

## Oral Error Correction in Foreign Language Classrooms: Students' Attitudes

Manal Mohammad Alghazo<sup>(1)\*</sup>

(1) Associate Professor - Department of Curriculum and Instructions, College of Educational Sciences - Mutah University, Karak – Jordan.

Received: 10/05/2024

Accepted: 04/03/2025

Published: 30/06/2025

\* **Corresponding Author:**

[m-gazo@mutah.edu.jo](mailto:m-gazo@mutah.edu.jo)

**DOI:**

<https://doi.org/10.59759/educational.v4i2.502>

### Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students in public schools in Southern Almazar district towards teachers' correction of their oral errors. The study also aimed to investigate the students' attitudes towards the types of errors corrected by their teachers in the EFL classroom. This study is a descriptive analytical study that used a questionnaire as a tool to collect data on students' attitudes, and which was designed by the researcher based on previous literature. The questionnaire consisted of (25) items based on a five Likert scale, and it was distributed over two main domains. The first domain is the overall students' attitude towards teachers' error correction, and the second domain is regarding error types being corrected. The questionnaire was checked for validity and reliability before being distributed to the students. The participants of the study were 342 male and female students from tenth grade in public schools in southern Almazar district.

After obtaining the data, the results were analyzed statistically through mean scores, standard deviations, t-test and Levenes' test. The results of the study showed that participants have positive attitudes towards oral error correction, results also showed that the participants have a positive attitude towards the oral error correction by their teachers. The results also showed the positivity of students' attitudes towards the type of errors corrected by teachers inside classroom which is correcting vocabulary, pronunciation and grammar respectively. In addition, the results showed that there were no significant statistical differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in students' attitudes towards oral error correction in the classroom due to gender, and no significant statistical differences in students' attitudes towards the types of errors corrected by teachers due to gender. The study concluded that students need their teachers to correct their oral errors whether these errors are lexical, pronunciation or grammatical errors. The researcher recommended conducting another study to investigate teachers' attitudes towards error correction of students' oral errors, and another to investigate the methods of error correction used by teachers.

**Keywords:** Error Correction; Oral Error Correction, Students' Attitudes.

## تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية في صفوف اللغة الإنجليزية: اتجاهات الطلبة

منال محمد الغزو<sup>(1)</sup>

(1) أستاذ مشارك، قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس، كلية العلوم التربوية، جامعة مؤتة - المملكة الأردنية الهاشمية.

## ملخص

هدفت الدراسة الحالية الكشف عن اتجاهات طلبة الصف العاشر في المدارس الحكومية في لواء المزار الجنوبي نحو تصحيح معلمهم لأخطائهم الشفهية، كما هدفت الدراسة الكشف عن اتجاهات الطلبة نحو أنواع الأخطاء الشفهية التي يصححها معلمهم داخل الغرفة الصفية. تعد الدراسة الحالية وصفية تحليلية اعتمدت على الاستبيان كأداة لجمع البيانات عن اتجاهات الطلبة، والتي تم تصميمها من قبل الباحثة مستعينة بالأدب السابق. تكونت الأداة من 25 فقرة معتمدة على مقياس لكيريت الخماسي. قسم الاستبيان إلى محورين أساسيين: الأول آراء الطلبة بشكل عام نحو تصحيح الأخطاء اللغوية من قبل المعلمين، والمحور الثاني هو أنواع الأخطاء اللغوية التي يتم تصحيحها. كما تم التحقق من صدق الأداة وثباتها قبل توزيعها على الطلبة. بلغ عدد المشاركين في الدراسة 342 طالباً وطالبة من طلبة الصف العاشر في المدارس الحكومية في لواء المزار الجنوبي. تم تحليل النتائج إحصائياً عن طريق استخراج المتوسطات الحسابية والانحرافات المعيارية وحساب اختبار "ت" واختبار (ليفين). أظهرت النتائج أن الطلبة لديهم اتجاهات إيجابية نحو تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية من قبل معلمهم كما أظهرت إيجابية اتجاهات الطلبة نحو أنواع الأخطاء التي يصححها معلمهم داخل الغرفة الصفية، وهي تصحيح الأخطاء في المفردات واللفظ والقواعد على التوالي. كما أظهرت النتائج عدم وجود فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية عند مستوى الدلالة ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) في اتجاهات الطلبة نحو تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية داخل الغرفة الصفية تعزى لمتغير الجنس، وكذلك عدم وجود فروق دالة إحصائية في اتجاهات الطلبة نحو أنواع الأخطاء التي يصححها معلمهم تعزى لمتغير الجنس. خلصت الدراسة إلى أن الطلبة يحتاجون من معلمهم أن يقوموا بتصحيح أخطائهم الشفهية سواء كانت أخطاء في المفردات، اللفظ، أو القواعد. أوصت الباحثة بعمل دراسة أخرى تستطلع رأي معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية نحو تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية لدى الطلبة ودراسة أخرى تبحث في الأساليب المتبعة من قبل المعلمين في تصحيح الأخطاء.

الكلمات الدالة: تصحيح الأخطاء؛ تصحيح الأخطاء الشفهية؛ اتجاهات الطلبة.

---

---

## Introduction

Learning English as a foreign language has gained great importance in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. English is needed worldwide to conduct business and trade among different companies in different countries. It is also the language of science and technology. It is necessary for students to learn English in order to gain knowledge about modern technology written in English. In Jordanian schools English is taught as a foreign language from KG-12. Through the process of learning English students make many errors both written and oral. These errors are a natural part of the process of language learning. Errors are considered to be very important in foreign and second language learning. As a matter of fact, they are also very important to first language learning, (Corder, 1967; Selinker, 1972). Errors are quite important for teachers as well, because they guide the teacher to what students need to learn and what they have already learned, (Corder, 1981). Errors are defined as a deviation from a correct form, where the correct form refers to the native speakers' norm (Allwright & Bailey, 1991).

Dulay & Burt (1974) argued that making errors is an inevitable part of the language learning process, because it is a mental process where learners test out their formed hypotheses (Chomsky, 1959). It is through errors that learners attempt to try out the language. Errors are differentiated from Mistakes in that mistakes are deviant forms of language that can be corrected by the speaker and are not systematic. While errors are systematic and cannot be corrected by the speaker. Errors reflect the learners' competence (underlying Knowledge) of the target language norm, (Corder, 1967; Selinker, 1972). While mistakes reflect the learners' performance.

Errors in foreign language learning stem from two sources. The first one is interference from the first language (i.e. interlingual errors) (Ellis, 1994; Brown 2001). Interference errors may occur in different areas, such as in pronunciation, spelling, lexical items, and grammar. The second source for errors is within the target language itself. Such errors are called developmental errors or intralingual errors. These errors occur even by children learning native language. Intralingual errors may occur in different areas such as pronunciation, lexical items and

grammar. A child learning English as a native language may produce an irregular verb for example using the suffix (-ed) believing that this suffix turns every verb into the past form. Dulay and Burt (1974) showed that the developmental errors are more than interference errors in number. They found that 4.7% of children's errors were interference errors while, 87.1% were developmental errors.

In addition to errors being interference or intralingual, they occur in grammar, lexical items or pronunciation. Within the grammatical errors researchers such as Zahid Hurain (2023) found that the most grammatical errors found among speakers of English as a foreign language were omission and misinformation errors. He argued that these grammatical errors resulted from overuse of prepositions and incorrect word order. Grammatical errors can result from addition, omission, misinformation (Krisma, Y & Arif, B 2022). As for pronunciation errors, they are the most common errors committed by speakers of English as a foreign language. And are usually the result of interference from the native language (Kurnia, R., & Jabu, B., & Munir 2023). The third type of oral errors discussed in this research paper is vocabulary item error type. Learners of English as a foreign language usually make wrong choices with regard to vocabulary selection in their spoken language. Also lack of knowledge in the target language vocabulary leads learners to omit vocabulary during speaking, (Al Hosni, 2014).

Teachers in the classroom are required to deal with students' errors, and that is when oral error correction emerges. Corrective feedback is very important in foreign language learning (Alamri & Fawzi, 2016). Some linguists such as Lyster, Lightbrown and Spada, (1999) believe that corrective feedback is necessary and quiet helpful to students' learning. Schachter, (1998) argued that if errors are not corrected, the hypotheses set by the learner may become a rule and learned in the incorrect form. When teachers deal with errors they must decide on a technique to use for each error depending on the situation. This process of error correction may have positive or negative effects on students. Therefor students' attitudes towards oral error correction is very important. Considering that Learner's attitude is a factor in the learning process argues Candlin & Mercer, (2001). They explained

that the learners' attitudes may determine their success or failure in language learning. The current study investigates learners' attitudes towards type of errors corrected by teachers. Learners may have different views towards error correction reports Shi Guang (2017). Some may have positive attitudes while other may express negative attitudes towards Error correction in the classroom. However, the belief in this research is that error correction is important and is needed for the students to advance in their learning.

### Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

Learning English as a foreign language in Jordan is a very difficult process. It is mainly learned in the classrooms (taught through textbooks and teacher instructions). Very little chance is given to the students to learn it authentically. Students continually make many errors during the activities in the classroom. Teachers on the other hand continually make corrections of these different types of errors. The effect of error correction especially oral errors may have positive or negative effects on the students. The idea of this research hence, emerged, which is to investigate the attitudes of students (Males and females) about being corrected in front of their peers and their attitudes towards the types of errors corrected by their teachers in the classroom. The current study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the level of attitude of tenth grade male and female students' at southern Almazar public schools towards teachers' correction of oral errors?
2. What are the level of attitudes of tenth grade male and female students at southern Almazar public schools towards the types of oral errors corrected by their teachers?
3. Are there significant statistical differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in tenth grade male and female students' attitudes towards oral error correction and towards the types of oral errors corrected by their teachers due to gender?

### Study Significance

---

---

The goal for every teacher and for every students is for the student to learn to use the target language in a correct manner without any errors. Yet in the process of learning the target language students do make errors and teachers have to deal with these errors. Hence the current study is significant for both students and teachers alike. Once teachers understand and know about the way students feel about error correction, they will abide to how these students feel and perform their corrective feedback in a way suitable for the students. It is significant for the students as well in that teachers may feel at ease in correcting their errors. Therefore, the results are beneficial for both teachers and students alike.

### Study objectives

The main objective of this study is to examine the attitudes of 10<sup>th</sup> grade male and female students in public schools in southern Almazara district towards corrective feedback used by their teachers to deal with oral errors. The study also investigates the students' attitudes towards the types of errors the teachers correct in the classroom. Finally, the research also investigates significant statistical difference in students' attitudes towards oral error correction and the types of errors corrected in the classroom due to gender. The researcher hopes to shed light on oral error correction from students' perspectives and the attitudes towards the types of errors corrected. This is to enlighten other teachers about the subject so they can view the matter from students' perspectives.

### Literature Review

Studies of error correction began as early as 1977 when Chaudron examined the effect of different types of corrective feedback on students' oral production in a French immersion program. His main finding is that "repetition with emphasis" was more effective than other types of corrective feedback since it helped students reformulate the utterance in a correct way. Several researches have been conducted to investigate students' attitudes towards corrective feedback. One of

these studies was conducted by Ahangari & Amirzadeh (2011) who examine oral corrective feedback used by Iranian teachers at a university for elementary, intermediate, and advanced levels. The results showed that students had a positive attitude towards error correction.

A similar study conducted by Alhaysony, (2016) investigate students' attitudes towards corrective feedback as well. The participants were studying at the preparatory year at Ha'il University in Saudi Arabia. The results showed that student generally have positive attitude towards corrective feedback. They also preferred delayed feedback instead of immediate feedback. They accepted all six techniques of error correction with no specific preference for one over the others. Additionally, in Saudi Arabia, Alamri & Fawzi, (2016) examined Saudi EFL students' and teachers' perceptions of oral error correction and preference of oral error techniques. The participants were, EFL female university students and EFL university teachers. They used a classroom observation checklist and a questionnaire to collect the data. The study revealed a general positive attitude towards error correction in the classroom. Their study revealed that recast and explicit oral correction were the preferred techniques of error correction by both students and teachers alike. They recommended that teachers use other techniques in the classroom as well.

While in Iran, Saeb (2017) conducted a study to investigate Iranian students' and teachers' attitudes and preference for different amounts and types of oral corrective feedback. The researcher used two parallel questionnaires to gather the data. The result showed significant differences between students and teachers about the amount and type of oral corrective feedback. Students wanted to receive large amount of explicit corrective feedback while teachers felt that less feedback is better. Similarly, but in Saudi Arabia, Alkhamash & Gulnaz, (2019) investigated the beliefs of Taif university teachers of English as a foreign language about their use of feedback and their perception of its impact on students' performance. Fifty-seven teachers participated in the study. The results showed that the participants highly valued error correction in general.



Gamlo (2019) conducted a study to examine the preferences and perceptions of Saudi EFL learners with respect to correct feedback in speaking activities. The participants were sixty Female EFL students at the preparatory year in King Abdulaziz University in Saudi Arabia. The finding showed that the learners held positive attitudes towards corrective feedback of their oral errors. The findings also revealed that students want the errors to be corrected immediately by their teacher.

Zahid (2023) conducted a study to examine Grammatical errors made by students in Speaking English. The students are Bachelor degree students at a private university. The study's main aim is to examine the types of grammatical errors and causes of these errors. He found that the most grammatical errors were omission, misinformation.

AlGhafri, M., Mirza, C., & Gabarre, C. (2023) conducted a study to examine English language Omani students' attitudes towards teachers' oral corrective feedback strategies to examine the matching between the teachers' correction and students' preference of correction. They conducted interviews with students and asked questions such as what types of corrective feedback are used by teachers and preferred by students? The results showed that teachers used the "recast" type of feedback the most. While students preferred the "repetition" and "elicitation" types more. But in general students did prefer to be corrected when making errors. Finally, not finding research on oral error correction in Jordan, the researcher decided to conduct the current study to examine how Jordanian students view correction of their oral errors by their teachers.

### Methodology and Design

The study adopted a descriptive analytical design through a sample survey in order to describe and analyze the attitudes of tenth grade public school students (males and females) towards teachers' correction of their oral errors and their attitude towards the types of errors corrected by teachers' in English.

---

---

### **Population and Sample of the Study**

#### *Population of the study*

The study population consisted of tenth grade male and female students in public schools at southern Almazar district during the first semester of the academic year 2023/2024, which comprised of (1786) male and female students. (856) male students and (930) female students.

#### *Sample of the study*

The researcher followed a cluster random sampling to select the participants of the study from the schools of Almazar district. The study was conducted on (355) male and female students who were selected from different male, female and mixed public schools in the district. The mixed school is Mutah university model school. The process of collecting the data lasted for two weeks. After data collection ended and questionnaires were reviewed, (13) questionnaires were not selected to be analyzed for not having completed all the needed information. Therefore, the study sample consisted of (157) male and (185) female participant forming (342) male and female participants from the population of the study, which makes a percentage of (19.15%) of the population of the study. This study sample size is considered to be acceptable statistically according to Krejcie and Morgan table (1970). As for the qualitative characteristics of the participants in terms of gender the male students whose number was (157) made up 45.90 % of the population and the female students (185) made up 54.10% of the population.

#### *Pilot Study*

The questionnaire was distributed to a pilot sample from the study population but were not included in the sample of the study. The pilot study consisted of (35) male and female students who were selected randomly from four different public schools in southern Almazar district. The pilot study was conducted to verify the validity and reliability of the instrument.

### **Study Instrument**

---

The main research instrument was a questionnaire used to collect data from the study sample. Questionnaires are usually used for collecting data regarding students' attitudes towards a subject matter. The researcher prepared the questionnaire by reviewing previous related literature. It comprised of two main sections. The first section was to collect demographic data about the participants such as gender since it is a variable in the study, while the second section consisted of (25) items distributed as follows: (17) items concerning the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students' in public schools in southern Almazar district, towards oral error correction by their teachers, and (8) items concerning their attitudes towards the types of errors their teachers correct orally in the classroom. The types of errors included Grammatical errors, pronunciation errors and lexical errors.

### **Instrument Validity and Reliability**

#### **Instrument Validity**

##### **Face validity**

Face validity of the study instrument (i.e. the questionnaire) was obtained by presenting it in its initial form to specialists from different faculty at several Jordanian universities. It was presented to (9) arbitrators who were asked to give their opinions about the items in terms of appropriateness, and linguistic clarity. They were also asked to add, delete or modify any of the items in the questionnaire. Based on their suggestions (5) items were deleted while (6) items were modified. The questionnaire in its final version consisted of (25) items divided into two main domains. The first domain regarding students' attitudes towards oral error correction by teachers was reflected by (17) items, while (8) items reflected the second domain regarding students' attitudes towards the types of errors their teachers correct orally in the classroom.

##### **Internal Consistency**

Internal consistency was verified through distributing the questionnaire to a pilot sample consisting of (35) male and female students from the study population but not included in the study sample. Pearson's correlation Coefficient was calculated for each item against the overall coefficient score of the domain it belongs to: as presented in Table (1).

**Table (1): Correlation coefficient of individual item scores to the overall scores of the domains**

Attitude Towards teachers correcting oral errors				Attitude Towards Error types	
No	Pearson Correlation	No	Pearson Correlation	No	Pearson Correlation
1	0.735**	10	0.574**	1	0.611**
2	0.637**	11	0.607**	2	0.726**
3	0.689**	12	0.531**	3	0.648**
4	0.584**	13	0.638**	4	0.737**
5	0.644**	14	0.697**	5	0.651**
6	0.706**	15	0.552**	6	0.690**
7	0.772**	16	0.622**	7	0.621**
8	0.614**	17	0.684**	8	0.707**
9	0.716**				

**\*\*Significant at the (0.01) level**

Table (1) shows that the correlation coefficient of the items of the first domain to the overall degree of the domain at the statistical significant level (0.01) were between (0.574) and (0.772). while the correlation coefficient of the items of the second domain were between (0.611) and (0.737) which indicates internal consistency of the items of the two domains of the study.

#### Instrument Reliability

The reliability of the questionnaire was verified by calculating Cronbach Alpha and by the test re-test method of the pilot study. Table (2) shows the results of the reliability measures used to verify reliability.

**Table (2): Pearson Correlation and Cronbach Alpha values for the Reliability of the items of the study Instrument**

Domains	No of Items	Pearson Correlation	Cronbach Alpha
Attitude Towards teachers correcting verbal errors	17	0.895	0.864
Attitude Towards error types	8	0.906	0.837
All	25	0.901	0.915

Table (2) shows that the reliability of the items of the study instrument is quiet high. The value for Cronbach Alpha for the entire study instrument items was (0.915) and the value of the Pearson Correlation of the entire study instrument items was (0.901) which are both statistically significant at the level (0.05). Based on the validity and reliability measures used for the study instrument, the 25 items of the questionnaire were accepted.

### **Instrument Correction**

A five-point Likert scale was used to obtain students' responses to the items of the questionnaire. For the positive items "strongly agree" was marked with five points, "Agree" was marked four, "Neutral" was marked three, "Disagree" is given two points and finally "strongly disagree" is given a mark of one.

As for the negative items marking was as follows: "strongly agree" is given a mark of one, "Agree" is given a mark of two, "Neutral" is given a mark of three, "Disagree" is given a mark of four, and "strongly disagree" is given a mark of five. The scores were then divided into three main level namely (High, Medium, and Low) Based on the following formula:

Category length = (the highest value – the lowest value) / number of options= (5-1) / 3 and hence the level is calculated as follows

A: Low level: less than or equal to (2.33)

B: Medium level: more than or equal to (2.34) to less than or equal to (3.67)

C: More than or equal to (3.68) to (5)

### **Statistical Data Analysis**

To answer the research questions, statistical package SPSS V. 24 was used for descriptive and analytical measurements.

1. Frequencies and percentages, Mean scores and standard deviations.
2. t-test for independent samples, one-way ANOVA, and Scheffe test for post hoc tests to indicate the sources of differences for the mean scores.

### **Results**

**Results Pertaining to the First Research Question:** What are the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students' at southern Almazar public schools towards teachers' correction of their oral errors?

To answer this question mean scores, standard deviations and level of agreement of the attitude of students in the study sample for the first domain were calculated as shown in table (3).

**Table (3): Mean scores, Standard deviations, and level of agreement of the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students at southern Almazar schools towards teachers' correction of their Oral errors**

No	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level of agreement
9	I don't get bothered when my teacher corrects and explains my errors	4.313	0.80	1	High
1	I believe that teachers' correction of my oral errors can improve my speaking	4.301	0.91	2	High
10	Teacher's correction of my oral errors helps me identify my weakness in English.	4.246	0.86	3	High
8	I like it when my teacher tells me what kind of error I made and corrects it for me.	4.173	0.93	4	High

No	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level of agreement
2	I believe that correction of my oral errors will help me to not repeat my speaking errors in the future.	4.114	0.95	5	High
5	When my teacher corrects my speaking errors, I don't get annoyed.	4.059	1.04	6	High
3	I prefer my teacher to always correct my errors during speaking activities.	3.918	1.01	7	High
6	Teachers should correct students every time they make an error when speaking English.	3.886	1.12	8	High
7	I don't feel discouraged when the teacher corrects me in front of the class.	3.784	1.08	9	High
17	When my teacher corrects my speaking errors, I feel embarrassed.	3.643	1.30	10	Medium
11	When my teacher corrects my English without letting me know that she/he is correcting me, I feel happy.	3.635	1.18	11	Medium
4	I am not worried about making errors when I speak English.	3.597	1.16	12	Medium
13	I would feel much more comfortable if my teacher never corrects my errors in class.	3.518	1.27	13	Medium
12	I usually feel embarrassed when my teacher corrects me in front of the whole class.	3.386	1.28	14	Medium
16	I feel interrupted every time my teacher corrects my oral errors	3.225	1.16	15	Medium
15	Teachers should never correct their students' errors when the students speak English.	3.222	1.31	16	Medium
14	I feel frustrated, after my teacher corrects my oral errors.	3.175	1.21	17	Medium
	All Items	<b>3.776</b>	<b>0.45</b>	-	High



Results in Table (3) indicate that the overall attitude of students in the sample study towards teachers' correction of their oral errors is high. The mean score of the overall attitudes of students for all the items is (3.776) with a standard deviation of (0.45). Student responses to the items shows that (9) items out of (17) items are at "high" level with mean scores ranging from (3.784) to (4.313). The results also show one of the most important items at "high" level is item (9) which states, "*I don't get bothered when my teacher corrects and explains my oral errors.*", this item ranked first in the "high" category with a mean score of (4.313), in second place is item (1) "*I believe that teachers' correction of my oral errors can improve my speaking*" with a mean score of (4.301). In third place is item (10) which states "*Teacher's correction of my oral errors helps me identify my weakness in English,*" with a mean score of (4.246) followed by item (8) which states "*I like it when my teacher tells me what kind of errors I made and corrects it for me.*" With a mean score of (4.173).

Results also showed that some of the important items in the "Medium" level are as follows: Item (17) ranked number one with a mean score of (3.643) and it states "*when my teacher corrects my speaking errors, I feel embarrassed*". The item that ranked two in the "Medium" level is item (11) which states "*when my teacher corrects my English without letting me know that she/he is correcting me, I feel happy.*" With a mean score of (3.635). Followed in third rank by item number (4) with a mean score of (3.597) which states "*I am not worried about making errors when I speak English*" and in final rank is item number (14) which states "*I feel frustrated, after my teacher corrects me*" which has a mean score of (3.175). Results also showed that the Standard deviations of the items ranged between (0.80-1.30) which is considered an indicator of the homogeneity of responses.

**Results Pertaining to the Second Research Question:** What are the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students at southern Almazar public schools towards the types of oral errors corrected by their teachers?

To answer the second research question, mean scores, standard deviations and the level of agreement of students' attitudes towards the items of the second domain were calculated as shown in Table (4).

**Table (4): Mean scores, Standard deviations, and Level of agreement of the attitudes of students towards the types of oral errors corrected by their teachers.**

No	Error types	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level of agreement
1	Grammatical errors	3.857	0.85	3	High
2	Pronunciation	3.998	0.88	2	High
3	Lexical	4.023	0.75	1	High
-	All Types	3.952	0.66	-	High

Table (4) above shows that the overall level of students' attitudes towards the type of errors corrected by their teachers is "high". This level is reflected by a mean score of (3.952) with a standard deviation of (0.66). Table (4) also shows that students' attitudes towards lexical errors came in first place with a mean score of (4.023) and a standard deviation of (0.75) and a high level of agreement. In second place are attitudes towards pronunciation errors with a mean score of (3.998) and standard deviation of (0.88) and a high level of agreement as well. Finally, in third place are attitudes towards Grammatical errors with a mean score of (3.857) and a standard deviation of (0.85) and a high level of agreement. These results indicate a high level of agreement for the three types of oral errors.

As for each individual error type, the following tables show the results for each item of each error type.

#### ***Grammatical Errors***

**Table (5): Mean scores, Standard deviations, and Level of agreement for students' attitudes towards the Grammatical errors**

No	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level of agreement
3	I don't feel embarrassed when the teacher corrects my grammatical errors in class	3.898	1.03	1	High
1	I like teachers to correct my grammatical	3.842	1.10	2	High

No	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level of agreement
	errors in speaking				
2	If I produce an incorrect sentence grammatically I would like my teacher to correct me	3.830	1.24	3	High
	Total Grammatical	3.857	0.85	-	High

Table (5) reveals that the general level of agreement of the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students towards correcting grammatical errors, is high with mean score of (3.857) and a standard deviation of (0.85). Results in Table (5) also show that for each item within grammatical error type the level of agreement is also high with mean scores ranging between (3.830-3.898). Results also show that the standard deviations of the individual items within the grammatical error types ranged between (1.03-1.24) which indicated homogeneity in students' responses to the items.

### *Pronunciation Errors*

**Table (6): Mean scores, Standard deviations, and level of agreement for students' attitudes for the Pronunciation errors**

No	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level of agreement
5	When I mispronounce some English words, I would like my teacher to correct me	4.029	1.07	1	High
4	I like teachers to correct my pronunciation errors in speaking	4.009	0.97	2	High
6	I don't feel annoyed when my teacher corrects my pronunciation during speaking	3.959	0.99	3	High
	Total Pronunciation	3.998	0.88	-	High

Table (6) shows that the general level of agreement of tenth grade male and female students towards oral correction of pronunciation errors is high with a

mean score of (3.998) and a standard deviation of (0.88). The results also indicate that the individual items of the domain are high in level of agreement with mean scores ranging between (3.959-4.029) and the standard deviations ranged between which indicates homogeneity among the members in their responses to the items.

### *Lexical Errors*

**Table (7): Mean scores, Standard deviations, and level of agreement for students' attitudes for the lexical error**

No	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Rank	Level of agreement
8	When I cannot find the appropriate words while speaking, I like teachers to choose the appropriate word for me	4.056	1.12	1	High
7	I like teachers to correct my lexical errors in speaking	3.991	1.03	2	High
	<b>Total Lexical</b>	4.023	0.75	-	High

Table (7) indicates that the general level of agreement of the participants of the study towards lexical errors is high with a mean score of (4.023) and a standard deviation of (0.75). Results also indicate that the level of agreement for individual items in the lexical domain range between (3.991-4.056) and the standard deviations range between (1.03-1.12) which indicates a high level of homogeneity among the responses to the individual items.

### **Results Pertaining to the Third Research Question: Are there significant statistical differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in tenth grade male and female students' attitudes towards oral error correction and towards the types of oral errors corrected by their teachers due to gender?**

To answer the third research question of the study, statistical analyses were conducted to uncover the differences in 10<sup>th</sup> grade students' at southern Almazara district attitudes towards their teachers' correction of oral errors and towards the types of errors corrected due to gender. Multiple variance analysis (MANOVA) was conducted after Levene's Test was performed to check for moderate distribution of data which showed to be (249) for attitudes towards correction of oral errors and (.338) for attitudes towards error types which indicates homogeneity in the responses of the two groups for both domains. Table (8)

shows the Mean scores and standard deviations of students' attitudes towards correction of their oral errors and the types of errors corrected due to gender.

**Table (8): Mean scores and Standard Deviations of the attitudes of tenth grade students' at southern Almazar district towards their teachers' correction of oral errors and towards the types of errors corrected by their teachers due to gender**

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Attitude Towards teachers correcting verbal errors	Male	157	3.760	0.31
	Female	185	3.788	0.44
Grammatical Errors	Male	157	3.828	0.90
	Female	185	3.881	0.81
Pronunciation	Male	157	4.068	0.66
	Female	185	3.941	0.95
Vocabulary	Male	157	4.092	0.74
	Female	185	3.965	0.89
All Types	Male	157	3.984	0.53
	Female	185	3.924	0.75

Table (8) shows surface difference in the attitudes of tenth grade students at Southern Almazar district towards correction of oral errors and towards the types of oral errors corrected due to gender. In order to reveal statistical differences a MANOVA test was conducted. The results of the MANOVA analysis is shown in Table (9).

**Table (9): Multiple Variance Analysis MANOVA for the statistical significance between the attitudes of tenth grade students at Southern Almazar district towards oral correction and the types of oral errors corrected due to gender.**

source	Item	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
<b>Gender</b> <b>Hotelling's (0.015)</b> <b>F = 1.29</b> <b>Sig= 0.271</b>	Teachers Correcting Verbal Errors	0.07	1	0.066	0.437	0.509
	Grammatical Errors	0.24	1	0.239	0.327	0.568
	Pronunciation	1.38	1	1.378	2.010	0.157
	Vocabulary	1.38	1	1.380	2.046	0.154
	All Types	0.38	1	0.384	0.901	0.343
<b>Error</b>	Teachers Correcting Verbal Errors	51.22	340	0.151	-	-
	Grammatical Errors	248.63	340	0.731	-	-
	Pronunciation	233.18	340	0.686	-	-
	Vocabulary	229.43	340	0.675	-	-
	All Types	145.04	340	0.427	-	-
<b>Corrected Total</b>	Teachers Correcting Verbal Errors	51.28	341	-	-	-
	Grammatical Errors	248.87	341	-	-	-
	Pronunciation	234.56	341	-	-	-
	Vocabulary	230.81	341	-	-	-
	All Types	145.42	341	-	-	-

The data in Table (9) reveal that there are no significant statistical differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the Mean scores of the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students at Almazar district towards their teachers' correction of their oral errors due to gender. The F value was calculated as (.437) which is not significant statistically at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ). This result shows that there is convergence in students' attitudes for both males and females. Results also showed that there are no significant statistical differences at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ) in the attitudes of tenth grade male and female students at Southern Almazar district, towards the types of errors

corrected by teachers due to gender. The F value calculated for the Mean scores of the students' attitudes towards the types of errors was (.901) which is not statistically significant. Also there were no statistically significant differences in the Mean scores of students' attitudes due to gender for each type of error, namely Grammatical, Pronunciation, and Vocabulary. The F value for each type was (.327), (2.010), and (2.046) respectively. All values are not significant at ( $\alpha \leq 0.05$ ). This shows convergence in male and female students' attitudes towards the types of errors which teachers correct in the classroom.

### Discussion of Results

The results for the current research showed that both male and female tenth grade students in southern Almazar public schools have high level of agreement to correction of oral errors in the classroom. They preferred for their errors to be corrected by their teachers. This reflects their awareness of the benefit of correction for their success in language learning. They also have a high level of agreement to the types of errors corrected by their teachers in the classroom. It was found that their perception towards lexical, pronunciation and grammatical errors respectively was high and positive. The participants responded positively to oral error correction, this indicates that students have a high level of awareness to the importance of error correction to their learning of English as a foreign language. Only few items received a medium level of agreement to oral error correction and no item received a low level. Since no item received a low level of agreement this means that all students want and prefer their errors to be corrected. Therefore, not one students answered negatively to any of the items of the questionnaire. This indicates that students want help in learning English. They understand that learning a foreign language is not an easy process and it may be filled with errors that they prefer to know whether they are wrong or not and if they are wrong they want to be corrected by their teachers. This conclusion is similar to the conclusion reached by (Alhaysony, 2016; Alamri & Fawzi, 2016; Saeb, 2017; Gamlo 2019) who also found that the participants in their studies held positive attitude towards oral error



---

---

correction. This conclusion is quite important since researchers such as Lyster, Lightbrown and Spada, (1999) have emphasized the importance of error correction or corrective feedback to student's learning.

Students also held positive attitudes towards all types of errors that need to be corrected. In first place was the lexical errors, perhaps the reason is that they may have a limited amount of lexical items needed for communication. And through error correction of the lexical items they may add to their lexicon. Students knowledge of vocabulary items may help them further in communicating in English. In second rank was pronunciation errors, because pronunciation of a foreign language is not easy and has to be learned, therefore, correction of pronunciation errors may be very helpful for the students in gaining fluency in the foreign language. Once students have enough vocabulary items that are pronounced correctly then communication is further enhanced. In third place is correction of Grammatical errors. Students are taught grammar from KG-12 in Jordan. Therefore, to be correct grammatically is of great importance for communication and for advancement in school from one grade to another.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusions based on the results of the study indicate that learners are highly aware of the fact that error correction may lead to better language learning. Both male and female learners accepted being corrected in general when speaking in English. Teachers need to be understanding in the way they correct students' errors. They shouldn't discourage students in any way, but rather should make error correction a wanted and needed routine in the classroom. Corrective feedback is very beneficial for learners whether it is immediate feedback, that is in class as the students are speaking or delayed, that is later through tests and exams. Corrective feedback can be accomplished during or while the learners is speaking or later after the learner finishes speaking. This timing of correcting errors can be further examined in future research by asking students when they prefer to be corrected.

Students' personality characteristics may have an effect on when to be corrected, during, after or even later when other students are not present. Some of the more self-conscious students may not wish to be corrected in front of others. Also other areas that can be examined to error correction is whether students prefer peer correction over teacher correction. All these areas can and should be addressed in future research. In addition, one can investigate the way students wish to be evaluated, whether through recast, elicitation, repetition etc.

The conclusions for the current study is that correction of students' errors is important for language learning and is preferred by the learners both male and female. Based on these conclusions the researcher recommends that teachers should not hesitate to correct students' errors in the classroom. Since students want and prefer error correction to take place. Another recommendation is to conduct a study to investigate the teachers' views about error correction. And another study that investigated the types of error correction procedures preferred by students in the classroom.

## References

- Ahangari, S., & Amirzadeh, S. (2011). Exploring the teachers' use of spoken corrective feedback in teaching Iranian EFL learners at different levels of proficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(2), 1859–1868.
- Alamri, B., & Fawzi, H. (2016). Students' Preferences and Attitude towards Oral Error Correction Techniques at Yanbu University College, Saudi Arabia. *English Language Teaching*, 9(11), 59.
- AlGhafri, M., Mirza, C., & Gabarre, C. (2023). Oral Corrective feedback: A case study from Oman. *Arab World English Journal*, 14 (3) 406-417.
- Alhaysony, M. (2016). Saudi EFL Preparatory Year Students' Perception about Corrective Feedback in Oral Communication. *English Language Teaching*, 9(12), 47-61.
- Al Hosni, S. (2014). Speaking Difficulties Encountered by Young EFL Learners. *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)*, 2(6), 22-30.

- 
- 
- Alkhamash, R., & Gulnaz, F. (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback Techniques: An Investigation of the EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices at Taif University. *Arab World English Journal*, 10 (2). 40 -54. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol10no2.4>
  - Allwright, D., & Kathleen M. B. (1991). *Focusing on Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
  - Bang, Y. (1999). Reactions of EFL students to oral error correction. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 3, 39-51.
  - Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principle: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Longman
  - Candlin, C., & Mercer, N. (2001). *English Language in Its Social Context*. New York:Routledge
  - Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the correctional treatment of learners' errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46.
  - Chomsky, N. (1959). Review of Verbal behavior by B.F. Skinner. *Language* 35, 26-58.
  - Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 5(4), 161-170.
  - Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.
  - Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Errors and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 8(1), 129-136.
  - Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Errors and Strategies in Child Second Language Acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 8(2), 129-136.
  - Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
  - Gamlo, N. (2019). EFL Learners' Preferences of corrective Feedback in Speaking Activities. *World Journal of English Language*. 9(2), 28-37
  - Haghani, M. (2012). Corrective feedback and the students' uptake. *ELT Weekly*, 4(11). <http://www.eltwoekly.com/elt-newsletter>
  - Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching*. London/New York.

- 
- 
- Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL Students' preferences toward correction of classroom oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(4), 289-305.
  - Karisma, Y., & Arif, B. (2022). Exploring Grammatical Errors in Speaking of Students University: A case Study. *International Journal of Education and Linguistics*, 4,2, 145-153.
  - Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon.
  - Krejcie, R., & Morgan, D. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities, *educational and psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
  - Kurnia, R., & Jabu, B., & Munir, (2023). The Pronunciation Errors Made By students of First Grade Senior high School Frater Makassar. *International Journal of Business, English, and Communication (IJOBEC)*. 1, 31-35.
  - Lighbown, P. M. & Spada, N. (1999). A response to Truscott's "What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 55(4), 457-467.
  - Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
  - Mosbah, G. A. (2007). *Treatment of Classroom Oral Errors: A Comparative Study Between Native and Non-native Speaking Teachers*. Published Doctoral Dissertation
  - Park, G. (2010). Preference of Corrective Feedback Approaches Perceived by Native English Teachers and Students. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 7(4), 29-52
  - Saeb, F. (2017). Students' and Teachers' Perceptions and Preferences for Oral Corrective Feedback: Do They Match? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(4), 32-44
  - Schachter, J. (1988). Second language acquisition and its relationship to Universal Grammar. *Applied Linguistics*. 9(3), 219-235.
  - Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10(3), 209-230.

- 
- 
- Shi, G. (2017). Attitudes towards Error correction, Corrective Moves and Their Effects in College English Classrooms in China. *International Journal for Innovation Education and Research* 5, 32-39.
  - Tabatabaei, O. & Banitalebi, A. (2011). Feedback Strategies in Foreign Language Reading Classes. *Asian Culture and History*, 3(2), 59-70.
  - Truscott, J. M. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 55, 437-456 .  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3138/cmlr.55.4.437>
  - Zahid Hurain, (2023). Grammatical Errors made by students in Speaking English. *European Journal of Linguistics*, 2, 53-72.