RESEARCH ARTICLE

Interlanguage in the Classroom: Guiding the Learner to Discover Learning Processes

Leila BOUCHEBCHEB [1], Radia BOUGUEBS [2], Redouane AISSANI [3]

[1] The Higher School of Teachers Assia-Djebar of Constantine, Algeria. Email: bouchebcheb.leila@ensc.dz ; ORCID- 0009-0000-9618-2352
[2] The Higher School of Teachers Assia-Djebar of Constantine, Algeria. Email: bouguebs.radia@ensc.dz ; ORCID- 0000-0002-3548-7416
[3] Frères Mentouri University of Constantine 1, Algeria. Email: reginarachel@yahoo.fr

Abstract:

Current thinking on the role of error in learning tends to emphasise its positive aspect, challenging a field that has long been marked by didactic rejection. Errors must be accepted as an inevitable part of the teaching/learning process. This is why it is important to focus on work in situational contexts that allow learners to draw on their resources. Building knowledge requires FLE teachers to work with learners on the origin of errors, which allows them to discover where the difficulties, confusions or unacquired concepts lie. By focusing on the errors made, it is possible to transform obstacles into objectives and help learners adjust their learning and improve their interlanguage.

Both the teacher and the learner need to understand the logic behind the error process, analyse it and accept it as a normal stage in teaching/learning.

Introduction:

For a long time, mistakes were associated with failure and fault. Any deviation from the norm and the rules of language usage was considered a mistake, and those who made them were seen as poor students who deserved to be punished.

Mistakes were synonymous with dysfunction and lack of mastery and were to be avoided. Among the consequences of this methodology were the following :

· Learners place excessive importance on grades. Mistakes made take a back seat, even if the teacher offers remedial exercises.

· Avoidance : When speaking freely or semi-guided, learners participate using simple statements they are very sure of, so as not to take any risks.

· Laconicism : As the number of errors is generally directly related to the length of the statements, learners speak as little as possible.

· Silence : The learner takes absolutely no risks and prefers to remain silent.

To truly use errors to aid learning, we should think of them as a training tool rather than something to be corrected at all costs. Properly addressing errors would combine tolerance and a benevolent attitude with a constant focus on helping learners develop self-monitoring and self-correction skills, as Astolfi clearly states: « Didactic effectiveness is only possible through the internalisation of new frameworks for understanding what is at stake in the didactic act, and error is at the heart of this ».

Over the last decade, trends in language teaching have converged towards greater

consideration of the learner, their needs and learning strategies. Language teachers are expected to facilitate the development of highly complex language skills, with new categories that go beyond the traditional division into four skills. It has become necessary to review the status of errors in this new context, as well as to question a rather unstable, subjective and changing field that has long been marked by rejection and didactic negation. In short, our hypotheses are as follows: errors represent a training tool capable of regulating the teaching process, which means placing them at the heart of learning; cognitive practices relating to errors lead, among other things, to the acquisition of the strategic component of language competence.

The shift from the indirect paradigm (the 'grammar-translation' method) to the direct paradigm does not fundamentally change attitudes towards error: methods referred to as "direct" or 'active' exclude it from learning, while audio-oral or audiovisual methodology tends to avoid as much as possible the risk of error on the part of the learner. These approaches are consistent with behaviourist principles, which view language learning as a mechanical process of forming automatic responses and errors as a source of failure to be eliminated or reduced.

We approached this study based on a number of theoretical hypotheses derived from the cognitive approach that has dominated educational thinking in this century. Our approach is twofold: on the one hand, we analyse conceptions of error in didactic works, and on the other hand, we observe and interpret practices relating to error in the interactional context of the language classroom at the ENS in Constantine.

What is the current status of error in language learning? How can error be placed at the heart of this learning? What is the impact of the school context on error? What are the sources of error? How can we intervene when learners make errors?

I.Literature review

1. Errors in research on language acquisition and learning:

Since the 1960s, research on language acquisition/learning, particularly contrastive analysis, error analysis, studies on interlanguages and bilingual speech, has begun to focus on errors. Articles that can be considered as founding principles of the current constructivist perspective have contributed to giving errors a positive status. 'If what appears to me to be an error is ultimately more effective and powerful than a supposed truth, it is important to follow this error, because it is in it that truth and life lie, which I would miss if I persisted in what is reputed to be true. Light requires darkness, without which it cannot be light.' (C.G.Jung, 1953:12).

André Lamy (1976: 122) saw error as 'a springboard to correct expression'.

The relationship between prior learning and new learning, between acquired know-how and know-how to be acquired, justified the use of contrastive analysis. Following the same logic, comparing languages would have made it possible to predict learning problems by comparing the phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexical and semantic structures of the source language and the target language. It would then have been possible to envisage progressions that took into account the difficulties inherent in learning that would arise from the differences and similarities between the two languages.

Considered by Besse and Porquier to be the "strong" hypothesis of contrastive analysis, the hypothesis that advocated the development of contrastive descriptions for educational purposes is closely linked to the theory of interference. according to its author, F. Debyser 1, learners tend to transfer the formal and semantic characteristics of their mother tongue into the foreign language, both in reception and production. Similar features would be easily transferred, and therefore easier to learn, while different features would give rise to negative transfer, or interference, and therefore to errors, which would simply be manifestations of learning difficulties: contamination, accident, deviation, slippage or

transfer with negative connotations. Besse and Porquier point out that the formal distance or proximity between languages is a factor that can lead to very different behaviours. It is difficult to dissociate the positive effects of transfer from its negative effects: "In fact, the same transfer process can lead, depending on the case, to success or error, depending on the external criteria adopted. Furthermore, several processes may combine or follow one another to produce statements in a foreign language, whether correct or incorrect, without it being possible to disentangle the respective roles and effects of positive and negative transfers." (Besse & Porquier, 1986: 202).

To speak of transfer between two linguistic systems in the context of language learning is to ignore the essential fact that what is at stake in the learner's mind is not two systems or two grammatical descriptions, but rather the grammar internalised by the learner of their mother tongue and what they know or discover about the foreign language at a given stage of learning. Similarly, positive and negative transfer cannot occur in the learner between two linguistic systems, but between their own acquisitions of one or the other. Transfer can only occur between what has already been acquired, from the mother tongue and the foreign language, and the new data being acquired. In institutional foreign language learning, the influence of the mother tongue on the target language is not the only source of transfer, as prior learning of the foreign language is itself a source of "internal" transfers, both positive and negative. Conversely, highlighting similarities between the two systems often leads to over-generalisation or errors.

2. Error or mistake: Definition:

A mistake is a slip of the tongue, a random error caused by fatigue or psychological factors such as lack of attention, effort, confidence or interest, or by stress. The learner knows the structure but is unable to use the correct form. The error involves intellectual activity on the part of the learner. It is the result of incomplete, poorly assimilated or poorly consolidated knowledge. Errors may

or may not be systematic. Sometimes the learner could correct themselves, but fails to do so due to a lack of reflection. If they cannot self-correct, they may still recognise that they have made a mistake and sometimes explain the rule.

3. Analysing errors:

In the case of French as a foreign language, the first in-depth error analyses were carried out in Africa, using the 'BELC grid', the first typological grid, which was developed with a view to producing a Year 6 textbook for pupils in Africa. a corpus of more than 2,000 copies (dictations and essays) from Congo and other French-speaking locations was compiled; methods that prioritised taking into account the specificity of each context were used to develop the teaching materials. Two distinctions were made: between 'relative error' (the form exists but is unacceptable in the context) and 'absolute error' (written or oral form does not exist), and between 'graphic error' and 'oral error' for lexical and morphological errors. This grid has been the subject of much criticism.

It is not easy to decide on the 'expected outcome' when faced with an error. The absolute/relative distinction is relevant at the word level but not at the level of the syntagmatic sequence.

The diversity of aspects addressed by this first generation of error analysis revealed the complexity of the phenomenon; genuine explanatory analyses classified errors according to various typologies (relative/absolute, by addition/omission/replacement, on gender/number, etc.), established methodological distinctions (error/non-error, systematic/asystematic error, intralingual/interlingual error), created inventories and statistics to assess the frequency of errors, and attempted to identify potential causes, according to criteria borrowed from linguistic categories derived from traditional, structural, functional or transformational grammars. This is for teaching purposes, as error analysis has a dual objective: one theoretical, aimed at a better

understanding of foreign language learning processes, and the other practical, linked essentially to improving teaching.

Analyses based on cognitive psychology show that "one of the primary sources of errors, and undoubtedly the most persistent, is linked to the very efficiency of our cognitive functioning. " (M. Fayol, 1995: 140). Indeed, as P. Corder has shown, the occurrence of errors in foreign languages among non-native speakers is a natural, inevitable and necessary phenomenon, reflecting the gradual construction of interlanguages on the basis of successive hypotheses.

The systematic or typical errors that occur, and which are the main material for error analysis, are manifestations of a learner's "transitional competence". This type of error refers to an internalised system with rules, but the recurrence of certain 'erroneous' forms does not necessarily mean that they are representative of the interlanguage: this is the case with fossilisations, forms that are frequent or constant in a speaker's language, which they know to be 'erroneous' but cannot get rid of and which seem resistant to any pedagogical intervention. For example, we may hear first-year students enrolled in a French degree course using forms such as 'à côté de le cinéma' (next to the cinema), even though they are familiar with the rules of article contraction.

There are also cases where hesitation or alternation between a correct form and an incorrect form indicates insufficient competence or a change in progress. The identification of systematic errors, i.e. a system of errors, depends on the samples analysed and the conditions of speech production, both in a constrained educational setting and in spontaneous communication.

Studies show that teachers are often inclined to look for interferential explanations, whether or not they are familiar with the learners' source language. But in reality, interferential errors do not arise from differences between the two languages, but from the inadequacy of the system of correspondences that the learner constructs in response to these differences.

Error analysis has made a significant direct and indirect contribution to foreign language teaching at several levels: in improving pedagogical descriptions, in changing teaching and learning attitudes and practices, including those relating to the status of error, and in the design and content of teacher training programmes. Error research appears to be an important resource for analysing acquisition processes.

Other researchers emphasise the important role played by errors related to the interlanguage system itself: these errors are common to all learners, regardless of their L1, for a given target language. They consider this to be the case with overgeneralisation errors (e.g. on poudra based on the model of on voudra, content/malcontent based on the model of heureux/malheureux), or errors caused by non-compliance with rules or restrictions; none of these errors can be explained in terms of performance (fatigue, memory limitations) but rather in terms of competence; this type of error corresponds to attempts to construct hypotheses about the target language based on limited linguistic experience. Analysing errors allows us to discover the path taken by the learner and to understand their logic. The first step is to diagnose the type of error.

Is it a repetitive error that prevents the acquisition of new knowledge, or a temporary error caused, for example, by a misunderstanding of the instructions? In general, the errors made by one learner can be made by another. It is therefore very useful to work on the errors made by all learners. In conclusion, what was previously considered a shortcoming, or a failure is now seen as an indicator of learning from an acquisition perspective or as discursive know-how from an interactional perspective.

4. Dealing with mistakes in language classes:

In the classroom, oral interaction is at the very heart of the teaching process. The work of psychologists and psycholinguists

confirms that verbalisation and language exchange contribute to the dynamics of learning.

The 1990s saw the emergence of a wealth of research throughout the French-speaking world focusing on oral communication and classroom exchanges in all their forms, involving both teachers and learners. According to Kramsch, learning a foreign language is easier when placed in an interactive context.

The variety of discourse and a complex network of interactions transform the language classroom into 'a microcosm where the foreign language is learned and used primarily as an instrument of socialisation and acculturation' (C. Kramsch, 1991: 8).

In the language classroom, two types of discourse intermingle: on the one hand, the "foreign" discourse that forms the content of learning and that students strive to acquire, and on the other hand, the discourse that serves to facilitate this learning, i.e. the dialogue between teachers and students, which is didactic at times and natural at others. It can be said that error handling constitutes a kind of interface between the two types of discourse, insofar as corrections, self-corrections, reformulations and other compensatory strategies are involved in regulating interactions. This also gives rise to complex and sometimes problematic interactional phenomena, as C. Springer shows: "In the language classroom, the teacher is faced with the dilemma of a double constraint: to fully play the role of a native speaker and to fulfil their institutional role as a teacher. It is understandable that learners will also find themselves in this awkward situation, which can lead to misunderstandings: learners want to fully play their role as interlocutors, while teachers remind them through their corrections that they are only learners." (C. Springer, 1999: 46).

C. Kramsch also notes that language classes are sometimes subject to a lack of discursive coherence due to the ambiguity of intentions, tasks or roles that they involve: emphasis on form/attention paid to the message, didactic tasks/communicative tasks,

the role of the teacher/learner and that of the natural interlocutor.

A teacher who asks a question with an apparently communicative intention, followed by a request for lexical information, conveys an ambivalent and contradictory message: we expect exchanges aimed at simulating a communication situation in L2 as the preferred language, but we find that there is an implicit second 'contract' that takes priority, requiring correct sentences and prohibiting the use of the mother tongue. Following the same ambiguity of intentions, real 'breaks' occur in the exchanges: either the "code-switching" is not taken up and integrated by the teacher, or the teacher emphasises form without taking into account the meaning of the exchange. Contrary to what would happen in a natural situation, the decisions taken by the teacher at the interactive level can create confusion and even lead to errors.

II. Methodology
5. Example of error practice in FLE classes at ENSC:

"Interpreting errors will always be a risky practice in the teaching profession (as it is never completely definitive or certain), but it is nevertheless essential, as we believe that only a thoughtful response that takes into account the specific characteristics of each student's work can provide relevant support to accompany the student on their learning journey. " (M.Marquillo-Larruy, 2003:119).

5.1. Working hypotheses:

As we have already pointed out, the language classroom is a privileged place for observation and experience with regard to the network of interactions that occur there. Describing situations of verbal interaction in the classroom requires a methodological choice. In our case, we have focused on the variety of situations and the analysis of the concomitant variations in oral production.

We have chosen to develop this perspective here for two reasons: firstly, the diversity of didactic aspects observable in FLE classrooms that are related to the treatment of oral errors (feedback, the construction of

problem situations based on learners' misconceptions, methods of intervention on errors, the production of meaning, communication strategies); secondly, the variety of objective or subjective factors (organisational, didactic, relational, emotional) that influence practices relating to errors.

Our initial hypothesis is that, if errors are a process and not a product, we should see if and how it is possible to make them a training tool in FLE classes rather than something to be corrected at all costs.

The observation is carried out in a single field with a first-year French degree class (MEP). One of the avenues of analysis consists of attempting to identify, using both an analytical and synthetic approach, practices relating to error, with reference to two different levels: organisational and relational. The main tool for our analysis is an activity observation grid.

The organisational aspect is linked to the teacher's didactic choices and the practical approaches implemented with a view to achieving objectives. Information on the organisational aspect (the type of learners, the level of learning, the institutional objectives, the type of tasks, materials, instructions or techniques, the atmosphere in the classroom) helps us to make an initial breakdown of the practice observed. At the same time, it is a question of establishing a link between the teaching practice in question and the treatment of errors within that practice, in order to try to reflect on the question: to what extent are practices related to error (teachers' and learners' conceptions and attitudes) determined or at least influenced by the organisational conditions of teaching?

The relational plan relates to the communication methods and strategies used by the teacher to facilitate learning. The elements that our observation focused on were interactions (verbal and non-verbal) and feedback, in particular: the questioning techniques used, the formulation of instructions, turns of speech and the distribution of speaking time, and the teacher's voice and gestures.

In addition, we observed the type of relationships established between the actors in the classroom (collaboration, negotiation, distance), the teacher's attitude towards the learners, the type of feedback provided to them, and the degree of interest shown by the pupils. Our goal is to determine the impact of the relational sphere on error-related practices: what are the conceptions and attitudes towards error that can be observed in the classroom? Is error valued, considered a training aid, or, on the contrary, associated with value judgements and banned? How can we reconcile the teacher's encouraging attitude with their systematic correction of errors?

We would like to point out that the teaching we provide to these students during an oral practice session is more intensive than extensive; the simple fact of being exposed to oral French as a foreign language for four and a half hours a week immerses students in a highly intensive situation.

The group we observed for 20 hours is a group of MEF (20 students).

5.2 Teaching guidelines and approaches :
a) Organisational aspects:

Among the elements observed at the organisational level, we have chosen the following as points for reflection: the type of learners, the approach to language and the teaching materials. The question is not so much whether these elements are a source of errors among learners, but rather how the treatment of errors could be modulated in relation to the factors mentioned.

Observation element	Learning group (20 MEF students) 1st year A	Consequences for the practice of "error"
Assigned learning level	From A1 (introduction or discovery) to B1 Threshold	Determine each learner's real level; differentiated treatment
Institutional objectives	Communicating in FLE (among themselves and with the teacher)	Taking into account different expectations (learners, institution)
Main objectives of the activities	Linguistic and cultural	Identify obstacles from learners' misconceptions and define the objectives in context
Tasks	Generally the combination of several tasks, with the help of the teacher or material	Ensure the production of meaning, which is a source of motivation
Supports	Authentic visual, textual, and oral supports	Choose appropriate supports so as not to induce errors
Instructions	Require repetition and reformulations	Avoid misinterpretations; set clear "contracts" with learners
Techniques used by the teacher	Frontal questioning, autonomous work, sub-groups with guidance	Enable knowledge-building through autonomous and group work

Table 1

The 'contract' that makes the classroom a teaching space is explicit: only French is spoken during lessons and situations are always formal learning situations, assessed with a mark at the end of the week.

We have noticed different practices related to error. The ambiguity of roles (teacher/non-native speaker) is greater in formal learning situations, as learners are often encouraged to speak, not so much to express their ideas, but because 'they have to speak' in order to improve their language skills (see example below); even if the teacher does not systematically correct errors, this requirement to 'speak' has consequences, firstly in terms of the attention the learner pays to the form of their statements at the expense of meaning, and secondly in terms of their attitude towards errors; This could result in the student being reluctant to speak for fear of making mistakes: the effect will therefore be the opposite of what the teacher intended when encouraging the student to speak.

Example:

T: What is your opinion?
S: My opinion... everything is fine!
T: Everything is fine? Oh! She's not saying what she thinks, is she? What does a home, marriage and family mean to you?
S: I don't think about that.
T: But you could imagine! What is the best thing for your family?
S: A house.
T: Very good... but why?
S: In my opinion, men can't easily have a house!
E: Very well... can, continue, and what else?
And: I think they (want to) work and earn money.

We wanted to highlight the role of working in subgroups, which also has an impact on errors, insofar as group work is associated with beneficial confrontations and adjustments, and even corrections between students. During the preparation phase of the sub-group task, we noticed that, apart from the roles to be played, there are 'real' roles that are defined: leaders who direct the work or correct

others. In these circumstances, it is desirable for the teacher to provide minimal guidance to help the group's actions, encourage exchanges, but prevent disrespect and irony, which can have inhibiting effects.

b) Relationships:

The relational aspect provides information about the complex framework of interactions and feedback that shapes students' relationship with knowledge. The following table shows the data relating to the relational aspect in the field observed and the consequences of this in terms of errors.

Observation Element	Group MEF 1st A ENSC	Consequences for Practice
Questioning	Generally solicited in a nominative way	Revisit the status of the question as a learning tool
Distribution of speaking time	The teacher speaks more than the learners	Pay attention to words and their meaning
Type of teacher-learner interactions	Collaboration and negotiation	Stay attentive/listen actively
Teacher's attitude	Encourages, listens, promotes autonomy	Adopt a positive, confident attitude
Learners' attitudes	Generally motivated; Variable attention	Help the learner take charge of their learning
Teacher's voice and gestures	Voice = pedagogical tool; Gestures ritualized to signal an error (tongue click sound) as well as for explaining different course sequences	Provide non-verbal signals to help the learner adjust their activity; Choose "codes" accepted by everyone

Table 2

Our goal here is to determine how relationships impact error management practices. Based on classroom observations, we consider it obvious that communication within the classroom influences attitudes towards errors (both those of the teacher and those of the learners towards their own errors).

In general, we have found that the teacher's attitude is essential in shaping the student's relationship with knowledge; for example, the teacher encourages questioning and doubt with statements such as: 'Perhaps...', 'Don't you think that...?' 'How so? Think about it,' 'What could it be?', etc. In this way, learners are encouraged to ask questions and make hypotheses, which helps them take charge of their learning and become more autonomous. Furthermore, the most

important thing in the process of knowledge construction is to 'teach how to pose problems rather than answer questions', in order to avoid 'keeping students dependent on the teacher's questioning' (D. Descomps, 1999:91).

Thus, we noticed that our learners were more 'receptive' to the teacher's influence with regard to the concept of error, which was valued as a tool for raising questions. This was evident in the practice of not giving the answer, inviting the learner to search, help others and self-correct: 'I don't know, it's up to you to find out'; 'You're wrong there. Correct it'; 'Are you sure?'.

5.3. Support used and variation on the same theme:

We analysed several recorded sequences to illustrate the variety of ways of intervening on errors. The transcripts record the dialogues between the teacher (T) and the learners ('L').

Material chosen: 'Text: Fighting the Lion'

Contextualisation elements: reading activity, role-playing to interpret three of the already familiar characters, subgroup of 5 students.

1. T: We have three people talking around the fire about what happened. OK? Who are the children and why?

2. L: A warrior, a sorcerer and a witch doctor.

3. T: Good.

4. T: Why isn't Yakouba going to fight the lion a second time?

5. A: Because (...) that's why the lion "doesn't want to eat and pair (...), to protect the cattle.

6. E: We don't want exploitation.

7. E: We don't want exploitation, continue your discussion.

8. A: That's all, Madam.

9. E: That's all... That's good, isn't it? . Do you understand, everyone?

10. Everyone: Yes.

11. Based on what you understand?

12. Based on what you understand?

13. E: What? Who said that?

14. A: No, madam, he's not mad, he's jealous of... he said "he doesn't care, well... ." He's not a warrior, he's useless... he's jealous.

15. E: So, I was able to blame what benefits me, he's useless... he played the jealousy card well.

16. E: Intrôle, without stopping, what's wrong with her, her face?

17. A: It's good for my son, and the lion doesn't attack the cattle and doesn't attack Yakouba.

18. E: Okay. And the witch doctor, I didn't understand everything either?

19. A: Actually, the witch doctor, madam, he asks why Yakouba isn't going... for the second time to fight the lion.

20. Is that all you said, the witch doctor? Well, he's not very wise, that witch doctor, he doesn't have much to say.

21. A: I knew he would suggest that Yakouba go a second time to fight the lion.

22. E: We didn't quite understand everything.

In this sequence, we have selected for analysis the part that follows the role-play, consisting of questions aimed at improving the students' performance.

Firstly, we noticed several alternative ways of giving negative feedback: asking other learners to confirm their understanding (9,11); asking students to repeat their lines while specifying which character is speaking (3,10); entering into the game and asking for clarification not from the students but from the characters they wanted to play (20); shaking up a problem of comprehension or perception of the message, as in the natural acquisition situation (16, 18, 22).

Another very characteristic element of the analytical sequences is represented by repetitions or quasi-repetitions (15), which are modes of 'rephrasing' used by the teacher to reinforce assertions or, depending on prosodic modifications, to cast doubt on previous formulations. In this case, hetero-reformulation (15) invites the student to refine their production and reinforces it in a positive way.

Finally, there is an example of fossilisation in this sequence because the same erroneous structure (4, 19, 21) appears three times in the same speaker. We believe that a formal correction at the end of the sequence would have been possible and would not have had any impact on communication.

Conclusion:

« Errors still have a bright future ahead of them. But if we do not know where we are going, we should at least know where we come from » (D. Descomps, 1999: 131).

We based our study on constructivist hypotheses, which marked a turning point in the conception of error, a turning point that originated in an increased consideration of the

learner and their learning strategies. We used two analytical approaches; the first allowed us to better understand the logic of error as it emerges from didactic work; the second familiarised us with the practice of dealing with errors in the interactive context of the language classroom.

We have attempted to demonstrate that errors are a training tool that can be used to regulate the teaching process and that it is possible to place them at the heart of the learning process.

With this in mind, we took into account at least three significant aspects: anticipating errors in order to develop curricula capable of preventing them from occurring, identifying errors, i.e. developing typologies and remediation methods, and intervening when errors occur in order to help learners understand, analyse and deal with them.

To address the first two aspects, we interpreted work on acquisition, which has made error research an important resource for analysing acquisition processes. Although studies based on contrastive analysis or error analysis have shown limitations, they have given us an insight into the role of error in language learning and enabled us to identify the seeds of current constructivist conceptions of error.

Intervening on errors in situ, at the moment they occur, requires prior preparation by both the teacher and the learner. It involves understanding the logic of the error in order to allow it to appear as a normal stage in the learning process, an indication of the learner's representation of the language system; errors also act as a mirror, reflecting information back to the teacher about the teaching approach; for the learner, errors should not be interpreted as failures but as indicators of a stage to be overcome. We can conclude that in the constructivist approach, errors trigger learning insofar as:

1.We take into account the production of meaning, i.e. the motivations, interests and needs of learners;

2. We create a framework conducive to the expression of learners' ideas;

3. We try to identify 'obstacles' and transform them into learning objectives in order to help students adjust their initial representations;

4. We view error as an evolutionary process, influenced by context, partners, new learning and forgetting, rather than as something to be corrected.

Our analysis in the field reinforces the idea that taking error into account in teaching/learning projects could be a constant concern for FLE teachers. We cannot understand or intervene in errors without taking the trouble to analyse them: analysis is inseparable from theoretical hypotheses that come before it; it is important to know why we favour one approach over another at a given moment; at the same time, it is not enough to tell a student that they are wrong, it is not enough to show them, they must be put in a situation where they can discover for themselves.

The true educational function of the teacher is to "train (in) the profession of learning: to move away from passivity and dependence, to learn to make choices, to be demanding. (D. Descomps, 1999: 85). The means to achieve this, in line with the current constructivist view of learning, focus above all on respecting the learner's words and taking into account their way of reasoning in order to better support them in their discovery, which is the true learning process.

Bibliography :
- Astolfi, Jean-Pierre, 2003. L'erreur, un outil pour enseigner. Paris: ESF éditeur.
- Besse, Henry & Porquier, Rémy, 1984. Grammaires et didactique des langues, Paris: Haïter Credit.
- Corder, Pit, 1980. 'Que signifient les erreurs des apprenants' (What do learners' errors mean?), in Langages no. 57, pp. 9-15.
- Descomps, Daniel, 1999. La dynamique de l'erreur dans les apprentissages (The dynamics of error in learning). Paris: Hachette.

- Fayol, Michel, 1995. 'The concept of error, elements for a cognitive approach,' in Intelligences, schooling and success, 1995, Ed. La pensée sauvage, pp. 137-152.
- Jung, Carl Gustav, 1953. Psychological healing, Geneva: Librairie de l'université Georg & Cie
- Kramsch, Claire, 1991. Interaction et discours dans la classe de langue. CREDIF, Paris: Didier.
- Lamy, André, 1976. 'Pédagogie de la faute ou de l'acceptabilité,' in Etudes de linguistique appliquée n° 22, pp. 118-127.
- Marquillo Larruy, Martine, 2003. The Interpretation of Error, Paris: CLE International.
  F. Debyser
- Reason, James, 1993. Human Error, Paris: PUF.
- Roubaud, Marie-Noëlle, 2005. 'Reconsidérer l'erreur' (Reconsidering Error), in Cahiers pédagogiques no. 438.
- Springer, Claude, 1999. 'Que signifie aujourd'hui être compétent en langues à l'école ?' (What Does It Mean Today to Be Competent in Languages at School?), in Les langues modernes, no. 3, 1999, pp. 42-56.