2017-08-22

Second Cycle Primary English þÿLanguage Teachers Perceptio Oral Error Corrections and Their Actual Classroom Practice (A study with particular reference to Debre Markos Town Woreda).

Tariku, Fanta

Second Cycle Primary English Language Teachers' Perceptions On Oral Error Corrections and Their Actual Classroom Practice (A study with particular reference to Debre Markos Town Woreda).

BY

Tariku   Fanta

Bahir Dar University Faculty of Humanities

Department of English

July, 2011

Second Cycle Primary English Language Teachers' Perceptions On Oral Error Corrections and Their Actual Classroom Practice (A study with particular reference to Debre Markos Town Woreda)

BY

Tariku Fanta

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the Requirements for Master of Education in TEFL

Bahir Dar University

Faculty of Humanities

Department of English

July, 2011

Second Cycle Primary English Language Teachers' Perceptions on Oral Error Corrections and Their Actual Classroom Practice (A study with Particular reference to Debrer Markos Town Woreda).

BY

Tariku Fanta

Approved by Board of Examiners

…………………………….. …………… ……………….
Advisor   **Signature**   **Date**

………………………………. …………… ……………….
Internal Examiner   **Signature**   **Date**

……………………………. …………….. ………………..
External Examiner   **Signature**   **Date**

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work and all other sources are duly acknowledged.

Signature…………………………….   Date………………..

Name: TARIKU FANTA

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as a university advisor

Name: …………………………………….

Signature: ……………………

Date: …………………..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Abiy Yigizaw for his intensive professional advice and counseling by giving constructive comments and useful suggestions throughout the study. The work has become successful because of his unreserved support.

I am also grateful to my friends who gave necessary support for the success of this study.

I am also indebted to my wife W/ro Yirgedu Siber who helped me to pursue my education.

Finally, I would like to thank all participants in the study for their willingness to participate in the study and devoting their time to provide worthwhile information.

I

Table of Contents

Title   **Page**

CHAPTER TWO
Review of Related Literature

‖

CHAPTER THREE

III

Appendix   A

Appendix   B

Appendix   C

Appendix   D

Appendix   E

Appendix   F

Appendix   G

IV

List of Tables

V

ABSTRACT

This study aimed at investigating second cycle primary English language teachers' perceptions or oral error correction and their actual classroom practice with reference to Debre Markos Town Woreda. The study was further designed to examine teachers' perceptions or oral error corrections, to ascertain whether their perceptions correspond or not with their actual classroom practice, to assess errors which they give more attention for correction, to investigate when how and by whom these errors are correct. Besides, the study focused on investigating whether teachers are or not in line with the current theory and practice of oral error correction. The subjects of the study were all English teachers, 23 males and 7 females, in the Woreda. Data gathering instruments were questionnaires, class observations and interviews. While the data gathered by quantitative method were analyzed in frequency counts and percentages, the qualitative ones were analyzed in statements. The results of the study showed teachers have favorable perceptions on oral error corrections. The mean scores of perception and classroom practice questionnaires were 88.8 and 85.47 respectively. The study also showed there was substantial correlation between teachers' perceptions and classroom practice since the correlation coefficient was 0.73. To correct, teachers focused on errors which bring communication barriers. Teachers are in line with or favorable to the current theory and practice of oral error corrections. To strengthen teachers' perceptions and their classroom practice, the Ministry of Education and concerned authorities should give trainings for teachers.

VI

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Human learning is a process that involves the making of errors (Brown,1994). For instance, learning to swim, to play tennis, to type or to drive needs a process of making a number of errors. Language learning is also like these human learnings. All, first, second and foreign language learning involve countless errors. Concerning this, Brown (1994:205) pointed out the following:

> Second language learning is a process that is clearly not unlike first language learning in its trial-error nature. Inevitably learners will make mistakes in the process of acquisition, and indeed will even impede that process if they do not commit errors and then benefit in turn from various forms of feedback on those errors.

As foreign language learners, students can also make a lot of errors while speaking English in classrooms. However, teachers treat or correct those oral errors differently depending on their attitudes towards errors and error corrections. Teachers have two different perceptions on students' errors. Norrish (1983) stated that some teachers regard errors as undesirable, a sign of failure. However, others regard them as an essential part of learning. Norrish (1983:1) added the following point regarding the former view.

In many traditional language classes, students have been made to feel that errors bring discredit on the teacher and learner alike and have been reprimanded for making too many errors. This implies that errors are the fault of the student and could be avoided.

But other scholars such as Ancker, Lynch, Norrish and Zhu believe that errors are normal and unavoidable during the learning process.

Depending on their perceptions on error corrections, teachers treat or correct students' oral errors using various ways or techniques of error corrections. Norrish (1983) discussed that the language teachers' perceptions on error corrections are influenced by what they are doing in class.

Nowadays, the question of perceptions of teachers on errors and error corrections has become one of the most important professional issues in second and foreign languages pedagogy. (Zhu 2002) pointed out that changes in pedagogy can influence teachers' perceptions on errors and their corrections Allright and Bailey (1991) noted, " with the recent advent of the communicative approach to language teaching, less emphasis has been placed on formal accuracy than was formerly the case, and more importance given to the question of communicative effectiveness" (P.84).

Currently, Ethiopia has adopted communicative language teaching approach in all grade levels. The researcher hoped that if there is a change in pedagogy, there can be a change in teachers' perceptions on errors and error corrections. Accordingly, this paper attempted to investigate second cycle primary school English teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections and their classroom

practice; that is, whether they are in line with the updated (recent) theory and practice of teaching approach concerning on oral error corrections and classroom

practice. In addition, attempt was made to assess if there was a correspondence between teachers' perceptions and their actual classroom practice. The study also gave a focus for investigating kinds of errors teachers correct or treat, and how, when and by whom these errors were corrected or treated.

1.2   Statement of the Problem

As the focus of classroom instruction has shifted over the past few decades from an emphasis on language forms to functional language with in communicative context, the question of the place of error correction has become more and more important. However, the role of corrective feedback in language acquisition has become a highly controversial issue (Zhu 2002; Ancker, 2000).

Many foreign language teachers and educators would agree on providing students with corrections although they would not necessarily agree on what, how and when they should correct errors. With regard to this, Cathcart and Olsen, as cited in Brown (1994:221), stated the following:

> The matter of how to correct errors gets exceedingly complex. Research on error correction methods is not at all conclusive on the most effective method or technique for error correction. It seems quite clear that students in the classroom generally want and expect errors to be corrected.

Zhang(2010) shared the same idea stating that though disputed theories and research articles collide with each other, there appears to be a growing consensus among the majority of researchers and language practitioners concerning the significance of the role played by corrective feedback in the process of second and foreign language acquisitions.

Some teachers might still be sticking to the older methods based on behavioral theories of learning (audio-lingualism) immediate correction of every error. On the other hand, Doff (1988) stated that others use recent theory on language acquisitions and teaching methodology which supports the position that not all errors should be corrected, and those that are corrected should usually not be treated immediately. Ancker (2000) viewed that many teachers and their students still prefer immediate correction by the teacher, in the audio-lingual style, despite its lacks of efficacy and its punitive nature. Allright and Bailey (1991:10) stated other types of teachers as follows:

> But teachers who adopt the communicative approach are often more concerned with second language learners' ability to convey their ideas, get information, etc, than with their ability to produce grammatically accurate sentences. Some feel that it is more important for learners to accomplish their communicative goals than it is for their sentences to be perfectly well formed. Thu, many teachers consider the degree of pupils' communicative success when reacting to their output, in both speech and writing; whether or not the learners' language is accurate....

As discussed earlier, Ethiopia has been practicing communicative language teaching approach in all grade levels. Since this approach is a new pedagogy, a new or up to date oral error corrections and classroom practice are must. Zhu (2010) stated that realizing error corrections' merits, many countries are currently practicing in their language teaching methods. Teachers' perceptions and their classroom practice should fit the new pedagogy. If teachers are still sticking to the earlier teaching methods or approaches (e.g.audialingualism), the language teaching might be in trouble. "Teachers and students who take corrections seriously face overwhelming problems both in making corrections effective and in dealing with the harmful side effects of the practice" (Truscott, 1991:1).

Similarly, if their perceptions on error corrections are extremely favorable to some up-to-date error corrections theory advocates (non-correctors), researchers believe that the language teaching can also be in difficulty. This results in fossilization. Ancker (2000:21) described, "Finally, fossilization occurs when an individual reaches a satisfactory level of competence in the L_2 and does not worry about persistent mistakes …." So, to avoid this problem, correction should be necessary in communicative language teaching. Regarding this, Zhang (2010:306) viewed the following:

> A number of studies have examined whether corrective feedback in communicative or task based language classroom is effective. Their studies provide positive evidence for the effect of formal instruction and corrective feedback in improving the students' accuracy level on certain targeted linguistic features.

Accordingly, both extremist views on error corrections are not accepted by many researchers and educators. Hence, the researcher attempted to investigate second cycle primary school English language teachers, perceptions on oral error corrections and their actual classroom practice with particular reference to Debre Markos Town Woreda Second Cycle Primary Schools. The researcher chose the primary school teachers because this problem is not well researched at these levels. The researcher could not find any work on this problem concerning these primary school teachers' perceptions. So, its novelty initiated the researcher to study the problem.

1.3. Research Questions

To come up with possible solutions, the following were the basic questions of the study:

1. What perceptions second cycle primary school English teachers have on oral error correction?

2. What kinds of oral errors do they give great attention for corrections?

3. When, how, and by whom are these errors corrected?

4. Do teachers' perceptions correspond to their actual classroom practice?

5. Are teachers in line with the current or updated theory and practice of oral error corrections?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

The objectives of the study are the following:

- To identify the perceptions of Second Cycle Primary School English language teachers on oral error corrections.
- To assess if teachers are in line with the current theory and practice of oral error corrections.
- To investigate the kinds of errors they correct or treat.
- To investigate when, how and by whom oral errors are corrected.
- To assess their actual classroom practice on oral error corrections.
- To ascertain whether or not their perceptions correspond with their actual classroom practice.

1.5. Significance of the Study

Studying perceptions of teachers on correcting oral errors and their actual classroom practices is significant for several reasons. First, it can reveal the relationship that exists between perceptions and actual classroom practices on correcting oral errors. Second, it enables English language teachers particularly those who teach at second cycle primary levels to create or develop the awareness of correcting oral errors in actual classroom practice. Third, the insight gained in

the study can help as a base for other researchers to conduct in depth research on the topic.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

The study was delimited to investigating the perceptions of second cycle primary school English language teachers on students' oral errors and their actual classroom practice with reference to Dibiza, Biruh Tesfa, Abima, Endimata, Edetibeb, Dilbetigil, Maremiabet and Nigus Tekile Haimanot second cycle Primary schools of Debre Markos Town Woreda. The study would be more effective if it included private schools in the town and other nearby second cycle primary schools in other districts. However, since there were time and money constraints, the study was delimited to the aforementioned schools.

1.7. Limitations of the Study

The study had certain limitations. Shortage of related documents or references with the topic of the study was one of the limitations. Using a video camera could be another limitation. Although it was necessary, recording the classroom observations would make the students and teachers uncomfortable and might not make classroom practice as usual or normal. Being delimited in one geographical location or woreda and constraints of time and money were also limitations of the study.

1.8. Definitions of Technical Terms & Abbreviations
1.8.1. Technical Terms
Accuracy- Producing language carefully and exactly

Fluency- Producing language quickly and easily

Global Errors- Errors that affect the interpretation of the whole sentence (Norrish, 1983).

Local Errors- Errors that affect merely a part of a sentence, a clause or a   phrase (Norrish, 1983).

Peer correction- A kind of correction when students help each other to correct their own errors

Self-correction- A kind of correction when students correct their own errors by themselves.

Teacher Correction- A kind of correction when the teacher corrects students' errors.

1.8.2. Abbreviations

EFL - English as a foreign language

L_2 – Language Two (second language)

USAID -- United States Agency for International Development

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

2.1. Definition of Error and its Related Concepts

One of the persistent problems with which second or foreign language teachers have to deal with continuously is that of defining error. Researchers have difficulties in defining a language error. Some define it with reference to the production of linguistic form which deviates from the correct form. In his study of

teachers' reaction to children's errors, Chaudron, as quoted in Haileyesus (1995:6), defined errors as « linguistic forms or content that differed from native speaker's norms and facts.» Bartram and Walton, as cited in Haileyesus (1995), defined errors as wrong language which a native speaker would not usually produce. Norrish, on his part, (1983) stated a language error as a systematic deviation which a learner makes until he notices that native speakers do not produce this form. From this context, one can perceive something in common, and that is, native speaker's norm is used as the standard version.

Still others define error with reference to some selected norms of language performance, not necessarily to native speaker's norm. Duly and Burt, as quoted in Haileyesus (1995:6), recommended it as « the flawed sides of

learner speech or writing that are parts of conversation or composition that deviate from some selected norm of mature language performance.» Similarly, Allright and Bailey (1991) viewed errors as the learners' speech which usually deviates from the model they are trying to master.

Some take the formal classroom instruction of second or foreign languages, i.e., the teachers' response to students' utterances can be the criterion for defining or judging error. George pointed out that an error is a form that is unwanted by the teacher (as cited in Allright and Bailey, 1991). On his part, Chaudron, as cited in Allright and Bailey (1991), defined an error as any other behavior signaled by the teacher as needing improvement. As a result, this reveals the fact that some linguistic elements are accounted as «error» not because they are wrong but because they are unwanted or unaccepted by the teacher.

For a second or a foreign language teacher, it is useful to know the distinction among different types of anomalous language behavior: the error, the mistake, the

slip, the lapse and the attempt. Citing Corder, Allright and Bailey explained the difference between an error and a mistake as follows:

> He uses the term error to refer to regular to patterns in the learner's speech which consistently differ from the target language model. The regularity of such patterns reveals the learner's underlying competence the system of rules that governs his speech. In contrast, he uses the term mistake to refer to memory lapses, slips of the tongue (1991:91).

When a learner has not learnt something and consistently gets wrong, the systematic deviation is an error. However, when a learner sometimes uses one form and sometimes the other quite inconsistently, the deviation is a mistake (Norrish, 1983). Dan-yu (2007) shared this scholar's view stating that errors actually involve language that has not been acquired or has not been incorrectly acquired, while mistakes are idiosyncratic careless and inconsistent.

There is another type of wrong usage which can happen to anyone at any time which is called a lapse. This happens because of lack of concentration, shortness of memory, fatigue, etc. (Norrish, 1983). Norrish also described another type of wrong usage, an attempt, which is a guess or when neither the intended meaning nor the structure is clear to the teacher. Of these wrong usages or deviations, errors should be taken into account by classroom teachers. Since errors are not self- corrected, students need help from their teachers. Scholars believe that learners' errors need corrections, rather than mistakes or any other deviations. Since mistakes and others are self-corrected by the learners themselves, they should not be teachers' concerns for corrections.

2.2. Different Views on Error Corrections

Researchers and teachers have disputed over error corrections heatedly and continuously for a long period (Dan-yu, 2007; Zhu, 2010). In respect to this, Maharjan, in Journal of NELTA, (2010) suggested that there is no consensus on

error corrections among teachers themselves. Hence, concerning their perceptions or views on errors and their corrections, teachers are categorized under traditional and current or up-to-date theories of language acquisitions (Norrish, 1983; Richards, 1974)

2.2.1. Traditional Views on Error Corrections

This attitude or view was popular in the 1950s and 1960s as the tenet of audiolingualism or behaviorism. Teachers who advocate the traditional views on error corrections consider errors as undesirable or a sign of failure (Edge, 1989). Edge discussed that in many traditional language classes, learners have been made to feel that errors bring discredit on either the teacher or the learner, and they have been reprimanded for making errors. Richards (1974) stated that if teachers were to achieve a perfect teaching method, the errors would never be committed in the first place. In the Audiolingual Method, «There is a great effort to get students to produce error-free utterances» (Brown, 1994:71). Because of this, teachers believe every error should be corrected immediately. In relation to this, Dan-yu (2007:51) claimed the following:

> The traditional view point is that we, teachers, should deal with any error that appears. It is uncomfortable simply observing student error without taking any action. So most teachers hold they will correct students' errors whenever they discover. According to the behaviorism theory, many teachers regard errors a kind of "negative stimulus"; errors must be corrected at any cost.

In regard to this, Williams and Burden (1997) suggested that in audio-lingual language teaching method, errors were frowned upon as reinforcing bad habits. Freeman (1966:40) added the following point to the aforementioned idea: « it is important to prevent learners from making errors. Errors lead to the formation of bad habits when errors do occur, they should be immediately corrected by the teacher. »

Still, as researchers indicated, there are many teachers who adhere or advocate the audio-lingual teaching method concerning oral error corrections. For instance, Bartram and Walton, as cited in Ancker (2000), discerned that many teachers and their students still prefer immediate correction by the teacher, in the audio-lingual style, in spite of its lacks of efficacy and its punitive nature.

Norrish (1983) stressed that teachers who hold this attitude do not have tolerance for errors. In other words, they are intolerable for errors. Corder, as cited in Zhu (2010), expounded that such teachers try every means to prevent their students from making errors by constant correction which they believe, would help students recognize their errors and not repeat them. These teachers are more concerned with how to deal with errors rather than what causes them.

2.2.2. Current or Up-to-date Views on Error Corrections

This is the time of a gradual shift in classroom practice, from the immediate correction of every error in older methods based on behavioral theories of learning, audio lingualism, to a more tolerant modern approach (Ancker, 2000). Current theory on language acquisition and teacher methodology supports the position that not all errors should be corrected, and those that are corrected should not be usually corrected or treated immediately (Doff, 1988; Edge, 1989; Norrish, 1983; and Thompson, 2001).

This view is based on the fact that errors are expected and unavoidable. Errors are inevitable; they should be accepted as a sign or indication of some kind of learning activity taking place in the learner (Norrish, 1983). According to this scholar errors are essential parts of learning. They help the learner and provide him with feedback in the process of concept formation. Similarly, Corder, as cited in Zhu (2010), forwarded that teachers should accept that errors play an important role in the learning process. To language learners, language learning is not so much a question of acquiring a set of automatic habits, but rather a process of discovering the

underlying rules, categories and systems of choice in the language. Makino (1993:38) added, « Learner errors are seen as a natural and indispensable part of the learning process. They are also seen as inevitable, since learners are encouraged to explore to the target language. » Hence, all these views of researchers and educators imply that teachers who hold this view are favorable to errors and error corrections, unlikely to teachers who hold traditional views.

Teachers who advocate this view no longer automatically correct their students. Instead, they encourage self-correction and peer correction. They are less concerned with preventing errors and more focused on developing learners' communicative skills. Allright and Bailey (1991) noted the following:

> At a time when advocates of communicative language teaching are suggesting that teachers should pay much more attention to communication problems and perhaps much less attention to problems of linguistic accuracy, it would be interesting for teachers who wish to follow this advice to study their own behavior when they treat errors to make sure they really are managing to change in the way they would like to (P.112).

The aforementioned point indicates that teachers who are engaged in communicative language teaching, like Ethiopians, should be expected to give more attention to the communication problems not to linguistic problems. They should be more tolerant to students' oral errors. They can be no longer strict or serious about oral error corrections. Ancker (2000) proved that most English language teachers in Latin America, Africa, Central Asia, and Caucasus are modifying their classroom practice to accommodate a more tolerant approach to errors. They no longer automatically correct their students. Instead of doing this, they encourage self-correction and peer correction. They are less concerned with preventing errors and more focused on developing learners' communicative skills. However, Wondwosen and Getnet, as cited in Haileyesus (1995), discussed high school English teachers in Ethiopia were proved they would not give more chances

to students for self-correction and peer correction. Their studies pointed out that they used mainly teacher correction technique.

Nowadays, researchers and educators who hold this view (current theory of error corrections) have not reached consensus on oral error corrections. Two groups have emerged. While one group believes that correction is necessary, the other one does not believe the significance of error corrections. The latter group holds extreme views on oral error corrections. The advocates of this group consider correction is inappropriate or problematic in communication activities. For instance, Chaudron argued that it is extremely difficult to verify the effect of correction. It is a debate about the relative values of error correction (as cited in Makino, 1993). Long, as cited in Makino (1993), debated that error correction is not important. Others like Krashen and Terrell expressed similar doubts about the effectiveness of error corrections (as cited in Makino, 1993). Makino (1993:337) stated, « The errors made learners are part of a natural process of language learning, and simply indicative of a certain stage of their inter-language which will develop naturally into more accurate and appropriate forms.» Krashen (1987) and Lewis (1993), as cited in Ancker (2000), argued that correction is ineffective, even a waste of time. As Zhang (2010) stated such researchers even advocate abandoning corrections in classroom interaction due to their problems. However many scholars have agreed that the first and most important step a teacher must take is to determine the objective of an activity (Ancker, 2000). These scholars claimed that if the objective is to develop accuracy, correction is necessary. On the other hand, if the objective of the activity is to develop fluency, correction might not be necessary. They have also stated that since the main objective of language learning is to receive and convey meaningful messages, correction should be focused on errors that interfere with this objective, not on inaccuracies of usage. Regarding this, Dan-yu (2007) proposed that in the majority of communicative situations, during speech, the learners' statements should not be interrupted to correct errors. If this is done, students can be scattered- brained to some degree, and anxious. Even they can be passive.

Brown (1993) strengthened the above point discussing that too much negative feedback a barrage of interruption corrections leads learners to shut off their attempts at communication. Dan-yu (2007:51) summarized her discussion about the attitudes of teachers towards learners' errors as this:

> So many researchers argue that errors could be tolerable, especially those in favor of communication teaching methods, advocating that there is no need to correct errors. They say it is natural for learners to produce errors, which will be able to vanish gradually. Meanwhile different voices come on; they predict it is likely to result in error fossil, if errors are not corrected immediately. As a result, they could easily form the fossils in learners mind. Up to now, there is still no agreement over whether to correct errors, how, when and where.

Bartram and Walton, as cited in Haileyesus (1995), made some reference to problems of over correctors and non-correctors (two extremists) that can have an impact on actualizing teachers' attitudes towards errors. They commented that if teachers are heavy-correctors, students are likely to face problems of teacher dependence, lack of creativity, lack of independent thought being unable to make new and original language, and tension or being worried about making errors. They also commented that if they are non-correctors, the problem of fossilization can occur. Besides, they (teachers) are likely to encounter problems from authorities, parents, colleagues and even students.

2.3. Types of Errors and their Priorities of Corrections

It is a fact that language learners' especially foreign and second language learners can make various errors. Based on the different standard, there may be many kinds of divisions. For instance, according to the language intelligibility, errors can be divided into two types, global and local (Dan-yu- 2007; Norrish, 1993). While the former affects comprehension, the latter one does not break down communication. « The global error is the type which affects the interpretation of the whole sentence, and the local error merely a part of it, a clause or a phrase» (Norrish, 1983: 106). Norrish (1983:106) attempted to make clear the two types of error providing the following example:

> The sentence 'The soldiers had been shooting when they are blindfolded' contains examples of both kinds of error. The major error, the one most likely to lead to misunderstanding of the sentence, is the substitution of 'shooting' for 'shot'. This error we can call global; it affects the interpretation of the entire sentence. The awkward present tense in the subordinate clause 'when they are blind folded' constitutes a local error, since it hardly interfere with the utterer's intended meaning.

Therefore, Norrish suggested that errors that cause irritation but do not break down communication should receive a lower priority of correction than those which breakdown communication or missed the listener. In other words, the global error needs correction or treatment before the local error.

Dan-yu (2007: 52) provided further explanation concerning the attitudes of teachers towards these types of error and their corrections:

> For the global errors, most teachers share similar opinions that such errors must be corrected through a variety of ways, such as, prompt, guiding, negotiation and so on ; for the latter, there exists two views ; one school holds that local errors will not hinder the statements from being understood, therefore, it is unnecessary to spend time on it; while the other argues this type of errors also violate the language rules, if it is not corrected in time, as time passes, it will deposit in the deep memory which is hard to eliminate, so error fossils appear.

Accordingly, many scholars advise teachers to have tolerance to some kinds of errors and give priorities of corrections since all types of errors or deviations of a language do not lead to breakdown in communication. Hence, in order to provide effective correction for students' errors, the teacher must first determine exactly what the errors are (Truscott, 2011).

Concerning priority of corrections, Norrish (1983) raised errors in grammar, vocabulary or lexis. He pointed out that there is more serious error or breakdown of communication in grammar rather than vocabulary or lexis. For example, the usual word order of a simple sentence in English is subject + verb + object. However, if this is changed, i.e., verb + subject + object, the problem of comprehension or communication can be serious or severe. Nevertheless,

the replacement of the word 'chair' by 'table' in the sentence ' He sat on the ...' may change the meaning but will not lead to complete misunderstanding. As a result , according to Norrish, the grammatical errors seem more serious and need the priority of correction over the vocabulary item.

Another criterion for deciding priorities in error correction is high frequency errors. Regarding this, Cohen (1975), Hendrickson (1976), Norrish (1983), Clark (1987), Edge (1989) and Krashen (1991), as cited in Haileyesus (1995), discussed that high frequency errors and errors that can have stigmatizing effect on the hearer should get priority. On his part, Zhu (2010) recommended that instead of correcting errors randomly, teachers should correct them systematically. They should concentrate on errors that hinder communication. Thus, according to this researcher, if an error is likely to hinder comprehension or lead students into further errors, then it should be corrected. This educator also emphasized that teachers should correct those errors that are regularly repeated by students and those they consider to be the most serious. However, he pointed out that teachers should not correct every now and then in a way that affects learners' confidence or interest in learning. In order to correct oral errors, teachers should know well types

of errors. They have to have understanding of the priorities of correcting errors. In addition, they should know causes of errors such as inter-lingual interference, intra-lingual interference, translation, and context of learning.

2.4. Techniques or Strategies to Correct Oral Errors

Traditionally, it has been the teacher's role to correct errors. However, many researchers believe that teacher correction is the least effective strategy or technique of correcting errors in terms of retention and improvement. Although teachers are ideally placed to provide correction feedback of students' performance, students can also be extremely effective at mentoring and judging their own language production (Harmer, 2001).

Accordingly, error correction should not always be the responsibility of teachers. Students themselves should correct their errors. Concerning this, Zhu (2010:4) discussed that

> Teachers can encourage students to use discovery technique. For example, if a student makes an error while speaking, the teacher could say: «Excuse me»? "Sorry, could you say that again? "Or he could repeat the student's sentence and stress the error to indicate that is not correct. By doing so, the student will try to correct himself and as a result, would be more confident when dealing with errors and less dependent on the teacher.

Zhu expressed his belief there is much evidence that a self- discovery approach reduces the likelihood of students' dependence on external assistance. Thus, in addition to teachers' correction, students' corrections (self-correction and peer

correction) are essential techniques or strategies. Lynch (2010) suggested that there are three essential basic techniques of error corrections. These are self-correction, peer correction and teacher correction.

Regarding self-correction, Makino (1993:338) pointed out the following:

> In the process of language learning, learners sometimes notice some of their errors by themselves, through the strategy of monitoring, and they can also correct some of their errors when other people, such as teachers or peers, give those cues or hints about them. Those learners who are able to correct their own errors can activate their linguistic competence.

Many researchers such as Makino praised self-correction more than any other type of techniques or strategies of error correction. Makino (1993) described this as, "Of course, while teacher correction of learner error is helpful to some students, self-correction may be more worthwhile to others (P.338). Lynch (2010) also put it as, "Of these, most effective in English or foreign language skills acquisition is self-correction. When learners realize and correct their own mistakes they are more effectively internalizing the language" (P.2). Researchers and teachers argue that self-correction is more memorable than teacher correction. Edge (1989) stated that self-correction is easier to remember, because a student can put something right in his or her own head. In support of this, Vivier, Hopkins and Potter (1994) discussed, «If a student is given the opportunity to identify and correct his/her own errors, the correction will be memorable » (P.10). If students correct their own errors or mistakes, they are more likely to remember the correct forms than if someone else corrects the errors for them.

If the student can correct himself or herself, the teacher needs to say nothing. However, if he or she is not able to self-correct, the teacher should run to another corrective strategy—peer correction. Therefore, peer correction can be utilized when

the self-correction process breaks down or falls. When the student cannot self-correct, some members of the class can correct the errors, because when learners can recognize and correct their errors co-operatively or jointly, they actually help each other to develop their English language skills (Lynch, 2010).

In connection with this point, Lewis and Hill (1985) discerned that if the student is not able to provide self-correction the teacher should invite other students in the class to comment before providing the correct language.

Many scholarly people believe that peer correction technique has a lot of significant points or advantages even though some students hate to be corrected by their peers. For example, Edge (1989:53) pointed out the following two advantages:

- When two students work together on correcting each other's work, the discussion helps each one to learn from his or her errors. Two heeds are better than one.
- We all have difficulty in seeing our own mistakes, even if a teacher has given us a signal as to what sort of a mistake it is. Cooperation helps develop an ability to see our own mistakes.

On this point, Lewis and Hill (1985) mentioned three significant points. First, it ((Peer correction) helps to keep all the class involved while an individual is answering a question. Second, by participating students in correcting each other enables them to clear that language learning is a corporate activity. Third, it can reduce the teacher's domination or over-zealous teacher correction.

To strengthen this issue, Harmer (2001) forwarded, «Student-student correction works well in class where there is a genuinely cooperative atmosphere; the idea of the group helping all of its members is a powerful concept » (P.107).

However, Edge (1989) pointed out that if the teacher thinks that the error needs to be corrected, and if neither the student who made the error, nor any other student can correct it, the teacher has to give more help. « As a last resort, if all other possibilities fail, the teacher gives the correct form …» (P.29). But teacher correction

may be the least effective form of corrective in terms of student retention and improvement. Concerning this, USAID (2008) recommended that correction work for students can make them dependent on the teacher and not encourage them to think. Edge (1989) also showed the effectiveness of those corrective techniques respectively as follows: « Give a chance for self-correction and, if possible, use peer correction rather than direct teacher correction» (P.35). Edge (1989) gave further discussion about peer correction as this:

> Although peer correction is external and therefore less desirable than self-correction, it has the advantage of giving all the students more opportunities for language production and hypothesis testing. It also promotes communication among students and decreases the teacher's domination of classroom discourses (P.29).

All the above scholars' views on the techniques of correcting oral errors imply that teachers who hold the recent correcting error theories can apply or implement in classrooms. If they are advocates of the recent theory, it is a must to use all the techniques depending on situations. However, teachers who hold the contrary theory, traditional theory, stick to the teacher correction. They use it mostly. They are more of negligent of other techniques, i.e., self-correction and peer correction.

2.5. Error Corrections on Accuracy and Fluency of Oral Works

The way in which teachers treat students' oral errors depends on whether they are accuracy or fluency in the students' work. Harmer (2001) indicated that decisions about how to correct errors depend on the stage of the lesson, the activity, the type of errors made, and the particular student who is making that error. Many

researchers and educators believe that oral error correction is complex. Zhang (2010: 307), for instance, expressed it:

> Oral error feedback is a complex decision making process. When a student commits an error, the teacher firstly should decide which kind of error it is, whether to correct it, if so when and how to correct it, and who should correct it. Teachers should take students' cognitive, affective reality and as well as students' pre preferences of error feedback into consideration.

To correct oral errors, the first and most important thing teachers have to do is to determine the objective or aim of an activity. If the objective is to develop accuracy, correction is necessary. However, if the objective of the activity is to develop fluency, corrections may not be necessary. Thus, the extent to which correction is appropriate depends on the objective or aim of each activity.

2.5.1. Error Corrections on Accuracy during Oral Work

A teacher should make a distinction between accuracy and fluency while treating or correcting errors during oral work. In this regard, Harmer (2001:14) discussed the following:

> We need to decide whether a particular activity in the classroom is designed to expect the students' complete accuracy-as in the study of a piece of grammar, a pronunciation exercise, or more some vocabulary work for example- or whether we are asking the students to use the language as fluently as possible. We need to make a clear difference between 'non-communicative' and 'communicative' activities… whereas the former are generally intended to ensure correctness; the latter are designed to improve language fluency.

With regard to oral work in which the focus is on fluency, Zhu (2010) pointed out that students should be stopped immediately when they make errors in order to avoid continuing repeating them. Harmer (2001) suggested that when students are involved in accuracy work, it is part of the teacher's function to point out and correct the errors the students are making. Here, teacher's intervention is important. However, during communicative activities, teachers should not interrupt students in mid-flow to point out errors such as grammar, lexis or pronunciation since they interrupt the communication and drags back the activity. Edge (1989) stated, «most teachers would agree that spoken accuracy is most important for our learners when they are practicing carefully something that has just been presented to them....» (P.23.) This scholar explained further teachers should not always ignore their students' correctness since successful communication depends on a certain level of accuracy, and their examinations are based on how accurate students are constructing correct language. In strengthening this point, Lewis and Hill (1985) suggested that it is appropriate to correct immediately during accuracy oral practices. These scholars advised teachers to concentrate on accuracy pointing out an error immediately by facial expressions or gestures.

Thompson (2001) forwarded the following steps to a teacher to correct a student who makes an error on producing accuracy, either in a language point or in pronunciation.

§ Ask the student to try to correct the error himself/herself.

§ If she/he cannot do so, ask another student to give the correct answer and ask the first student to repeat the answer correctly.

§ If other students do not know the correct answer, or say it incorrectly, you should make the correction yourself and ask the class and then individual students to repeat it after you.

§ If the students are working in pairs or groups, encourage them to gently correct each other's language and pronunciation if they can.

Similarly, Edge (1989) noted that teachers should give firstly a chance for self-correction, if possible use peer correction rather than direct teacher correction.

Accordingly, one can understand from the above two scholars' points the steps of correcting oral errors are self-correction, peer correction and teacher correction. These steps are favorable to the current correction theory and practice.

2.5.2. Error Corrections on Fluency during Oral Work.

The techniques or ways when students speak in fluency activities are different in which teacher correct errors. In fluency activities, students should not be interrupted for corrections. Teachers should concentrate on what their saying. In other words, teachers need to concentrate on the content not just the language form. Harmer (2001) underlined that teachers' tolerance of errors in fluency activities have to be much greater than they are during more controlled activities. Rivers said that in order to develop the students' oral interaction ability, teachers should focus on fluency rather than accuracy in communicative practice (as cited in Kassaw, 2008).

However, there are times when teachers can intervene during fluency activities. No need of being completely no correctors. In relation to this, Harmer (2001:107) indicated the following point:

> If communication breaks down completely during a fluency activity, we
> may well have to intervene. If our students cannot think of what to say,
> we may want to prompt them forwards. If this is just the right moment
> to point out language feature we may offer a form of correction.

In support of this, Thompson (2001) suggested that teachers should correct students if there is a breakdown in communication. Likewise, Norrish (1983) noted that when there are too many errors, the meaning can become obscured. If the teacher does not hear errors which worry them, the course of the action should not

be necessarily to correct the errors immediately but teachers should note those errors and come back to them on another occasion.

According to the above view of Norrish, one can understand some errors in oral work need delayed corrections. To carry out these delayed corrections, scholars such as Edge (1989), Harmer (2001), Lewis and Hill (1985) and Norrish (1983)

advised teachers to note down the errors drawing up a list of language points like tenses, prepositions, adjectives order, pronunciations, etc. Harmer (2001), for example, pointed out that teachers should use charts or other forms of categorization to help them to give corrections.

Thompson (2001) proposed the following approaches that teachers use when they correct students' errors during fluency on oral work:

§ Let the students speak, and delay correction till later.

§ Note any major or important errors as you listen to them without interrupting while they are talking. And correct them at the end of the activity.

§ When you correct them, first of all ask them to provide you the correction themselves.

§ If they fail to correct the errors, give some practice in it for them.

§ If the error occurs in an important language point, you should decide to use some time in the next lesson revising the point with all the class.

Accordingly, when teachers attempt to correct their students' oral errors, first of all, they should take into account the objectives of the activities. They have to know whether the activity is accuracy or fluency since their correction techniques are different.

2.6. Deciding When to Correct Oral Errors

Long (1977), as cited in Brown (1994), indicated that the question of when to correct or treat oral errors has no simple answer. The answer of this question depends on types of errors and activities or objectives (as described earlier). There are

immediate and delayed corrections of errors. Many researchers and educators agree on this issue. Thompson (2001) reflected that it is not necessary to correct every error students make when using the target language.

There can be some times when it is good to correct errors and other times when it is better to remain silent or to correct them late. In support of this, Zhu (2010) suggested that an important aspect that should be taken into consideration is the context in which the errors are occurred. The context can lead teachers either to correct immediately when an error is made, delay the correction until the end of the activity or ignore the error. Zhu (2010) elaborated the issue as:

> With regard to speaking activities (a context where the focus is on fluency), the usual advice is to delay feedback until the end of the activity so as to avoid interrupting the student's flow of speech. While in a pronunciation activity (a context where focus is on accuracy), students should be stopped immediately when they make a mistake, otherwise they will continue repeating it (P.129).

As a result, one can perceive from this context teachers can delay the correction for shorter or longer periods of time. No more of interrupting students' speech unlikely the adherents of audiolingualism teaching methods do. So scholars advise teachers while accuracy practices or activities need immediate corrections, fluency practice or activities need immediate corrections, or they do not need to do so. In support of this, Lewis and Hill (1985:94) put it as, «...it will be appropriate to correct immediately during accuracy practices, but to avoid disturbing the spontaneity of fluency practices. »

Therefore, these scholars stressed that in the case of fluency practices teachers must expect that students can make a lot of errors of all types. So, it is better to go through them systematically after the practice. Besides, it is advised that teachers should decide when to correct errors. They ought to know which errors need immediate corrections and which ones need delayed corrections.

2.7. Dangers of Over Correction

Overemphasis on corrections by the teacher can have a de-motivating effect. Brown (1994) stressed that a barrage of corrections causes learners to shut their mouths.

This enables them to refrain from speaking or attempting at communication. It makes them lose their hopes. In other words, it de-motivates them. Harmer (2001) forwarded, «Over-use of even gentle correction will, however, be counter-productive. By constantly interrupting the flow of the activity, we may bring it to a standstill » (P.108). Hence, Harmer put forward that intensive correction is unpleasant. On his part, Edge (1989) explained that correction should not mean insisting on everything being absolutely correct. Correction means helping students to become more accurate in their use of the target language. Lewis and Hill (1985) discussed that it can be disastrous to note down a large number of errors and go through them for corrections.

USAID (2008:96) propounded the following results or dangers of over-corrections:

- reluctance to speak for fear of making mistakes
- reluctance to take risks or experiment with language
- fear of punishment
- loss of self-image in front of peers and teacher
- reliance of the teacher to provide the correct model
- division of the class into those that can and those that can't
- fear of dislike of learning English

Hence, to avoid the above and other negative effects, teachers should not use overcorrection.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology

3.1. Introduction

As described earlier, the objective of the study was to investigate the perceptions of second cycle primary school English teachers on oral error corrections, and their

actual classroom practice particularly in Debre Markos Town Woreda. Attempted was made to investigate whether teachers are in line with or not the current or up-to-date theory and practice of oral error corrections. The researcher used both quantitative and qualitative research methods. While the quantitative method included questionnaires and class observations, the qualitative one consisted of two open-ended items in the perception questionnaire of teachers and interviews.

3.2. Target Population, Samples and Sampling Techniques of the Study

The target population of this study was all English language teachers of governmental Second Cycle Primary Schools in Debre Markos Town Woreda. Debre Markos Town Woreda was chosen because the researcher lives there. In Debre Markos Town Woreda, there are eight governmental Second Cycle Primary Schools, namely Nigus Tekle Haimanot, Dibiza, Abima, Biruh Tesfa, Endimata, Edetibeb, Dilbetigil and Maremiabet,(the school in Debre Markos Prison). The total number of English teachers in the schools was 32, i.e. 25 males and 7 females. While 3 teachers were degree holders, the rest 29 teachers, were diploma holders in English. Therefore, the target population of the study was all English language teachers in the aforementioned schools. However, for the class observations and the interviews, 4 teachers were selected from 4 schools, namely Nigus Tekle Haimanot, Abima, Dibiza and Endimata. Therefore, for the questionnaires, comprehensive (available) sampling technique was employed. Nevertheless, for the class observations and the interviews, 4 teachers were selected from four schools using simple random sampling (lottery method). Among these teachers, 2 were females. These teachers were from Nigus Tekle Haimanot, Abima, Dibiza and Endimata. These schools were also selected using simple random sampling.

3.3. Data Gathering Instruments.

As it was mentioned earlier, to obtain valuable information from the participants, questionnaires, classroom observations and interviews were used as means of data gathering instruments. All these data gathering instruments were developed by the researcher adapting from available literature.

3.3.1. Questionnaires

Two questionnaires were employed in the study. The first questionnaire with 5-point Likert scale was designed for teachers to get information about their perceptions on oral error corrections. The questionnaire consisted of 26 items. While 24 items were closed-ended, 2 items were open-ended. The last two open-ended items required teachers to list some points they would agree or disagree on oral error corrections. In this questionnaire, teachers were required to confirm their alternatives across the scales, that is from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The second questionnaire with 5-point frequency scale was designed for teachers to obtain information about their actual classroom practice of oral error corrections. This questionnaire consisted of 24 closed items. The items were constructed with 5-point frequency scales. Accordingly, teachers were asked to confirm their options across the scales, that is from never (1) to always (5) for each item. All items in the questionnaire shared almost all features of the first questionnaire (attitude questionnaire). That was purposely done because it enabled the researcher to cross-check whether teachers' perceptions correspond or not with their classroom practice. All items of both questionnaires were concerned recent or updated and practice of oral error corrections with the intention of knowing whether teachers were or not favorable to the aforementioned theory and practice.

The closed-ended items in all questionnaires were grouped into four categories. In the first category, items 1-10 were grouped; they referred to oral errors which need high or little attention for corrections. The Second category consisted of items 11-13 which referred to time when oral errors should be corrected. The third one consisted of 14-18 items which focused on who should treat or correct oral errors. The last category—items 19-24 dealt with teachers' reactions to oral errors.

3.3.2. Observations

As stated earlier, observations was one of the data gathering instruments to observe teachers' actual classrooms practices on oral error corrections. Observations were conducted with a checklist. The checklist consisted of three types of error categories: lexical errors, grammatical errors and phonological errors. It also comprised categories of corrected and in corrected errors, and when and by whom these errors were corrected. This checklist was also used to investigate the types of errors which were given great attention by the teachers.

The researcher managed to observe four English teachers in four schools. Because of constraints of time, it was decided to observe one teacher from each grade. The teachers were two males and two females. Lots were drawn to select these teachers and the schools. The schools in which these teachers taught were Nigus Tekle Haimanot, Dibiza, Abima and Endimata. Each of the four teachers was observed twice for 45 minutes. All of them were videotaped by one of the researcher's colleagues. Accordingly, the videotaped was used to replay and check the observations. The researcher observed and tallied when the items of the categories occurred. Then, their frequency counts were expressed in percentages, and interpreted.

3.3.3. Interviews

Interviews were made to assess teachers' perceptions and their classroom practice. Therefore, four semi structured questions were developed and administered for the four teachers who were observed while they were teaching. As mentioned earlier, the teachers were selected by lot from Nigus Tekle Haimanot, Dibiza, Abima and Endimata schools. After observations and questionnaires had been conducted, the interviews were made in Amharic with the teachers. Those interviews were conducted with them separately. Each interview took almost 25 minutes. The interviews were made with no audiotapes.

3.4. Data Gathering Procedures

After the observation checklist had been developed, by the researcher and got approval from the advisor, four teachers (four classes) were observed twice each using the observation checklist while a colleague of mine was videotaping the teachers' classroom practices. During each observation, the observer (researcher) tallied the incidents or happenings of the items under the categories. After each observation, it was attempted to check the tallies or the counts of the incidents replaying the recorded by the video. In the end, the frequency counts were computed in percentages, and were analyzed and interpreted

After observations, teachers' questionnaires were conducted. But before administering the questionnaires, two Amharic teachers provided constructive comments. Therefore, the feedback from these friends enabled the researcher to measure the validity of the questionnaires. In addition, to measure the validity and reliability the two questionnaires were translated into Amharic (see Appendices D&E). Then, the questionnaires were pilot-tested on 6 English teachers from Gozamin Woreda (nearby Woreda). As a result, the reliability of the two questionnaires (perceptions and classroom practice) was calculated by Split-Half Method of Spearman-Brown prophecy formula. Scores on the odd numbered items were correlated with scores on the even-numbered items. Hence, it was found that the perceptions questionnaire had 0.79 and teachers' classroom practice questionnaire had 0.76. These results showed that the coefficient of reliability questionnaires had acceptable degrees of reliability. After these procedures were made, the questionnaires were distributed to teachers.

Finally, the four interview questions were conducted separately with the four teachers, who were observed while teaching. During each interview, the researcher took notes. In the end, teachers' responses or answers were analyzed and described in statements.

3.5. Data Analysis Procedures

For the research, both quantitative and qualitative data analyses techniques were employed. Those data gathered through closed-ended questionnaires and observations were organized in the form of tables, quantified and analyzed quantitatively using percentages. Whereas, the two items in the perceptions questionnaire and interviews with teachers were described in statements.

Concerning the quantitative data, if the mean scores of the respondents of the attitude questionnaire and classroom practice questionnaire would be 72 and above, teachers would be considered to have favorable perceptions on oral error corrections, and the current theory and classroom practice of oral error corrections. However, if their mean scores would be below 72, they would be in the contrary perceptions and classroom practice. The above benchmark of the mean score (72) was decided because Yalew (1998) indicated that expected means core could be a benchmark. Accordingly, the highest score in each questionnaire was 120 (the highest value on the Likert and Frequency Scale (5) times (X) the total number of closed ended items in the questionnaires. Similarly, the least score is 24(1X24). Therefore, to find the expected means core should be highest score plus (+) least score and divided by two. Hence, $\frac{120 + 24}{2}$ = 72.
Therefore, the expected mean score of the respondents of the two questionnaires (perceptions and classroom practice) were 72.

As correlation coefficient best shows relationship between variables, the relationship between teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections and their actual classroom practice would be calculated by using the Spearman rho (p) rank order Coefficient of Correlation since it is quick, easy and acceptable method, and there are tied ranks in the data (Best and Kahn, 1993). Besides, the results of teachers' perceptions questionnaire, their actual classroom practice questionnaire, classroom observation and interview were compared and conclusions were made out of the

data. The criteria for deciding the relationship between teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections and their actual classroom practice are given below:

Coefficient (r)	Interpretation
✮ 0.00 -- 0.19	Negligible
✮ 0.20 -- 0.39	Low
✮ 0.40 -- 0.59	Moderate
✮ 0.60 -- 0.79	Substantial
✮ 0.80 -- 1.00	High to very high

(Yalew, 1998:340)

Eventually, the result of the correlation coefficient would be compared with the mean scores of the perception and classroom practice of questionnaires. And the results of the two open-ended questions in the perceptions questionnaire, and classroom observation and interview would be made about what teachers were claiming to do and what they were doing actually in the classroom in correcting oral errors.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results and Discussion

This chapter deals with the results and discussion of the study. It also consists of respondents' characteristics in terms of sex, and schools.

4.1 Characteristics of Respondents

Since the total number of second cycle primary English language teachers in the woreda was 32, 32 copies of each questionnaire were distributed. Of 32 teachers, 23 male and 7 female teachers filled and returned the questionnaires. For the

observation and the interview, 2 male and 2 female teachers were selected and participated. So, the following table indicates the characteristics of the respondents.

Table 1

Distributions of Respondents from Each School

No	Schools	Number of respondents		Total
		Male	Female	
1	Nigus Tekle Haimanot	5	2	7
2	Dibiza	3	1	4
3	Abima	5	--	5
4	Biruhtesfa	1	1	2
5	Endimata	3	1	4
6	Edetibeb	2	2	4
7	Dilbetigil	3	--	3
8	Maremiabet	1	--	1
Total		23	7	30

Table 1 shows the distributions of teachers who responded the attitude and classroom practice questionnaires. From 8 second cycle primary schools, 30 teachers were the participants of the study. Of 30 teachers, 7 were females.

4.2. Results

In this part, the results of the study found by using various gathering instruments and methods were analyzed and interpreted.

4.2.1.   Teachers' perceptions Questionnaire Results

Table 2

Teachers' Responses Showing their Attention to Errors and Error Corrections (N=30)

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		5		4		3		2			1
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%

No	Statement	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	Every error should not be corrected	10	33.33	7	23.33	2	6.67	6	20	5	16.67
2	Teachers should concentrate on oral errors that interfere with communication	8	26.67	9	30	2	6.67	7	23.33	4	13.33
3	It is important to pay more attention to accuracy than fluency on oral error corrections	9	30	12	40	1	3.33	6	20	2	6.67
4	Teachers should not give equal concentration on correcting oral errors on accuracy and fluency	6	20	12	40	1	3.33	6	20	5	16.67
5	Global errors need corrections before local errors	15	50	9	30	--	--	4	13.33	2	6.67
6	Teachers should be aware of causes of errors in order to correct errors	23	76.67	7	23.33	--	--	--	--	--	--
7	Teachers should not give equal concentration on correcting lexical, grammatical and phonological errors	6	20	13	43.33	1	3.33	5	16.67	5	16.67
8	Teachers need concentration on oral errors that are regularly repeated by students and those they are considered to be the most serious	11	36.67	13	43.33	--	--	5	16.67	1	3.33
9	In order to deal with oral error corrections, teachers have to differentiate among students' laps, slips, mistakes and errors	16	53.33	6	20	3	10	5	16.67	--	--
10	Teachers should deal with important errors but not all errors that appear	13	43.33	9	30	3	10	5	16.67	--	--
Average		12	39	10	32	1	4	5	17	2	8

N= Number of respondents

Table 2 indicates the results of teachers on the perceptions of the questionnaire towards oral errors which need high or little attention while practicing oral error corrections in classroom. On item 1 in the table, while 10 (33.33%) of the respondents strongly agreed that every error made by students should not be corrected, 7 (23.33%) of them agreed on the issue. However, 2(6.67%) of the respondents remained undecided. Others, 6(20%) and 5(6.67%) disagreed and strongly disagreed on the item respectively. On item 2, 8(26.67%) and 9(30%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the items respectively. Nevertheless, 7(23.33%) and 4(13.33%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. 2(6.67%) of the respondents remained undecided. Here, the majority of

the teachers were on the side of concentrating on oral errors that interfere with communication. Regarding item 4, 6(20%), 12(40%), 1(3.33%), 6(20%), 5(16.67%) of the teachers strongly agreed, agreed, undecided, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. Concerning item 6, 23(76.67%) of the teachers strongly agreed and 7(23.33%) agreed on the issue.

In general, table 2 shows that while the respondents' average score who strongly agreed and agreed was 71%, the respondents' average score who disagreed and strongly disagreed was 25%. And the average score who was undecided was 4%

Table 3
Teachers' Responses about When to Correct Oral Errors (N= 30)

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		5		4		3		2		1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11	It is not important to stop students and make them say it correctly when they say anything wrong.	5	50	8	26.67	--	--	6	20	1	3.33
12	Teachers should not deal with all errors as soon as they are made by students	3	10	6	20	2	6.67	12	40	7	23.33
13	Teachers can give delayed corrections	3	10	8	26.67	1	3.33	9	30	9	30
	Average	7	23	7	25	1	3	9	30	6	19

Table 3 shows that teachers' perceptions on time when they correct or treat oral errors. On item11 in the table, while 15(50%) of the respondents strongly agreed that there is no importance of interrupting students to give corrections while they are speaking, 8(26.67%) of them agreed on the importance of interruption for corrections. Conversely, 6(20%) of the respondents disagreed and 1(3.33%) strongly disagreed on the issue. They believed there should be interruption for corrections. With regard to item 12, 3(10%) of the respondents strongly agreed and 6(20%) agreed

that all errors should not be corrected as soon as they are made by students. However, 12(40%) and 7(23.33%) of them disagreed and strongly disagreed on the issue, respectively. The rest, 2(6.67%) did not decide. On item 13, 3(10%) strongly agreed and 8(26.67%) agreed that teachers can give delayed corrections. On the other hand, 9(30%) of the respondents disagreed and 9(30%) strongly disagreed on delayed corrections.

To sum up the table, on average while 48% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed on delayed corrections, 49% of them either disagreed or strongly disagreed on delayed corrections. Only 3% of them were undecided.

Table 4
Teachers' Responses Concerning Who Corrects or Treats Errors (N=30)

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		5		4		3		2		1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
14	Teachers give chances to their students for self correction	7	23.33	20	66.67	--	--	2	6.67	1	3.33
15	Teachers give chances to their students for peer corrections	8	26.67	19	63.33	1	3.33	2	6.67	--	--
16	Teachers should not correct mostly themselves when students make errors	8	26.67	9	30	1	3.33	7	23.33	5	16.67
17	Teachers should not give equal chances for self-corrections, peer corrections and teacher corrections	7	23.33	12	40	1	3.33	5	16.67	5	16.67
18	It is important to give more chances for self-corrections and peer corrections than teacher corrections	15	50	4	13.33	2	6.67	7	23.33	2	6.67
Average		9	30	13	43	1	3	4	15	3	9

Table 4 indicates the results of teachers' perceptions concerning who corrects or treats students' errors. As it is displayed on item 14,7(23.33%) and 20(66.67%) of the

respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively on self- corrections. Whereas, 2(6.67%) of the teachers disagreed and 1(3.33%) of them strongly disagreed on self-correction. On item 15, while 8(26.67%) and 19(63.33%) of the teachers either strongly agreed or agreed on peer corrections, 1(3.33%) of them remained undecided, and 2(6.67%) disagreed on the issue.

In general, the total average of the respondents who strongly agreed and agreed in the table was 22(73%). On the other hand, the total average of the respondents who disagreed and strongly disagreed was 7(24%). Only 1(3%) of them averagely were undecided.

Table 5

Teachers Responses How to React to or Treat Oral Errors (N=30)

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		5		4		3		2		1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
19	Teachers correct students without feeling angry or unhappy when they make errors	16	53.33	7	23.33	2	6.67	5	16.67	--	--
20	Teachers should correct students with no reprimanding students for making many errors	11	36.67	12	40	1	3.33	3	10	3	10
21	Teachers provide corrections without considering errors as signs of failures or problems	16	53.33	8	26.67	--	--	4	13.33	2	6.67
22	Teachers should treat or correct errors with tolerance	23	76.67	4	13.33	--	--	2	6.67	1	3.33
23	Teachers should not prevent students from making errors by constant or continuous corrections	4	13.33	2	6.67	1	3.33	12	40	11	36.67
24	Teachers should correct errors systematically instead of randomly	21	70	9	30	--	--	--	--	--	--

Average		15	51	7	23	1	2	4	14	3	10

Table 5 shows the result of teachers' perceptions questionnaire towards their reactions to students' oral errors. As indicated in the table, on average, 22 (74%) of the respondents were positive or favorable to all the items in the table. To the contrary, averagely 7 (24%) were negative or unfavorable to the items. Only 1(2%) remained undecided averagely.

While the total average of the respondents to all the items of the perception questionnaire was 67%, the average of the respondents who disagreed and strongly disagreed to the same items of the questionnaire was 30%. Only 3% of them were undecided. As a result, majority of the teachers were positive or favorable to items of the perception questionnaire. Besides, the mean score of 30 respondents on the perception questionnaire was 88.8. Again, this shows that majority of the teachers were favorable to the items of the perception questionnaire. In other words, they are favorable to oral error corrections.

As it was mentioned, there were two open ended questions (items 25 and 26) in the teachers' perception questionnaire. Therefore participants gave the following responses to the open-ended question that inquire for additional points that must be done in oral error corrections:

➤ Encouraging or motivating students to speak even though they make errors.
➤ Not interrupting them for correction while speaking.
➤ Correcting errors until students say them correctly.
➤ Investigating their errors systematically.
➤ Telling them errors are inevitable and normal.

However the following responses were about what must be avoided in oral error corrections:

➤ Saying 'don not say' to students when correcting them.

➤ Reprimanding, insulting, harassing and discouraging them when they make errors.

➤ Over-correcting errors.

➤ Telling them they are weak in English when they make errors.

➤ Trying to prevent students from making errors.

4.2.2. Teachers' Classroom Practice Questionnaire Results

Table 6
Teachers' Responses Showing their Attention to Errors and Error Corrections (N=30)

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		always 5		usually 4		Sometimes 3		rarely 2		never 1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	I refrain from correcting every error	12	40	4	13.33	4	13.33	5	16.67	5	16.67
2	I concentrate on the errors that interfere with communication.	10	33.33	6	20	9	30	3	10	2	6.67
3	I pay more attention to accuracy than fluency on oral error corrections	6	20	11	36.67	4	13.33	5	16.67	4	13.33
4	I refrain from giving equal concentration on correcting oral errors on both accuracy and fluency.	2	6.67	6	20	5	16.67	7	23.33	10	33.33
5	To correct students' oral errors I give priority to global errors over local errors.	15	50	8	26.67	4	13.33	2	6.67	1	3.33
6	I try to investigate causes of errors so as to correct students' oral errors.	12	40	10	33.3	6	20	2	6.67	--	--
7	I refrain from giving equal concentration on correcting lexical, grammatical and phonological errors	2	6.67	10	33.3	6	20	3	10	9	30
8	I concentrate on oral errors that are regularly repeated by students	15	50	13	43.33	--	--	2	6.67	--	--

	and those they are considered to be the most serious									
9	In order to deal with errors I have to differentiate among students' laps, slips, mistakes and errors	17	56.6	9	30	3	10	1	3.33	--	--
10	I deal with important errors but not all errors that appear.	12	40		33.33	4	13.33	2	6.67	2	6.67
	Average	10	34	9	29	5	15	3	11	3	11

Table 6 indicates the results of the classroom practice questionnaire of teachers concerning errors that need high or little attention for errors and error corrections. On item 1 in the table while 12 (40%) of the teachers responded that they always refrain from correcting every error, 4(13.33%) of them replied they usually refrain from correcting every error. However, 4(13.33%), 5(16.67%) and 5(16.67%) of them replied to 'sometimes', 'rarely' and 'never' respectively. As shown in the table on all items except on items 4 and 7, the majority of teachers gave responses to either 'always' or 'usually'. But on items 4 and 7, most of the teachers replied to 'sometimes' 'rarely' and 'never'. They responded they give equal concentration on correcting oral errors on both accuracy and fluency, and lexical, grammatical and phonological errors. This response on these items mismatches with the responses of the perceptions items.

In this table, on the average, 10(34%), 9(29%), 5(15%), 3(11%) and 3(11%) of the teachers (most of them) responded to 'always', 'usually', 'sometimes', 'rarely' and 'never' respectively.

Table 7

Teachers' Responses about When to Correct Oral Errors (N=30)

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		5		4		3		2		1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11	I refrain from stopping students and make them say it correctly when they say anything wrong	5	16.67	9	30	3	10	7	23.33	6	20
12	I refrain from dealing with all oral errors as soon as they are made by students.	4	13.33	7	23.33	2	6.67	5	16.67	12	40
13	I give delayed oral error corrections	5	16.67	16	53.33	5	16.67	1	3.33	3	10
	Average	5	16	11	36	3	11	4	14	7	23

Table 7 indicates the findings on teachers' classroom practice of teachers' questionnaire concerning when to correct oral errors. On item 11, in the table while 5(16.67%) of the teachers responded they always refrain from stopping students or interrupting their speech for corrections, 9(30%) of the teachers replied they usually refrain from interrupting for corrections. In contrast, 7(23.33%) and 6(20%) of the teachers gave responses that they rarely refrain and never refrain from interrupting respectively. On item 12, most of the teachers, 17(56.67%), responded that they either rarely or never refrain from dealing with all oral errors as soon as they are made, i.e. they give immediate corrections. On item 13, 5(16.67%) and 16(53.33%), most teachers responded that they either always or usually respectively give delayed error corrections. The responses except on item 12 can match with perceptions responses.

To sum up the responses to all items of table 7, on the average, 5(16%), 11(36%), 3(11%), 4(14%) and 7(23%) of the teachers responded to 'always', 'usually', 'sometimes', 'rarely' and 'never' respectively. This implies that most of the teachers are favorable to correcting oral errors in the actual classroom practice.

Table 8

Teachers' Responses Concerning Who Treats or Corrects (N=30

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		5		4		3		2		1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
14	I give chances to students for self- corrections	5	16.67	13	43.33	8	26.67	3	10	1	3.33
15	I give chances to students for per corrections	4	13.33	14	46.67	8	26.67	4	13.33	--	
16	I do not mostly myself correct students' errors.	9	30	9	30	4	13.33	5	16.67	3	10
17	I refrain from giving equal chances for self-correction, peer correction and teacher correction	4	13.33	12	40	5	16.6	6	20	3	10
18	I give more chances for self- correction and peer correction than teacher correction	11	36.67	12	40	4	13.33	2	6.67	1	3.33
Average		7	22	12	40	6	20	4	13	1	5

Table 8 indicates the responses of teachers concerning who treats or corrects students' oral errors. On all items in the table, most of the teachers preferred to 'always' and 'usually' to 'sometimes', 'rarely' and 'never'. On average, 7(22%) of the teachers responded to 'always' and 12(40%) of them replied to 'usually'. This implies that majority of the teachers are in favor

of the current or updated actual classroom practice of oral error corrections. Here, teachers'
responses corresponded with their perception responses.

Table 9

Teachers' Responses to Teachers' Reactions to Errors (N=30)

No	Item Statement	Responses									
		5		4		3		2		1	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
19	I correct students without feeling angry or unhappy	13	43.33	14	46.67	-	--	--		3	10
20	I correct students with no reprimanding for making many errors	10	33.33	11	36.67	1	3.33	5	16.67	3	10
21	I provide) corrections with out considering errors as signs of failures or problems	6	20	14	46.67	--	--	3	10	7	23.33
22	I treat or correct errors with tolerance	9	30	17	56.67	1	3.33	2	6.67	1	3.33
23	I refrain from preventing students from making errors by constant or continuous corrections	1	3.33	6	20	5	16.67	9	30	9	30
24	I treat or correct errors systematically instead of randomly	15	50	11	36.67	3	10	--		1	3.33
	Average	9	30	12	40	2	6	3	11	4	13

Table 9 shows the results of teachers' responses to their reactions to oral
errors. . On all items except on item 23, most of the teachers replied to 'always'
and 'usually'. While on item 19, 27(90%) responded to either 'always' or

'usually', on item 20, 21(70%) of them replied to 'always' and 'usually'. On the rest items, on item 21, 20(56.67%), on item 22, 26(86.67%) and on item 24, 26(86.67%) of the teachers gave responses to either 'always' or 'usually'. But the majority to item 23 responded that they either rarely or never refrain from preventing students from making errors by constant corrections. That is to say, they would prefer to prevent students from making errors. Likely to perception responses, majority of the teachers' responded favorably to the items.

4.2.3 Combined Analysis and Discussion of the two Questionnaires

Table 10

Mean Scores Correlation coefficient of teachers' perception questionnaire and classroom practice questionnaire.

Mean score of the teachers' perception on oral error corrections (X)	Mean score of the teachers' classroom practice questionnaire(Y)	Correlation coefficient of the two questionnaires (P)
88.8	85.47	0.73

As shown in table 10, while the mean score of the teachers in the perception ques5ionnaire is 88.8, the mean score of the teachers in the classroom practice is 85.47. As mentioned earlier, the expected mean score in each questionnaire was 72. As Yalew (1998) described the highest value on the scale times (X) the total number of items ion the questionnaire plus the least score times (X) the total number of the questionnaire divided by two can be the expected mean scores of the questionnaires. Hence, since the mean scores of the perception questionnaire and classroom practice are 88.8 and 85.47 respectively are above

the expected mean score (72), teachers have favorable perceptions on oral error correction and they are favorable to classroom practices.

Table 10 also shows the correlation coefficient of the perception and classroom practice questionnaires. As indicated in the table, their correlation coefficient is 0.73. And this number signifies substantial relationship. In other words, there is a substantial relationship between teachers' perceptions and classroom practice.

4.2.4 Classroom Observation Results

As previously noted, four teachers in four grades (5, 6,7,8) and in four schools were observed. Each of the teachers was observed twice each for 45 minutes. Accordingly, eight classroom observations were conducted. The researcher observed the classes with the help of observation checklist, which was prepared beforehand (see Appendix F). The checklist had three parts. The first part referred to types of errors (lexical, grammatical and phonological errors) committed by students and the errors corrected and uncorrected. The second part enabled the researcher to know who corrected the errors. The last one was about the time when the errors were corrected (immediate and delayed corrections). As a result, analyses and interpretations were made using three tables. All the tables consisted of the results of all eight class observations.

Table 11

Observation Result Indicating the Total Errors and Corrected Errors

No	Error Category	Total Errors	Corrected	Uncorrected

No	Error Category		Errors		Errors	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Lexical Errors	65	11	33	5.58	32	5.41
2	Grammatical Errors	393	66.5	97	16.41	296	50.09
3	Phonological Errors	133	22.50	66	11.17	67	11.34
Total		591	100	196	33.16	395	66.84

Table 11 indicates classroom observation results that dealt with the total errors made by students and their corrections. As indicated in the table, on item 1, the total lexical errors made by students were 65(11%). Among those errors, 33(5.58%) were corrected. Nevertheless, 32(5.41%) remained uncorrected. In regard to grammatical errors, the total number was 393(66.5%). This shows that this category of errors comprised the largest number of all the categories. Of those errors, 97(16.41%) were corrected. The rest, 296(50.09%), the number of errors made by students was 133(22.50%). Only 66(11.17%) of those errors were corrected while 67(11.34%) were not corrected.

To sum up, the total number of errors made by the students was 591. While the number of errors that was corrected was 196(33.16%), the uncorrected one was 395(66.84%).

Table 12

Observation Results Showing who Corrected the Errors

No	Error Category	Total Corrected		Self Corrected		Peer Corrected		Teacher Corrected	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Lexical Errors	33	16.84	2	1.02	8	4.08	23	11.74
2	Grammatical Errors	97	49.49	10	5.10	14	7.14	73	37.24
3	Phonological Errors	66	33.67	4	2.04	12	6.13	50	25.51

Total	196	100	16	8.16	34	17.35	146	74.49

Table 12 reveals the class observation results that disclosed who corrected the errors. As it can be seen from the table, 33(16.84%) of the corrected lexical errors, 2(1.02%), 8(4.08%) and 23(11.74%) of them were self-corrected, peer corrected and teacher corrected respectively. On item 2, the result indicates that 97(49.49%) of the corrected grammatical errors, 10(5.10%) were self-corrected, 14(7.14%) were peer corrected and 73(37.24%) were teacher corrected. In the same table of item 3, 66(33.67%) of them were phonological corrected errors while only 4(2.04%) of them were self-corrected, 12(6.13%) and 50(25.51%) of the corrected errors were done by peers and teachers respectively.

In general, of the 196 corrected errors, 16(8.16%) were self- corrected, 34(17.35%) peer corrected, and 146(74.49%) teacher treated.

Table 13

Observation Results about When Corrections Were Made

No	Error Category	Total Corrected Errors		Immediately Corrected		Delayed Corrected	
		F	%	F	%	F	%
1	Lexical Errors	33	16.84	31	15.82	2	1.02
2	Grammatical Errors	97	49.49	96	48.98	1	0.51
3	Phonological Errors	66	33.67	63	32.14	3	1.53

Total	196	100	190	96.94	6	3.06

Table 13 shows the findings when the errors were corrected. As it is clear to see from the table, the number of lexical errors that were corrected immediately was 31(15.82%). In contrast, 2(1.02%) of them were later corrected. With respect to item 2 (grammatical errors), while 96(48.98%) of the errors were immediate corrected, only 1(0.51%) error was later corrected. Concerning phonological errors, of the corrected errors, 66(33.67%), 63(32.14%) were immediately corrected. However, 3(1.53%) were later corrected.

To summarize, among 196 corrected errors of all types, 190(96.94%) were treated or corrected immediately whereas 6(3.06%) were corrected with delay.

4.2.5 Interview Results

As previously described, four teachers, who were observed by the investigator, were also interviewed. Four semi structured items of interview were developed and conducted with each of them separately. As a result, their responses were analyzed and described on aggregate under each question.

Question 1: Which types of errors do you correct or treat when students make oral errors?

To this question, the interviewees gave their own opinions. The errors they correct are as follows: pronunciation (phonological) errors, grammatical errors and lexical errors. They reported that they correct errors which create communication barriers. They also discussed that they correct or treat serious (important) errors. In addition, they informed they gave emphasis on errors that are repeated regularly by students.

Question 2: When do you correct or treat errors made by students?

All of the interviewees responded that they use immediate and delayed corrections. T_1 pointed out that the objective of the activity or exercise can determine the time when errors are corrected, while some activities need immediate corrections, others need delayed corrections. They also stated that they use even postponed corrections if the activity or the topic has continuation of the next day. However, T_2 told the interviewer postponed correction has advantages or disadvantages. She (T_2) has a fear of the absence of some students for the next class. This T_2 informed that even the students who would make errors might not be present for the next class, and miss the postponed corrections. Due to this, T_2 explained that she uses postponed error corrections rarely.

T_3 also reported that she uses usually immediate error correction technique since the activities are oral. Therefore, all the teachers stated they prefer immediate corrections to delayed or postponed corrections

Question 3: When students make oral errors, who should give corrections?

All of the interviewees discussed that they use all of the three techniques of error corrections: self-correction, peer correction and teacher correction. They expressed their beliefs that self-correction and peer correction are more

important than teacher correction. Nevertheless, two interviewees replied they usually use teacher correction due to shortage of time.

Question 4: When students make oral errors, how do you treat or react to oral errors?

Each of the interviewees expressed their reflections on his/her reaction to oral errors. Hence, their reflections or views were stated on aggregate as follows:

No to be filled with anger when students make errors.

No reprimanding even if they make many errors.

Encouragement should be provided for those who make errors.

No need of rushing to corrections, i.e., no interruption while they speak.

Tolerance for errors is important.

No need of over-correcting since this discourages students.

To be serious or strict to errors is not important.

Instead of seeing errors negatively, it is important to see them positively.

Helping them to correct themselves is important.

There should not be humiliating students for making errors.

There should be praising for attempting to correct their errors.

Passing the questions to other students since peer correction is necessary.

4.3. Discussion

This section discussed the findings and possible implications in light of the basic questions of the study.

4.3.1. Teachers' perceptions on Oral Error Corrections

Both quantitative and qualitative data gathering instruments used in the study proved that teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections were favorable. The mean (average) scores of the respondents in both questionnaires were found high. The mean score of teachers' perceptions questionnaire was 88.8. And the mean score of teachers' classroom practice questionnaire were 85.47. These mean scores proved that teachers had favorable perceptions on oral error corrections since, as explained earlier, all the items of the questionnaires were developed based on the tenets of people who hold favorable perceptions on oral error corrections. Thus, scoring high results on the items of the questionnaires proved that teachers' perceptions are high on oral error corrections. In addition, teachers' responses to the two open ended items (25 and 26) in the perceptions questionnaire can be witness to the teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections are high. All of the points they stated under the two open ended items were the good qualities of teachers who are on position of favorable or high perceptions on oral error corrections.

The results of the actual classroom observations also strengthened this fact. As it can be seen in the tables of classroom observations, teachers were not strict with the oral errors made by students. Of 591 total errors made by students, 196(33.16%) were corrected (see table 11). As a result, this shows that they were not strict with errors. They were very tolerant to them. Therefore, being tolerant to errors is one of the good qualities of teachers who have positive attitudes towards errors. This finding coincided with literature of Ancker(2000) that teachers should be more tolerant to students' oral errors. It also proved the view of Dan-yu (2007) that errors should be tolerable, especially those in favor of communicative teaching methods.

The other data gathering instrument in this study, the interview also proved teachers had high perceptions on oral error corrections. Most of the issues they discussed were favorable to oral error corrections.

4.3.2 Teachers Attention to Kinds of Oral Errors

The findings in the study indicated teachers gave great attention on serious or most important errors, which create breakdown in communication, and errors repeated regularly by students. This was proved by the responses of teachers in both quantitative and qualitative methods. Teachers' responses to the perception questionnaire and open ended items, and the interviews also proved teachers focused on important errors instead of correcting every error. Besides, the researcher found evidence for this during the classroom observations. Observed teachers did not treat or correct all the errors made by students. They were selective for corrections. Of the errors made in the three types of errors (lexical, grammatical and phonological errors), most of the corrected errors were the serious or the most important ones. The unnoticeable and unimportant errors were ignored by the teachers. This finding proved the idea of Zhu (2010) that teachers should concentrate on errors that hinder communication.

4.3.3 When, How and by Whom Oral Errors Are Corrected

Concerning the time when oral errors are corrected, the study proved that most of the corrected errors were corrected immediately. In both the perception and classroom practice questionnaires, most of the teachers either disagreed or strongly disagreed to the technique of immediate correction and they replied they use it rarely or never use it (See tables 3 and 7). Most teachers responded in both questionnaires they use delayed corrections. However, these

responses did not match with the actual classroom practice observations. Most of the corrected errors in the actual classroom practice were corrected immediately. Of 196 total corrected errors, 190(96.94%) were corrected immediately. The rest, 6(3.06%) were delayed corrections. This result indicates that teachers are immediate correctors.

On this issue, this study proved the studies conducted by Wondwosen and Getnet, as cited in Haileyesus (1995), asserted that high school English teachers in Ethiopia were immediate correctors. Besides, they stated those teachers used mostly teacher correction technique in classroom practice whether the activity is oral or written. Accordingly, this study also found teachers in these second cycle primary schools are immediate correctors and teacher correctors. They did not give more chances for self- correction and peer correction as observed the actual classroom practice although most of the teachers responded the contrary in the questionnaires. So, teachers are unfavorable to the view of Zhu (2010) that self-correction and peer correction are essential techniques since they reduce students' dependence on external assistance.

Even though these teachers fulfilled many of the principles and practices of the current English language methods, they gave little attention to some good qualities such as using delayed corrections, self and peer corrections as they were observed in classes. Lacking these good qualities make teachers are grouped under audio-lingual method (traditional method) teachers as Brown (1994) stated that in the audio-lingual method, teachers believe every error should be corrected immediately by the teacher. In support of this, Harmer (2001) also explained that, traditionally, it has been the teachers' role to correct errors.

Regarding how errors are corrected or reacted, they were corrected positively or gently. Both Quantitative and qualitative instruments proved that teachers'

reactions to errors were positive. They were tolerant to the errors. They were not strict, especially teachers' responses to the two open ended items and the interviews could be witness to this issue. This result proved the finding of Ancker (2000) that most language teachers in Africa are tolerant to errors.

As mentioned above, classroom observation results showed many of the corrected errors were corrected by the teachers themselves (see table 12). Out of 196 total corrected errors, teachers corrected 146(74.49%) of them. These classroom observations results did not much with the questionnaires and interviews results. Most of the teachers in the questionnaires were favorable to all the three techniques of corrections: self-correction, peer correction and teacher correction. However, in their actual classroom practice, they used more of teacher correction.

4.3.4. The Correspondence between Teachers' Perceptions and their Actual Classroom Practice

The results showed that there was correspondence or relationship between teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections and their actual classroom practice. While the mean score of the perception questionnaire was 88.8, the classroom practice questionnaire was 85.47. Hence, these mean scores proved that there was correspondence or relationship between teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections and their actual classroom practice.

However, there were some mismatches with their perceptions results and their actual classroom practice. The actual classroom practice observations result indicated teachers in the actual classroom practice were dominantly of correcting students' errors. Of 196 corrected errors, 146 (74.49%) were teacher corrected. Teachers gave little attention for self-correction and peer correction. But in the perception and classroom practice questionnaires most of the teachers responded they could use self-correction and peer correction more

than teacher correction. Nevertheless, in reality, the actual classroom practice observations revealed the contrary.

To sum up, except this issue, most of the responses of teachers in all data instruments and the responses of students to classroom practice questionnaire proved teachers' perceptions on oral error corrections and their classroom practice had correspondence or relationship.

4.3.5. Teachers' Perceptions on the Current Theory and Classroom Practice of Oral Error Corrections

The findings in the study showed that second cycle primary school English language teachers had favorable perceptions on oral error corrections. It was also found that their perceptions had substantial relationship with their actual classroom practice. As a result, these pieces of evidence (findings) proved that these teachers are favorable or in line with the current theory and practice of oral error corrections, because all the items in the questionnaires were developed based on the current tenets or theory and classroom practice of oral error corrections. That is to say, they (items of the questionnaires) refer to current tenets and classroom practice of oral error corrections.

In general, second cycle primary English language teachers are favorable or in line with the current theory and classroom practice of oral error corrections since they are found to have favorable perceptions on oral error corrections. This finding proved Ancker's (2000) research that this is the time of a gradual shift in classroom practice from audio-lingualism to a modern approach.

4.3.6. The Combined Discussion of the TwoQuestionnaires.

As it was indicated the mean of the perception score (88.8) is greater than the mean of the classroom practice score (85.47) (see table 10). Even though perceptions and practices should be linked, teachers were incapable of translating their views into practice thoroughly. However, the two questionnaires mean scores reveal teachers' perceptions and their practices

are in good terms. It is safely that teachers' perceptions and practices are consistent.

The relationship between teachers' perceptions on oral error correction and their actual classroom practice was calculated by using Spearman's rank order coefficient of correlation (P) and was found to be 0.73. This coefficient shows there is substantial relationship. The predefined criterion for evaluating the magnitude of a correlation which the researcher adopted from Yalew (1998) as described in chapter 3 was:

Table 14
Criteria for Determining Relationship between the Two Questionnaires

Coefficient (r)	Interpretation
0.00 -- 0.19	Negligible
0.20 -- 0.39	Low
0.40 -- 0.59	Moderate
0.60 -- 0.79	Substantial
0.80 -- 1.00	High to very high

(Yalew, 1998:340)

When the coefficient of the perception and practice questionnaires (0.73) is compared with the predefined criterion, it is in the range of 0.60 to 0.80 and consequently shows substantial relationship. On the other hand, p^2 or coefficient of determination is 0.73. This means that 53% of variance in the classroom correcting of oral errors is predictable from the variance of perception of teachers' towards oral error correction.

CHAPTER FIVE

Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify the second cycle primary school English language teachers perceptions on oral error corrections and to ascertain whether their perceptions would correspond with their actual classroom practice. To achieve this goal, the study attempted to answer the following basic questions:

1. What perceptions second cycle primary English language teachers have on oral error corrections?
2. What kinds of oral errors do teachers give high attention for corrections?
3. When, how and by whom are these oral errors corrected?
4. Do teachers' perceptions correspond with their actual classroom practice?
5. Are teachers in line with the current or updated theory and practice of oral error corrections?

To this end, the researcher reviewed literature and followed procedures. The population for this study was Second Cycle Primary School English language teachers in Debre Markos Town Woreda. Comprehensive sampling technique was employed. Consequently, all 32 English language teachers in all 8 second cycle primary schools were taken as a sample population. Of 32 teachers, 7 were females.

To obtain valuable information from the participants, questionnaires, classroom observations and interviews were used as means of data gathering tools. 32 pairs of copies of the two questionnaires were distributed to teachers. Of 32, 30 teachers filled in and returned the questionnaires. In addition, 4 teachers were observed and interviewed. Therefore, quantitative and qualitative data gathering instruments were employed for the study. Data

gathered through quantitative (closed ended items and observations) were analyzed using frequency counts, percentages and mean. Nevertheless, data gathered through qualitative (two open ended items and interviews) were analyzed in statements.

The data obtained from the two questionnaires were analyzed as follows. It was decided if the mean (average) score of the respondents were 72 and above, teachers would be considered to have favorable perceptions on oral error corrections if not, the contrary would be considered. This benchmark (72) was decided because of calculating the expected mean score using the highest score and the least score divided by two. That is to say while the highest score of a respondent is 120(24X5), the least score of a respondent on the Likert and Frequency scale is 24(24X1). Thus, the expected mean score is $\frac{120+24}{2} = 72$.

The most important results of this study were the following:

The mean score of the respondents in the perceptions questionnaire was 88.8.

The mean score of the respondents in the classroom practice questionnaire was 85.47. The relationship between teachers perceptions on oral error correction and their actual classroom practice was calculated by using the Spearman rho (P) and was found to be 0.73. Since the correlation of perception and classroom practice is 0.73, there is a substantial relationship between their perceptions and classroom practice.

Since the mean score of the respondents in each questionnaire was above the expected mean score, 72, it is implied teachers are favorable to perceptions and classroom practice of oral error corrections.

All the written responses to the open ended items and the interviews results reflected the qualities of people (teachers) who hold favorable perceptions on oral error corrections.

Teachers were dominantly immediate correctors of oral errors in classroom observation.

In the actual classroom practice, teachers gave little attention to self-corrections and peer corrections. Many of the errors were corrected by teachers. Thus, there was a mismatch between teachers' responses in the questionnaires and their actual classroom practice concerning these techniques of corrections. Teachers responded in the questionnaires they use self-correction and peer correction more than teacher correction. However, the reality showed the contrary.

Teachers did not correct every error made by students. They concentrated on important or serious errors consequently teachers were not strict error correctors.

Teachers corrected all the three kinds of errors: lexical, phonological and grammatical errors.

Teachers are found to be in line with the current theory and practice of correcting oral errors.

5.2 Conclusions

Based on the findings and discussion made in this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

∨ Second cycle primary school English language teachers have favorable perception on oral error correction.

∨ There is a substantial relationship between teachers' perceptions on oral error correction and their actual classroom practice.

∨ 53% of variance in the classroom practice correcting errors is predictable from the variance of perceptions of teachers' on oral error correction.

∨ Teachers are in line with or favorable to the current theory and practice of correcting oral errors.

∨ Teachers did not correct or treat every error students made. Instead, they corrected errors that interfere with communication.

∨ Since teachers did not correct every error made by students, the conclusion could be drawn that they were not strict with errors. They were tolerant to them. They were selective. As a result, this quality is one of the qualities of teachers who have favorable perceptions on oral error corrections.

∨ Teachers gave immediate and delayed corrections. Nevertheless, they were more of immediate correctors.

∨ Although most of the teachers responded in the questionnaires they give more chances for self and peer corrections than teacher correction, they used mostly teacher correction technique in the actual classroom.

∨ Teachers corrected their students without reprimanding even though they made many and repeated errors.

∨ Teachers corrected all the kinds of errors: lexical, phonological and grammatical errors.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study and the conclusion made, the following recommendations were forwarded.

- ∨ Teachers should not concentrate on teacher correction technique, but they should rather concentrate on self-corrections and peer corrections. They have to be flexible in them. They have to give chances for students to correct their errors. Otherwise, the teaching learning tends to be teacher central or traditional.
- ∨ Teachers should use delay corrections even postponed corrections depending on circumstances. They should not be more of immediate correctors in order to avoid interruptions.
- ∨ The ministry of Education or other concerned authorities and stake holders can make use of second cycle primary school English language teachers' perceptions and favorable practice of correcting oral errors to give trainings to further strengthen their perceptions on oral error corrections and classroom practice.
- ∨ Colleges and Universities should design courses of studies on errors and corrections for English language teaching trainees or students at colleges and universities.

Bibliography

Allan, D. (1991). Tape journals: Bridging the gap between communication and error correction. *ELT Journal,* 45(1), 60-65.

Allright, D., and Bailey, K. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research.* New York: Cambridge University   Press.

Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and Corrective feedback: Up dated theory and classroom practice. *English Teaching Forum,* 38(4), 20-25.

Best, J.W., and Kahn, J.V. (1993). *Research in education* (7th ed.). New DelhiL; Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited.

Bordens, K.S., and Abbot, B.B. (1996). *Research design and methods* (4th ed.). California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Brown, H.D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* Sanfrancisco: Prentice Hall Regents.

Chen, Z. (2008). Recasts as corrective feedback in Chines's English classroom interaction. (*ELEA Journal,* 31(3), 30-34.

Dan-yu, W. (2007). Common sense approach to errors in spoken English. *US-China Foreign Language,* 5(8), 51-55.

Davis,P., Garside, B., and RinVoluci.M. (1998). *Ways of doing: Students explore their every day and class room processes.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dobson, J.M. (1974). *Effective techniques for English Conversation groups.* Washington, D.C: Newbury House publishers.

Doff, A. (1988). *Teach English: A training Course for teachers.* Cambridge:Cambridge University
        Press.

Edge,J.(1989). *Mistakes and Correction.* London: Longman.

ESL Teaching Training. (2010). Teaching tip11: Error correction. Retrieved on September 6, 2010, from *htt: //WWW. tefl. net/ teacher-training/ teaching-tip 11.htm.*

Freeman, D.L. (1986). *Techniques and Principles in language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University press.

Gannon, P. (1985). *Exploration in language Study*. London: Edward Aronld (publishers) Ltd.

Haileyesus Bala(1995). *Teachers' attitudes towards English language learners' errors (with particular reference to grade 11).* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Addis Ababa, Institute of Languages Studies, Addis Ababa.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Kassaw Baye(2008). Factors affecting classroom oral interactions on students' participation in English language classes: (DBTEVTCH third year language social science students). *Research Journal,* 1 (12), 148—172.

Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL students' preferences toward correction of classroom oral   errors. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9, 1-12.

Lewis, M.,and Hill,J. (1985). *Practical techniques for language teaching.* London: Commercial Color Press.

Lynch, L.M. (2010). English language error correction-A key language skills development tool. Retrieved on September 6, 2010, from *http:// ezineartricle. Com/? English-Language-error correction ___ A_ key _ language – skills- DE . . .*

Maharjan, L.B. (2009). Learners' errors and their evaluatiohn. *Jouranl of NELTA,* 14 (2), 71-75.

Makino, T. (1993). Learner self-correction in EFL written composition. *ELT Journal*, 47 (4), 336-341.

Moss, H. (2002). The correction of students' oral errors. Retrieved on October 21, 2001, from *file http// WWW. British council. Org/ Portugal-in english – 2011, apr - the correction—of—students—oral – errors. Pdf.*

Murphy, D. (1986). Communication and correction in the classroom. *ELT Journal,* 40 (2), 146156.

Norrish, J.C. (1983). *Language learners and their errors.* London: Macmillan publishers Ltd.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University press.

Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing.* Newyork: McGraw—Hill.

Richareds, J.C. (1974). *Error analysis: perspectives on second language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Richards, J.C., and Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Sadek, F.S. (2010). Impact of Palestinian EFL teachers' attitudes toward oral errors on their students' attitudes and choice of error treatment strategies. Digital collections. Retrieved on February 11, 2011, from *http// d collections, bc.eEduc /R/? func= cd-bin-jump-ful l & object-id = 163387 & local-base= GEN 01.*

Show, H. (1970). *Errors in English and ways to correct them* (2nd ed). Newyork: Barnes and Noble

Books.

Stevick, E.W. (1983). *Teaching and learning languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Thompson, H. (2001). *Teaching primary English.* Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Truscot, J. (1999). What is wrong with oral grammar correction. *UTP Journal*, 55(4), 1-12.

Ur, P. (1999). *A course in language teaching.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

USAID. (2008). *Teacher training manual English for Ethiopia grades 6,7 and 8.* Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education Curriculum Development Department (CDD).

Vale, D., and Feunteun, A. (1995). *Teaching children English: A training course for teachers of English to children.* Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Vivier, M.D., Hopikins, A., and Potter, J. (1994). *Look ahead classroom course.* Harlow: Longman Group UK Ltd.

ያለው እንደወቀ, (1998)። *የምርምር መሠረታዊ መርሆችና አተገባበር፡ አይታወቅም፣ አልፋ አሳታሚዎች።*

Yalew Endawoke (2005). Educational research (EPSY. 233) Course module for year II Education students. Unpublished, Bahirdar University, Department of Pedagogical Sciences, Bahirdar.

Wilkins, D.A. (1974) *Second language learning and teaching*. London: Edward Arnold (publishers) Ltd.

Williams, M., and Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Zhang, Y., and Zhang, L. (2010). A brief analysis of corrective feedback in oral interaction. *Journal of language and research*, 1,(3),306--308.

Zhu, H. (2010). An analysis of college students' attitudes towards error correction in EFL context English language teaching. *Journal of English language teaching*, 3(4), 127—130.