- 178 [Affective Factors and Reading Achievement in Different Groups of Readers International Journal of Special Education (2019)]
- 'Affective Factors and Reading Achievement in Different Groups of Readers'. International Journal of Special
 Education Retrieved April 22, 2019. 33 (1) p. .
- 181 [Brown ()] H D Brown . Principles of Language Learning and Teaching, 2014. Longman. (4th edition)
- [James ()] Errors in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis, C James . 2013. New York, NY:
 Routledge.
- [Almohaimeed and almarshad (2018)] 'Foreign Language Learners' Attitudes and Perceptions of L1 Use in L2
- Classroom'. M S Almohaimeed , H M &almarshad . Arab World Journal 2018. April 22, 201922, 2019. 9 p. .
 (Retrieved)
- [Gass ()] 'Integrating research areas: a framework for second language studies'. S M Gass . Applied Linguistics9
 1988. 2 p. .
- 189 [Cheng ()] 'Inter language-based Error Analysis in Higher Vocational and Technological College EFL Education
- in China'. X Cheng . Journal of Language Teaching and Research 2015. 6 (3) p. .