Oral Error treatment in the EFL Classroom:
Comparing Teachers and Students Preferences

Assistant Lecturer: Wafaa Shakir Ibrahim
   College of arts/ university Of al-basrah

Abstract

Student's errors have been tackled seriously by researchers because they are involved in serving the educational and academic field in three related purposes 1); The pedagogical purpose, that is showing the teacher what his\her learners have learned from the topics presented and what areas that are still uncontrolled. 2); The research purpose, students' errors are treated as academic evidence for how languages are learned. 3); The learning purpose, they can be considered as means of feedback to the students to investigate the rule of the target language (Corder (1967) as cited in Eliss and Gary, 2005:49). This study is aimed at gaining more insights into the nature of error making and finding out the oral errors that are often made by the students of the College of Education, English Dep., how do they receive attention from the teacher and how does the teacher corrects them. The study used a questionnaire as a means of collecting information from both teachers and students. Generally speaking, the results show that students prefer the teacher that corrects their errors all the time and errors are not tolerated inside the class. The majority of teachers held positive attitudes towards errors and believe that correcting students' errors makes differences in both of the teaching and learning process. Their practices also indicated that they gave corrections to selective errors and mostly at transitional points with friendly attitudes. Most of them prefer that they denote to their students that an error has been committed by asking them to rephrase the incorrect phrases or sentences in a correct way. Most of the teachers use an elicitation technique in correcting errors and one of the most used kinds is the chain correction technique. The teachers differ in opinion on why correcting students errors. Also they varied in defining the term "accuracy and fluency" according to their own point of view.

Introduction

Error treatment is an important and complex issue in language learning and teaching, and plays a crucial role in the development of student's ability in performing in a foreign language accurately. When it comes to oral error correction we are dealing with teacher's reaction to students' oral performance while learning a foreign language. Language teachers have ample experience in treating their students' errors. Accordingly, there is always a disagreement among teachers about the details of what, when and how to correct these errors, forgetting an important question; should correction be done at all? It is true that students are difficult to be understood if they make many errors in a foreign language, so this is why a reasonable level of correctness is important in language teaching to communicate effectively using a foreign language. Also students must not be worried every time they make an error, on the contrary, they must feel confident while using the target language and correction must be given in an atmosphere of support and warm solidarity, so that they can achieve, to some extent, accuracy and fluency which are both important for foreign language learners.

The Nature of Error making

As a starting point, it is necessary to spell out that errors are either productive errors (spoken and written) or receptive errors (faulty understanding). This research concentrates only on the productive spoken errors in language learning. The term 'error' is defined

differently according to different fields of interests. An *error*, according to Hendrickson (1980:169), is defined as "an utterance, form, or structure that a particular language teacher deems unacceptable because of its inappropriate use or its absence in real-life discourse". In this light, an error could be a deviation from a phonological or grammatical rule, an incorrect form or expression in a particular situation. Crystal (1997:139) adds that an error is a "systematic" reflection of the learners competence in learning a foreign language.

Lennon (1991) as cited in Ellis and Gary (2005:56) clarifies the term error as:

> *A linguistic form or combination of forms which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production would, in a likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts.*

Adding that students errors are:

> *Evidence that progress is being made. Errors often shows us that a student is experimenting with language, trying out ideas, taking risks, attempting to communicate, making progress.*

Crystal (1997:139) shares the same idea, stating that error is a "systematic" reflection of the learners competence in learning a foreign language.

Ellis and Gary (2005:56) asserts that error is a difficult task to deal with in the sense that difficulty lays behind deciding whether "grammaticality or acceptability" that serves as a criterion. Grammatically speaking, an error is as "breach of the rule of the coda". Defining errors grammatically makes it necessary to light up the distinction between what is called 'overt and covert error'. The former means that an error can "be detected by inspecting the sentence utterance in which it occurs". While the latter means "it only becomes apparent when a large stretch of the discourse is considered". Acceptability, on the other hand, mainly depends on the "subjective evaluation"" and on making stylistic judgements rather than grammatical ones. It also means attempting to "identify a situational context in which the utterance in question might fit".

It is worth to mention the two fundamental notions that should be treated differently: error and mistake. Dictionary of language and applied linguistics (1992: 109) defines a mistake as a performance that is either a random guess or a slip that can be self-corrected it is a lack of attention, i.e. it is failure to put what is known (his competence) into practice correctly, even a native speaker can make a mistake in his native language. Whereas an error is caused by a lack of knowledge that cannot be self-corrected only by the help of others.

Aspects of Error Correction

Recently, professional researchers of foreign language teaching have redirected their attention to error treatment. It is inevitable to remark that correction of speech errors is a complex phenomenon and many variables like age, educational background, level of proficiency, and interests of language learners should be taken into consideration. What is also of great interest to us are activities that learners are involved in.

Freda, M. Holley and Janet King as cited in Lalauda (1981:1) point out that 'successful exchange of ideas should be valued and rewarded whether those ideas are expressed

grammatically or not". James P. Lantdf as cited in (ibid), on his side, has braced the communicative competence with a favoured selective correction of errors by stating that "if the language programs are to emphasize communication, teachers will have to develop a greater tolerance to error than they have displayed to the present".

Psychologically speaking, Wilga Rivers as cited in Lalauda (1981:1) state that those language teachers that consider themselves as perfectionists always have the tendency to criticize every error made by learners, the latter will consider the learning task as an impossible one. On the same psychological idea, James M. Henderickson as cited in (ibid: 2) asserts that:

> *When teachers tolerate some student errors, students often feel more confident about using the target language than if all their error are corrected...Many language educators recognize...that correcting every error is counter-productive to learning a foreign language. Therefore teachers need to create a supportive classroom environment in which their students can feel confident about expressing their ideas and feelings freely without suffering the threat or embarrassment of having each one of their oral and written errors corrected.*

A good deal of teacher sensitivity is needed when treating students' errors because learners have different preferences and attitudes towards error correction. And of course, learners preferences are a reliable guide by itself. The teacher must think whether the correction made had it's positive or negative effect on the learner. i.e. was the correction expressed "gently or assertively, supportively or as a condemnation, tactfully or rudely". Obviously, learners differ in their responses, some might respond better to a gently made correction and others might be on the contrary. This is why learners responses to different expressions of error treatment are often surprising and confusing. (Ur, 1996:248).

Approaches in language teaching have charged their point of view towards correcting learners' errors within the learning process. Starting with the approaches in the first half of the twentieth century that are based on the behaviourist's principles, e.g. audiolingualism assumes that learners don't learn by committing errors but by receiving only correct input. And if there is any correction, it should be made immediately, otherwise that teacher's correction will be ineffective, latter correction is not useful for learning. So the teacher has an important role in reinforcing correct responses and correcting incorrect ones. On the contrary, the communicative approaches', in the 1980's, advocators believe that errors are not important as long as they don't affect communication. Focus should be on message rather than mistakes. That is, errors are allowed to pass by without correction only if necessary because in language learning only fluency in practice is needed. This was a shift from the strictness on errors to tolerance of errors. (Wilkins, 1972:165-166, Johnson and Hellen, 1999:114, and Doughty and Michael, 2003:248).

Types of Errors that should be Corrected

Teachers of a foreign language must not have the attempt to correct all students spoken errors in communication tasks, they must first examine the significance of the error. Pierson (2005:1) categorises the oral errors that need some form of correction into three

categories. The following types of errors can consider a misunderstanding for learners of a foreign language.

The first type is **"Errors that Impair Communication"**. Burt and Kiparsky (1972) as cited in Pierson (2005:1) categorize errors as *global* or *local*. Global errors are those errors that hinder communication and prevent the listener from comprehending some aspects of the intended message. Such errors include errors of form (grammar, pronunciation or vocabulary) they impair communication this is why they should be treated to make the message conveyed more comprehensible. Local errors, on the other hand," involve a minor violation in the language without affecting the intended meaning". Such errors needn't any treatment because context provide clues to its meaning.

The second type is **"Errors that Stigmatize the Learner"**. Global errors of meaning include those that stigmatize the learner, for example, as rude, indifferent or stupid. These errors often occur when the language learner fails to understand or respond appropriately to the social rules of the target culture. Generally speaking, people in the target culture usually don't mind if foreigners make some grammatical mistakes. But what annoys them those who violate the social rules of their culture. For example making a request in an inappropriate way that sounds rude to the listener. Thus, this latter type of error is clearly a candidate for correction.

"Errors that Are Produced Frequently" is the third type. Such errors may also need to be pointed out and treated. Brown (2000) as cited in Pierson (2005:2) offers the example: "John cans sing. John mays sing. John wills go". There is communication in the example, but the speaker has the problem in distinguishing modals (e.g., *may, can*) from other verb forms. Sometimes the language learner may benefit from explicit instruction in a case where specific grammar rules are broken. In this case, explicit instruction may help to reduce the frequency of errors with modals.

When to Correct Errors

Knowing when should learners' 'serious' errors be corrected depends on a number of interrelated factors. It's a crucial fact for both the learners and the teachers. Concerning learners and especially those that are in a stage where they commit numerous oral errors, it would be impossible to correct immediately all of the errors, the learner will be frustrated, unconfident and belittled while speaking and correction will not be effective. On the teachers part, awareness of choosing a suitable time for effective correction is very important too. Such awareness can let teacher feel more relaxed and satisfied with the error correction process because s/he is at the same time neither neglecting her/his work as a teacher by postponing correction of errors or harming the learner with too much correction.(Pierson, 2005:3).

Correction time is also determined by whether we are after language accuracy or fluency. When our focus is on language accuracy an immediate correction is recommended. But when language fluency is the aim, at this time, error correction is recommended to be reduced and postponed after finishing the activity just in case not making interruption to the flow of speech, or to make brief correction to those serious errors that cannot be neglected. (Scrivener,2005:160&299)

Error Correction Techniques

Techniques of oral correction is one of the focusing point in this research. Obviously, all FLT agree that error correction should be done in an encouraging and gentle way and it differs according to the type of the error, the type of the language focus (discussed above) and the stage or level of the student. The person, whether the teacher or the students, correcting the error is another fact in determining the correction technique used. The source of the error

is also an important factor for the teacher to decide the sort of treatment, so the correction process should be systematic. Accordingly, Walz (1982) as cited in Freiermuth (2006:4) suggests a three-stage model which occurs in various situations that have both advantages and disadvantages at the same time: Stage (1) self- correction with the help of the teacher helps pointing out the errors and increases motivation and dependency . Within this category Omaggio (1986) as cited in (ibid) provides the most seven implemented techniques. The first type is pinpointing, the teacher points out the student's error by repeating the utterance up to the error and exaggerates the word that preceded the error with a rising intonation. Secondly, rephrasing a question which the student failed in answering correctly. Thirdly, cueing can be used when a student "stumbles" in answering or when he makes a clear error. Here the teacher supports the student with options. Fourthly, an "offshoot of cueing" it is rephrasing the question that the student gave a correct form of answer but with an inappropriate response, so the teacher says the question again but this time adding new information to help the student to give an acceptable answer. Fifthly, is giving explanation for a key word just to clear up the student's confusion. Sixthly, through questioning the teacher is clarifying the student's incomprehensible response or a mispronounced word. Seventhly, providing the student with the model of a correct structure and allowing the student to come up with similar correct responses. Finally, repeating the student's answer but with the correct form. Stage (2) peer-correction (student to student), asking the learner's peers for assistance. This approach will help the others in the group to be engaged in listening to one another carefully. It also gives feedback to the teacher about other students who have learned the correct form. Here Omaggio also provides a technique that can be applied. The technique is providing interview questions written on cards for the students to interview each other, if no correction is made, the teacher can provide the correction. Stage (3)teacher correction, which is considered the lest effective way. Omaggio shows two ways for this. Firstly, the teacher can easily provide the correct answer. This is used when time is limited and when there are too much errors in the utterances that doesn't permits comprehension. Paraphrasing is the second technique offered and it is not effective especially if the teacher doesn't make sure that the students have realized that correction has been made.

Ur (1991:248) clarifies the fact that learners in general differ from one another in responding to different ways their errors are corrected. Surprisingly, what we see humiliating and a rudely way in expressing correction by a teacher may seem or felt differently to the learner whom was corrected and vise versa.

The main focus here is to answer the question; which technique to use to indicate that an error has occurred and how it could be corrected?

Chaudron (1977) as cited in Alderson and Beretta (1992:269) categorizes error correction techniques into the following:

- Ignore: Teacher ignores learner's errors and goes on to another topic.
- Acceptance: Simple approving or accepting word (often as a sign of reception of the utterance), but teacher may proceed to correct an error.
- Attention: an attention getter, like 'think'
- Negation: teacher shows rejection of part or all of learned utterance.
- Provide: Teacher provides the correct answer when learner has been unable to or when no response is offered.
- Repetition with no change: Teacher repeats learner utterance with no change of error nor omission of error.

- Repetition with change and emphasis: teacher repeats learner utterance with no change of error, but emphasis locates or indicates fact of error.
- Repetition with change: usually, teacher simply adds correction and continues to other topics.
- Repetition with change and emphasis: teacher adds emphasis to stress location of error and its correct formulation.
- Explanation: Teacher provide information as to cause of error, possibly including a generalization of the type of error.
- Repeat: Teacher requests learner to repeat utterance with the intention of having the learner self-correct
- Loop: Teacher honestly needs a replay of learner utterance due to lack of clarity or certainty of its form.
- Prompt: teacher uses a lead-in cue to get learner to repeat utterance, possibly at point of error; possible slight rising intonation.
- Clue: Teacher reaction provides learner with isolation of type of error, or the nature of its immediate correction, without actually providing the correction. E.g. further examples of the same error type may be given.
- Original Question: Teacher repeats the original question that led to the incorrect response.
- Alerted Question: Teacher alerts original question syntactically but not semantically.
- Questions: Numerous ways of asking for a new response, but not just original or altered questions, i.e. when error occurs, a new line of questioning is taken up.
- Transfer: Teacher asks another student or group of students to provide correction.
- Acceptance: Teacher shows approval of learner utterance and then repeats the error apparently confirming that it is Correct.
- Verification: Teacher attempts to make sure that the class has understood the correction.

On the same conceptions Lyster and Ranta (1997) as cited in Lee (2002:3) categorized correction techniques as follows:

1. Explicit correction. Clearly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect, then the teacher provides the correct form.

2. Recast. *Without* directly indicating that the student's utterance was incorrect, the teacher implicitly reformulates the student's error, or provides the correction.

3. Clarification request. By using phrases like "Excuse me?" or "I don't understand," the teacher indicates that the message has not been understood or that the student's utterance contained some kind of mistake and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.

4. Metalinguistic clues. *Without* providing the correct form, the teacher poses questions or provides comments or information related to the formation of the student's utterance (for example, "Do we say it like that?")

5. Elicitation. The teacher directly elicits the correct form from the student by asking questions (e.g., "How do we say that in …?"), by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance (e.g., "It's a....") or by asking students to reformulate the utterance (e.g., "Say that again."). Elicitation questions differ from questions that are defined as metalinguistic clues in that they require more than a yes/no response

6. Repetition. The teacher repeats the student's error and adjusts intonation to draw student's attention to it.

Finally, it's worth mentioning here Allwright's taxonomy (1988) as cited in Johnson and Helen (1999:115), he classifies correction techniques into sixteen types. The first six types are determined in terms of options, i.e. "to treat or to ignore completely" and "to treat immediately or delay". Concerning the other types, they are classified as "possible features of error treatments", e.g. "blame indicated" and "location indicated.

Methodology:
Participants:

40 Iraqi learners at the university level, majoring in English as a foreign language, participated in the study. The participants were distributed into 10 students for each stage, 5 males and 5 females, dept. of English, College of education, University of Basra. Also 15 Iraqi teachers in the same department and university participated in the study, 8 males and 7 females. Those teachers were distributed into linguistic teachers and literary teachers.

Procedure:

The present study was based on a questionnaire procedure for both the teachers and students. As far as the students questionnaire is concerned, it consists of 3 statements (see appendix 1) these statements were 3 direct speech statements spoken by three different teachers indicating their own experiences in teaching concerning error correction. These three speeches were not used to be identified, by the students, for which point of view was correct or not, but rather to survey them and to know what kind of teacher does a student, learning a foreign language, prefer in teaching. The respondents are required to make a tick in front of the kind of teacher they prefer.

Results:

Generally speaking, table (1) reports that 45% of the students in the four stages as a total, prefer the second type of teacher. That is to say, they prefer the teacher that corrects their errors all the time and errors are not tolerated inside the class. 50% males and 40% females.

Specifically speaking 50% of first stage students prefer the third kind of teacher, i.e. they prefer the teacher that doesn't interrupt their speech to correct their errors even if there were some, instead errors are treated later on in a special way. 80% of them were females. While 60% was the maximum percent of the males in the first stage that preferred the second type of teacher. That is to say, 60% of the males preferred the teacher that corrects their errors all the time and errors are not tolerated inside the class.

According to the second stage students, 40% of the students preferred the teacher that corrects their errors all the time , 60% of them were females, which was the maximum percent for the second stage females. While 60% was the maximum percent of the males that preferred the teacher that postpones error treatment until the student finishes expressing him\herself so that they don't worry about errors.

Similarly, 40% of the third stage students preferred the second type of teacher that never allows errors to be committed and if so they are corrected right away . 40% of the females in that stage preferred the first and the second type equally and that was the maximum percent of the females. While 40% was the maximum percent of males that preferred the third type.

According to the fourth stage students, 60% as a total preferred the second type of teacher. 80% of them were males and that was the maximum percent for them. 40% of the females were the maximum percent of the females in this stage that preferred this type of teacher.

Table (1) Students' opinion for the three types of teachers

No. item	Sex	1st Stage	%	2nd Stage	%	3rd Stage	%	4th Stage	%	Total	%
A	M	1	20%	1	20%	2	40%	0	0%	4	20%
	F	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	1	20%	4	20%
Total		1	10%	3	30%	3	30%	1	10%	8	20%
B	M	3	60%	1	20%	2	40%	4	80%	10	50%
	F	1	20%	3	60%	2	40%	2	40%	8	40%
Total		4	40%	4	40%	4	40%	6	60%	18	45%
c	M	1	20%	3	60%	1	20%	2	40%	7	35%
	F	4	80%	0	0%	2	40%	1	20%	7	35%
Total		5	50%	3	30%	3	30%	3	30%	14	35%

On the other side, the teachers' questionnaire consisted of 5 different questions (see appendix 2). The objectives of these 5 questions were relatively: 1) To know the way of indicating that an error has been committed by a student; 2)To know what kind of error correction techniques used by the teacher for treating students' errors inside the class in general; 3) To know the variation of grading the seriousness of students' errors by teachers; 4) To know the teachers point of view towards correcting students' errors; 5) To clarify the variation in defining the two terms 'accuracy and fluency' among teachers.

Table (2): Teachers' responses to question No.1

sex \ item	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%
M	0	0	4	50	2	25	5	62.5	0	0	0	0	1	12.5	5	62.5
F	1	14.3	5	71.4	2	28.8	6	85.7	1	14.3	0	0	3	42.9	2	28.8
Total	1	6.7	9	60	4	26.7	11	73.3	1	6.7	0	0	4	26.7	7	46.6

As clarified in table (2) that the maximum percent was 73.3% of teachers (62.5% males & 85.7% females) that assume they denote to their students that an error has been committed by asking the student to rephrase the incorrect phrase or sentence in a correct way. While the minimum percentage was 6.7% of them (0% males & 14.3% females) that assume they ask a one word question.

Table (3): Teachers' responses to question No. 2

sex \ item \ Item No	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%	8	%	9	%
M	1	12.5	2	25	3	37.5	4	50	1	12.5	3	37.5	1	12.5	3	37.5	3	37.5
F	3	42.9	5	71.4	4	57.1	5	71.4	3	42.9	3	42.9	2	28.8	1	14.3	5	71.4
Total	4	26.7	7	46.6	7	46.6	9	60	4	26.7	6	40	3	20	4	26.7	8	53.5

Table No. Three clarifies the fact that 60% of the teachers (50% males & 71.4% females) use an elicitation technique in correcting the students errors. One of this kind of technique is the chain correction technique in treating students errors. This is done by asking the other students to participate in correcting their colleague's error one after the other like a chain.

Table (4): Teachers' opinion for the seriousness of students' errors

Item No.	sex	0	%	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	Total
1	M	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	0	0%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	7
	F	2	28.6%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	7
Total		3	21.4%	1	7.1%	2	14.9%	3	21.4%	3	21.4%	2	14.9%	14
2	M	0	0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	0	0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	7
	F	0	0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	0	0%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	7
Total		0	0%	2	14.9%	6	42.9%	0	0%	2	14.9%	4	28.6%	14
3	M	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	0	0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	7
	F	0	0%	0	0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0%	4	57.1%	7
Total		1	7.1%	2	14.9%	2	14.9%	2	14.9%	1	7.1%	6	42.9%	14
4	M	0	0%	0	0%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	0	0%	4	57.1%	7
	F	0	0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	7
Total		0	0%	1	7.1%	3	21.4%	3	21.4%	2	14.9%	5	35.7%	14
5	M	0	0%	0	0%	2	28.6%	0	0%	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	7
	F	0	0%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	7
Total		0	0%	1	7.1%	3	21.4	2	14.9%	3	21.4%	5	35.7%	14
6	M	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	7
	F		0%		0%		14.3%		14.3%		14.3%	4	57.1%	7

Sentence	Gender	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	Total
			0		0		1		1		1			
Total		0%	0	0%	0	7.1%	1	14.9%	2	28.6%	4	50%	7	14
7	M	0%	0	0%	0	28.6%	2	28.6%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	2	7
	F	0%	0	0%	0	14.3%	1	28.6%	2	0%	0	57.1%	4	7
Total		0%	0	0%	0	21.4%	3	28.6%	4	7.1%	1	42.9%	6	14
8	M	0%	0	0%	0	28.6%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	2	14.3%	1	7
	F	0%	0	14.3%	1	0%	0	14.3%	1	42.9%	3	28.6%	2	7
Total		0%	0	7.1%	1	14.9%	2	21.4%	3	35.7%	5	21.4%	3	14
9	M	0%	0	14.3%	1	28.6%	2	42.9%	3	0%	0	14.3%	1	7
	F	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	42.9%	3	0%	0	57.1%	4	7
Total		0%	0	7.1%	1	14.9	2	42.9%	6	0%	0	35.7%	5	14
10	M	0%	0	0%	0	14.3%	1	57.1%	4	0%	0	28.6%	2	7
	F	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	14.3%	1	14.3%	1	71.4%	5	7
Total		0%	0	0%	0	7.1%	1	35.7%	5	7.1%	1	50%	7	14

Generally speaking, table No. Four reports that 50% of the teachers consider that sentence No. 6 and sentence No. 10 are the most sentences that have a serious error. According to the female teachers 71% considered sentence 10 is the sentence that has the serious error and that was a maximum percent for the female teachers in this part of the questionnaire. While 57% of the male teachers considered that sentence 4 has the most serious error among the other sentences. And that was the maximum percent of the male teachers in this part of the questionnaire. While on the other hand, 35.7% of the teachers considered that sentences 4, 5 and 9 are equal in error seriousness. Moreover,14.3% of male and female teachers,14.9% of the total, considered that the error in the first sentence is the less serious one.

As far as question No. Four is concerned, the teachers' answers are divided into two parts: Part one reveals that 7 male teachers (87.5%) out of 8 and 6 female teachers (85.7%) out of 7, all agree that correcting students' errors makes difference to students' learning. While 1 male teacher (12.5%) out of 8 and 1 female (14.9%) out of 7 agree that it depends, i.e. it makes differences in some way or in another and on the type of error committed.

In part two only 5 male teachers and 6 female teachers have given their opinion. This part reveals that 2 male teachers (40%) and 3 female teachers (50%) agree that we, as teachers, correct our students' errors in order to let the students overcome them again in the

future. On the other hand, 2 male teachers (40%) and 2 female teachers (33.3%) agree that we correct students errors in order to reinforce the correct use of language, they must know the correct form of language. Only 1 male teacher (20%) clarifies the idea that students' may not notice their errors this is why we should correct them in order to decrease the number of the students' errors. 1 female teacher (16.7%) states that error correction is part of language learning, i.e. it is a way of learning.

Question No. Five is also of two parts. In part one 7 male teachers and other 6 female teachers have reported their opinion concerning the term 'Accuracy'. 4 male teachers (57.1%) and other 4 females (66.7%) all define accuracy as using the language in its well-defined norms concerning grammar, pronunciation,... it is the correctness of form and content. While accuracy for 2 male teachers (28.6%) is the correct use of language skills. On the other hand, accuracy, for 1 male teacher (14.3%) and 2 females (33.3%), means the ability to convey a message and to be able to communicate exactly and effectively.

In part two the same number of teachers as in part one have reported their opinion, but this time to the term 'fluency'. 3 male teachers(42.8%) and 2 female teachers (33.3%) agree that fluency is related to smooth and rapid use of language. i.e. in an acceptable speed. Meanwhile, both 2 male teachers (28.6%) agree that fluency is approaching the native speakers' way of speaking (speed, intonation, expressions, facial gestures...etc). And other 2 female teachers (33.3%) have agreed that fluency means using language in a good smooth way without hesitation and stuttering as possible. While 1 male teacher (14.3%) and another female teacher (16.7%) both agree that fluency is the ability to convey certain concept or idea using easy and effective language. Only 1 male teacher (14.3%) state that fluency is "the ability to speak or write in good manner". Finally, 1 female teacher (16.7%) clarifies that fluency means "to be able to form correct and understandable sentences with acceptable pronunciation as a speaker and to understand what others say as a listener".

Conclusions:

1- Although there were significant differences in students preference of teachers, but it is clear from the results that most of the students specially males prefer their errors to be corrected and never tolerated inside class because they are after accuracy in language learning and this preference increases as students become more advanced learners.

2- Most teachers, specially females, indicate to their students that they committed an error by rephrasing the correct phrase or sentence in a correct way. While few female teachers use a one word question to denote to their students that they have committed an error and non of the male teachers use that technique.

3- Most teachers, specially females, use an elicitation technique in correcting students errors and one of those most techniques is asking other students to correct each other errors.

4- According to the results, male and female teachers differ in considering errors of students, that is to say what a teacher might consider a serious errors another teacher might consider it less serious and vise versa. So teachers vary in their seriousness of students errors according to the type of course they teach and to the type of errors committed whether it is a semantic one or a syntactic one and also because the teachers vary in defining the terms accuracy and fluency according to their point of view.

5- Linguistics and literary teachers equally agree that correcting students errors makes difference to students' learning, but they varied in explaining why they correct those errors.

References

Alderson, J. C. and Alan B. (1992). Evaluating second language Education. Cambridge: Cambridge, University Press.

Crystal, D. (1997). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. UK. Blake well Publishers Ltd.

Doughty, C. J. And Michael H. L. (2003). The Handbook of S.L.A. Cambridge: Cambridge University press

Ellis, R. And Gary, B. (2005). Analysing Learner Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Freiermuth, M. R. (1998). "L2 Error Correction: Criteria and Techniques" Available at http://www.jalt-   publications.org/tit/files/97/sep/friermuth.html

Johnson, K. And Helen J. , ed. (1999). Encyclopaedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Lalande, J. F. (1981)." An Error in Error-Correction Policies." ADFL Bulletin, Vol. 12, No. 3. Available at http://web2.adfl.org/adfl/bulletin/V12N3/toc/123toc.htm

Lee, J. (2002). "Gender Effect on Error Treatment in University ESL classrooms" Available at   http://www.eastern.edu/publications/emme.html

Scrivener, J. (2005). Learning Teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers. Great Britain: Macmillan.

Pierson, C. (2005). "Dealing with Learner Errors" Available at http://www.wheaton.edu/bgc/icct/

Ur, P. (1996). A Course in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wilkins, D.A. (1972). Linguistics in language Teaching. Great Britain: The Chaucer Press Ltd.

Appendix No. One

Which of the following teachers do you prefer?

Teacher (A): " I correct students sometimes, but not all the time. If we're on particular language point, then I insist that they say it correctly. But if we're doing a freer activity then I try not to correct too much. If I do correct students, I try to do it in an encouraging way."

Teacher (B): "I never let my students make mistakes. If they say anything wrong, I stop them and make them say it correctly. I don't want them to learn bad English from each other, and they prefer this as well."

Teacher (C): " I try to correct errors as little as possible. I want my students to express themselves in English without worrying about making mistakes. Sometimes I notice points that everyone gets wrong and deal with them later- but I never interrupt students to correct them."

Appendix No. Two

Name:

Dear teachers,

   I'm working on a paper about treating students errors, in which I need your appreciated help and cooperation by answering the following questions according to your own experience in teaching.

Q1: How do you show a mistake has been made? Make a tick.

- Tut

- Facial expressions

- Direct "wrong"

- Ask the student to rephrase

- Parrot (you repeat the error)

- Silence

- Humour

- Write on the board

Q2: The following are error correction techniques used for treating students' errors inside the class in general, make a tick in front of the technique that you use in your class:

- Ask a question/ ask a one word question

- Gesture combined with facial expressions

- Write the problem sentence on the board

- Make a chine correction- ask other students

- Repeat the sentence up to the error

- Tell them the correct form directly. Repeating the sentence correctly.

- Zero correction/ guided discovery

- Offering the student options to fill-in the missing element. For example when s/he hesitates over verb form, you say (come, came, have come).

- Rephrase a question (with new information) when a student responds with a correct form but inappropriate response.

Q3: Grade the mistakes in the following sentences from 5 to 0, where 5 is a very serious mistake and 0 is no mistake at all. Obviously you must decide for yourself what "serious" means.

- She asked me where did I come from.

- The book was into the bag.

- The problem was that the door wasn't keyed.

- He's fond of cooking himself and for me.

- The people panic and runned away.

- Did you went there alone.

- A few people and I was looking for the mystery man.

- She was about herself very sensible.

- We visit London last weekend.

- I like the city very much, because it is expected about the future.

    Q3: Why do we correct students' errors? Does it make any difference to student's learning?
    _____
    _____
    Q4: How do *you* define accuracy and fluency?
    _____
    _____
    _____

الخلاصة

أخطاء الطلبة قد تم معالجتها بجدية من قبل الباحثين لكونها تعمل على خدمة المجال التعليمي والأكاديمي في ثلاثة أغراض مترابطة ومتكاملة ١): الغرض التربوي، عن طريق إظهار للمدرس ماذا تعلموا الطلبة من الموضوع المقدم لهم وماهي الجوانب والنقاط التي لم يتعلموها. ٢): الغرض البحثي، أخطاء الطلبة تم معالجتها كدليل أكاديمي لكيفية تعلم واكتساب اللغة. ٣): الغرض ألتعلمي، ممكن اعتبار تلك الأخطاء كوسيلة لاكتشاف الطلبة قوانين اللغة المكتسبة (Corder (1967) في (Eliss & Gary, (2005:49). هذه الدراسة تهدف في تسليط ضوء أكثر في طبيعة ارتكاب الأخطاء اللغوية وكذلك تهدف إلى اكتشاف الأخطاء الشفوية التي يرتكبها طلبة كلية التربية قسم اللغة الانكليزية، وكيف تثير اهتمام المدرس إثناء التعليم وكيف يصححها للطلبة. الدراسة بنيت على استبيان كوسيلة لجمع المعلومات من الطلبة والمدرسين. عموما النتائج أظهرت إن الطلبة يفضلون المدرس الذي يهتم بتصحيح أخطاءهم في كل مرة يرتكبون الخطأ. اغلب المدرسين كان لهم موقف ايجابي تجاه تلك الأخطاء وهم يؤمنون بأن تصحيح تلك الأخطاء في حينها تعمل على خدمة جانبي التعليمي والتدريسي. ومن خلال ممارساتهم العملية في الصف، المدرسين يصححون أخطاء معينة وبطريقة ودية. اغلب المدرسين فضلوا ان يشيروا بأن هناك خطأ ارتكب بطريقة الطلب من الطالب إعادة الجملة أو المقطع الخطاء بطريقة صحيحة وبمساعدتهم. اغلب المدرسين استخدموا طريقة الاستخراج أو الاستنباط في تصحيح الأخطاء وأكثر تلك الطرق استخداما هي طريقة سلسلة التصحيح بين الطلبة. كذلك اختلفوا المدرسين في وجهات النظر في سبب تصحيح أخطاء الطلبة إثناء التدريس. وكذلك اختلفوا في تعريف المصطلحين "الطلاقة والدقة" من وجهات نظرهم الأكاديمية.