**NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY**

**GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES AND PREFERENCES**

**REGARDING ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK"**

**MASTER THESIS**

**ZIRAK RASUL SAEED**

**SUPERVISOR: PROF. DR. MOHAMMAD H. KESHAVARZ**

**NICOSIA**

**JULY 2014**

NEAR EAST UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING

TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES AND PREFERENCES

REGARDING ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

MASTER THESIS

ZIRAK RASUL SAEED

SUPERVISOR: PROF. DR. MOHAMMAD H. KESHAVARZ

NICOSIA

JULY 2014

We certify that we have read the thesis submitted by Zirak Rasul Saeed entitled "Teachers' and Students' Perspectives and Preferences Regarding Oral Corrective Feedback" and that in our combined opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and in quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

………………………………………………….

Asst. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Kurt

Head of the Committee

………………………………………………….

Prof. Dr. Mohammad Hossein Keshavarz

Supervisor

………………………………………………….

Asst. Prof. Dr. Doina Popescu

Committee Member

Approved by the

Graduate School of Educational Sciences

………………………………………………….

Prof. Dr. Orhan Çiftçi

Director of Graduate School of Educational Sciences

# DECLARATION

I hereby declare that all the information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all the materials and results that are not original to this study.

**Name, Middle and last name: Zirak Rasul Saeed**

**Signature: …………………….**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# DEDICATION

To my family especially my parents who have always supported me with

endless love.

# ABSTRACT

## TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' PERSPECTIVES AND PREFERENCES

## REGARDING ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK

**Saeed, Zirak Rasul**

**MA Program in English Language Teaching**

**Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Mohammad H. Keshavarz**

**July 2014, 122 pages**

This study aimed at investigating the attitude of EFL students and teachers towards oral corrective feedback (OCF). To achieve the objective of the study, 50 EFL teachers from all high schools in Rania city and 200 EFL students in four different high schools participated in this study. Data were collected through an attitude questionnaire. The results showed that Kurdish EFL students have positive attitudes towards OCF. It was also revealed that the vast majority of students want their errors to be corrected, whereas less than half of the teachers agree that students' errors should be corrected. Furthermore, teachers and students believe that CF should be provided after a communicative task is over, and both groups preferred serious oral errors that may hamper communication should be given priority in CF. Moreover, the results revealed that teachers regard *implicit feedback* as a more effective technique, whereas students prefer *clarification request*. Students prefer teachers to give CF while teachers prefer students themselves to correct their errors (self-correction). The findings are interpreted to have pedagogical implications for syllabus designers and language teachers.

*Keywords:* CF, teachers and students preferences for CF, types of CF

# ÖZ

## ÖĞRETMENLERİN VE ÖĞRENCİLERİN SÖZLÜ DÜZELTİCİ GERİ BİLDİRİMLER HAKKINDAKİ BAKIŞ VE TERCİHLERİ

**Saeed, Ziral Rasul**

**Yüksek Lisans, İngilizce Öğretmenliği Anabilim Dalı**

**Danışman: Prof. Dr. Mohammad H. Keshavarz**

**Temmuz 2014, 122 sayfa**

Bu çalışma, İngilizce yabancı dil öğretmen ve öğrencilerin sözlü düzeltici geri bildirime yönelik tutumlarını incelemeyi amaçladı. Bu çalışmanın hedefini başarmak (hedefine ulaşmak) için, Raina şehrindeki tüm liselerden 50 İngilizce yabancı dil öğretmeni ve 4 ayrı liseden 200 İngilizce yabancı dil öğrencisi bu çalışmaya katıldı. Veriler bir anket vasıtasıyla toplanmıştır. Çıkan sonuçlara göre, Kürt İngilizce yabancı dil öğrencilerinin düzeltici geri bildirimlere yönelik olumlu tutumları vardır. Ayrıca gösterildi ki bu öğrencilerin büyük bir çoğunluğu yanlışlarının düzeltilmesini istiyor, oysa öğretmenlerin yarısından azı hataların düzeltilmesi gerektiğini doğru buluyor. Ayrıca, öğretmenler ve öğrenciler inanıyor ki, iletişimsel bir görev tamamlandıktan sonra düzeltici geri bildirimin sağlanması gerektiğini ve her iki grupta düzeltici geri bildirimde önceliğin iletişimi bozan hatalara verilmesini vurguluyor. Çıkan bu sonuçlar gösterdi ki, öğretmenler *ifade edilmeden anlaşılan geri bildirimi* daha etkili teknik olarak saymakta, oysa öğrenciler *açıklığa kavuşturmayı* tercih etmektedir. Öğretmenler öğrencilerin kendi hatalarını düzeltmesini tercih ederken, öğrenciler öğretmenlerin düzeltici geri bildirim vermesini tercih etmektedir. Bulgular, müfredat tasarımcıları ve dil öğretmenleri açısından pedagojik etkilerin olduğunu göstermektedir.

*Anahtar kelimeler:* Düzeltici geri bildirim, düzeltici geri bildirim için öğretmen ve öğrenci tercihleri, düzeltici geri bildirim tercihleri

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# LIST OF APPENDICES

# LIST OF TABLES

# ABBREVIATIONS

**Terms and Abbreviations Used in the Thesis**

KRG         :         Kurdistan Regional Government

ANOVA       :         Analysis of Variance

EFL         :         English as a Foreign Language

ESL         :         English as a second language

EC          :         Error Correction

FL          :         Foreign Language

CF          :         Corrective Feedback

OCF         :         Oral Corrective Feedback

SPSS        :         Statistical Package for Social Sciences

M           :         Mean

SD          :         Standard Deviation

M.D         :         Mean Difference

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

Most, if not all, second or foreign language learners make phonological, grammatical, and lexical errors while speaking or writing in foreign languages. When there is a mistake, correction is often provided, and without committing mistakes learning never occurs. Subsequently, error correction is inevitable and all teachers have to deal with it as part of their teaching responsibility. Making errors should be seen as a part of the process of learning a foreign language (see Corder, 1967; Makino, 1993; Cook, 2008; Lightbown & Spada, 2011; Ellis, 2009; and Hendrickson, 1978, cited in Rahimi, 2010). Some foreign language educators believe that actual learning will only take place when learners commit mistakes and receive good corrective feedback from their teachers. Hendrickson (1978) supports this idea by saying that "Errors are signals that actual learning is taking place, they can indicate students' progress and success in language learning" (as quoted in Othman, 2012, p. 51).

Depending on learners' errors, Corder (1967) maintains that there have been two schools of thoughts in the area of methodology:

Firstly, the school which maintains that if we were to achieve a perfect teaching method the errors would never be committed in the first place, and therefore the occurrence of errors are merely a sign of the present inadequacy of our teaching techniques. The philosophy of the second school is that we live in an imperfect world and consequently errors will always occur in spite of our best efforts. Our ingenuity should be concentrated on techniques for dealing with errors after they have occurred. (p. 163)

Undoubtedly, errors have a pivotal role in the process of learning a second or foreign language. Errors are of great significance to teachers, students and researchers. The significance of errors to the teachers is that they can detect students' progress in the learning process. Teachers are also able to find out what the students have learned and what they need to focus on. In addition, it helps them better understand the causes of the errors that students are likely to make and to find out learners' weak points in learning that language. In these cases, it is possible for teachers to deal with errors in an effective way. Furthermore, making errors is also important to the learners. Learners that learning a new language often encompass some difficulties and it is through errors that students notice their weaknesses and therefore focus on them in order to find more suitable ways to be able to solve them. Finally, errors are also significant to the researchers. Corder further noted that, "errors provide researchers evidence of how language is learnt and acquired, what strategies or procedures the learner employs in his discovery of the language" (p. 167).

In the past errors were not considered as part of the learning process. During the 1950s and 1960s, errors were looked upon quite negatively and were directly dealt with Brooks stated that "Like sin, error is to be avoided and its influence overcomes, but its presence is to be expected" (as cited in Keshavarz, 2012, p.148). However, this negative attitude towards errors shifted into a positive one in the 60s, and errors are now seen a result of natural progress in language learning. Richards and Sampson (1974, cited in Miyao 1999, p. 204), insist that "errors should not be viewed as problems to be overcome, but rather as normal and inevitable features indicating the strategies that learners use". Others claim that "error correction is not only unnecessary, but also harmful to language learning" (Krashen, 1981a; 1981b as

cited in Rezaei, Mozaffari, & Hatef, 2011). In terms of corrective feedback, Truscott (1996, 1999) argues that "correction does not work at all, or is even counterproductive because it may hurt student's feelings" (as cited in Ur, 2012, p. 89). Allwright & Bailey (1992) argued that "the use of corrective feedback should be delayed to trigger learners' repair" (as cited in Rezaei, Mozaffari, & Hatef, 2011). On the other hand, in the teacher's Manual for German, level one; it is suggested that "Teachers should correct all errors immediately" (Keshavarz, 2012, p. 148). Some schools of thought like Behaviorism considered "errors as taboos in their discourse and believed that they should be immediately corrected by the teacher" (Brown, 2007; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001, as cited in Rezaei, Mozaffari, & Hatef, 2011).

As mentioned above, the most common issue that teachers deal with is error correction. It has been regarded as one the main functions of language teaching. Nunan (1989) claims that "error correction, along with formal instruction, is the classroom activity which most people think of as one of the language teacher's most important functions" (as cited in DOYON, 2000, pp. 43-44).

In the light of the argument stated above it is essential to find out about learners' perspective on error correction. By finding out about learners' preferences for the techniques used for error correction, teachers will know whether to correct students' errors or not; when and how to choose the best way of treating students' errors, etc. Learners' preferences will help teachers know what CF strategies to choose not to demotivate their students.

In this case, it is crucial to mention the techniques employed by teachers to correct students' errors. The main techniques are recasting, elicitation, clarification, metalinguistic clues, explicit correction, and repetition (Ur, 2012). Some teachers

tend to correct all the errors while some tend to be tolerant and still some others do not correct at all (Riazi and Riasati, 2007; Noora, 2006, as cited in Azar & Molavi, 2013).

Choosing an error correction technique requires a lot of ingenuity in order to be fruitful for the process of learning a language. In addition, not all students accept only one way of correction, so choosing the technique also depends on individuality. Teachers should know that they cannot use a single approach to correct students' errors because students are different from each other in their attitudes. Karra (2006) points out that when a student commits a mistake, the most effective way to correct him/her is not by simply spoon feeding him/her with it, but by leading them to explore the correct form and let them try different hypotheses for example searching for finding the correct linguistic forms.

During my experience as a teacher I have come across many issues in regards to error correction. Some students want explicit corrections in order to improve their language and to avoid mistakes, some others hate it and do not want their mistakes to be corrected directly. They particularly do not like to be asked questions like: "how do you say that in English?" and "Can you use the correct form?" Some teachers believe that every single error should be corrected immediately ignoring the fact that errors are vital in the learning process. Hagège (1999, cited in Karra, 2006, para. 21) emphasizes that dealing with errors in a good way is important. He notes that "it is useless, if not harmful, to treat errors as if they were "diseases or pathological situations which must be eliminated", especially if this treatment becomes discouraging, which is seen to occur in situations where teachers lose their patience because of learner's numerous errors".

Based on my experience as a teacher, students believe that teachers want to hurt their feelings and humiliate them in front of their classmates by correcting them. Moreover, some learners do not accept or want to be corrected; one can notice this anxiety first from the colour of their faces, or not participating in class activities taking into account the aforementioned. Teachers should know how to give feedback, and should try out different techniques while giving feedback. Students do not have the same attitudes towards techniques when receiving feedback. If teachers treat all students' errors with the same technique, it will be demotivating for most of them. It is just like a doctor that treats all patients with the same medication, which may have fatal consequences. As a result, treating all students in the same way and dealing with their errors with the same approach should be avoided. Each students' preference in terms of error correction, i.e., whether to be corrected or not and how to be corrected, should be taken into consideration as students are different from each another. To sum up, it could be said that a successful teacher should create an atmosphere full of confidence and relaxation for their learners.

**The Aim of the Study**

The main objective of this study is to find out about the preferences of teachers and students for error correction. Moreover, this study aims to find out whether or not learners benefit from CF and which type of oral corrective feedback is more effective. Finally, this study aims to investigate male and female students' attitudes towards teacher feedback in two different types of schools, i.e., co-educational and separate.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this study:

1- What are Kurdish EFL teachers and students' perspectives on classroom OCF?

2- What are Kurdish EFL students and teachers' preferences regarding classroom OCF?

3- Are there any statistically significant differences between teachers and students' perceptions of effective CF practices?

4- Do students' preferences for error correction vary according to their gender, age, number of years they have studied English, and types of school (co-educational vs. separate schools) they attend?

5- Do teachers' preferences for error correction vary according to their gender and teaching experience (i.e., number of years they have taught)?

6- Are male and female students' attitudes towards OCF in co-educational schools similar with those in separate schools?

**Significance of the Study**

The issue of teacher's oral CF has presented certain problems for both EFL teachers and students due to the disparity between teachers' actual practices and students' expectations and preferences. In this study, therefore, I hope to find out reasonable answers to the research questions so that teachers can gain more awareness of the significance of students' beliefs and their preferences for types of CF. influence of CF.

**Definitions of Key Terms**

**Errors versus mistakes.** Error and error correction have been variously defined by many researchers and writers. Day, R.; Chenoweth N.; Chun, E.;

Luppescu, S. (1984) define an oral error as "the use of a linguistic item or discourse structure in a way, which, according to fluent users of the language, indicates faulty or incomplete learning" (cited in Leiter, 2010, p.3). Other linguists like (Liski & Puntanen, 1983) have stated that an oral error "occurs where the speaker fails to follow the pattern or manner of speech of educated people in English speaking countries today" (cited in Leiter, J., 2010, p.3).

Lennon describes an oral error as "a linguistic form or a combination of forms, which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts" (1991, cited in Pawlak, 2014, p. 3). Furthermore, Chaudron views oral error as "1-linguistic forms or content that differ from native speaker norms or facts", "2- any other behavior which is indicated by the teacher as needing improvement" (1986, paraphrased Pawlak, 2014, p. 4). Dulay, Burt and Krashen (1982) defined oral errors as "the flawed side of learner speech or writing which deviates from some selected norm of mature language performance" (p.138). Yang (2010) defines language error "as an unsuccessful bit of language" (p. 266). Ellis (1994) defines an oral error as "a deviation from the norms of the target language". (p.51)

**Error correction and corrective feedback.** Several terms have been used related to the field of oral error correction to explain the way of correcting learners spoken errors, such as: treatment, repair, correction or corrective, and feedback (Ellis, 1994, p. 583). Linguists and practitioners from different places have different conceptions of oral error correction and feedback which will be discussed below.

Chaudron's (1998) opinion about error correction is that "any teacher behavior following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error"

(p.306). According to Ellis (1994), oral feedback "serves as a general cover term for information provided by listeners on the reception and comprehension of messages" (p.584). James describes oral correction as "a reactive second move of an adjacency pair to a first speaker or writer's utterance by someone who has made the judgment that all or part of that utterance is linguistically or factually wrong" (cited in Pawlak, 2014, p. 5).

Lightbown and Spada (2011) define oral CF as "an indication to a learner that his or her use of the target language is incorrect." (p. 197). Corrective feedback has been explained simply by Sheen and Ellis (2011) as "the feedback that learners receive on the linguistic errors they make in their oral or written production in a second language (L2)". (p. 593).

Corrective feedback has been categorized into six different types (for detail on this classification by Lyster and Ranta (1997) see chapter I) Ellis, Loewen, Elder, Erlam, Philp, and Reinders, (2009) have identified the term corrective feedback as follows:

Corrective feedback takes the form of responses to learner utterances that contain an error. The responses can consist of (a) an indication that an error has been committed, (b) provision of the correct target language form or (c) metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these. (p.303)

Similarly, Oral CF has been defined as "'responses to learner utterances containing an error' or as a 'complex phenomenon with several functions'" (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013, p. 1). According to Li (2010), "Corrective feedback in second language acquisition (SLA) refers to the responses to a learner's nontargetlike L2 production". (p.309)

For the term 'treatment', Chaudron (1977, cited in Ellis, 1994, p. 584) defined and distinguished this term into four different types. However, only two of these definitions seem useful and feasible "i) Treatment that results in the elicitation of a correct response from a learner, and ii) any reaction by the teacher that clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement". Moreover, the term repair is briefly defined by (van Lier, 1988) as "treatment of trouble occurring in interactive language use" (as cited in Othman, 2012, p. 60).

*Feedback types*. Most, if not all, teachers have viewed that the term error correction has wrongly been prescribed instead of the term 'corrective feedback'. Teachers giving CF are not supposed to correct the learners' errors, instead they are suggested to provide help for students to correct their own errors. Nethertheless, rectifying these errors are left for the learners to decide. Moreover, teachers have tried to develop the process of learning by providing some types of OCF to increase students' sensitivity, and the goal of OCF is to elevate the learners' metalinguistic sensitivity. Majer (2003) writes, for example, that "giving feedback is not tantamount to merely correcting errors. Error correction is part of language teaching, whereas feedback belongs in the domain of interaction. (…) Therefore all error correction is feedback, much as its actual realization may depend on a particular pedagogic goal (…)". (cited in Pawlak, 2014, p. 5).

According to Ur (1999), feedback has different approaches and functions:

> Feedback given to learners has two main distinguishable components: assessment and correction. In assessment, the learner is simply informed how well or badly he or she has performed. In correction, some specific

information is provided on aspects of the learner's performance: through explanation, or provision of better or other alternatives, or through elicitation of these from the learner. (p.110)

Moreover, teachers have employed different kinds of oral corrective feedback in order to help students correct their own errors. By employing the techniques stated below, put forth by Lyster and Ranta (1997, pp. 46-48), teachers have tried to help students in the learning process.

According to their taxonomy, there are six different types of oral corrective feedback that are often used in classroom interaction. Since their examples are in French I use Lightbown & Spada 's (2011) examples in English.

1- **Explicit correction:** refers to the explicit provision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student had said was incorrect (e.g., "Oh, you mean….", "You should say…….").

    S: The dog run fastly.

    T: 'Fastly' doesn't exist. 'Fast' does not take -ly. That's why I picked 'quickly'. (Lightbown & Spada, 2011, pp. 126-127)

2- **Recasts:** involve the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error. "Teachers indirectly indicating that the learner's utterance was mistake". Recasts are generally implicit in that they are not introduced by phrases such as "You mean," "Use this word," and "You should say."

    S1: Why you don't like Marc?

    T: Why don't you like Marc?

S2: I don't know, I don't like him. (Lightbown & Spada, 2011, pp. 126-127)

3- **Clarification request:** Indicates to students either that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required. A clarification request includes phrases such as "Pardon me?" and…" It may also include a repetition of the error as in "What do you mean by *X*?"

T: How often do you wash the dishes?

S: Fourteen.

T: Excuse me. (Clarification request)

S: Fourteen.

T: Fourteen what? (Clarification request)

S: Fourteen for a week.

T: Fourteen times a week? (Recast)

S: Yes. Lunch and dinner. (Lightbown & Spada, 2011, pp. 126-127)

4- **Metalinguistic feedback:** contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form. Metalinguistic comments generally indicate that there is an error somewhere (e.g., "There was a mistake," "Can you find your error?"…). In addition, Metalinguistic information generally provides either some grammatical metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error (e.g., "It's masculine") or a word definition in the case of lexical errors. Metalinguistic questions also point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student (e.g., "Is it feminine?").

S: We look at the people yesterday.

T: What's the ending we put on verbs when we talk about the past?

S: e-d (Lightbown & Spada, 2011, pp. 126-127)

5- **Elicitation:** refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student. First, teachers elicit completion of their own utterance by strategically pausing to allow students to "fill in the blank" … such as "No, not that. It's a . . .". Second, teachers use questions to elicit correct forms (e.g. …"How do we say *X* in French?"). Third, teachers occasionally ask students to reformulate their utterance.

S: My father cleans the plate.

T: Excuse me, he cleans the…???

S: Plates? (Lightbown & Spada, 2011, pp. 126-127)

6- **Repetition:** refers to the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's erroneous utterance. In most cases, teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the error.

S: He's in the bathroom.

T: Bathroom? Bedroom. He's in the bedroom. (Lightbown & Spada, 2011, pp. 126-127)

In addition, Lyster and Ranita (1997) add a seventh type of oral CF by mixing different types of feedback which they call 'multiple feedback'. They also explained that *"*Repetition clearly occurred with all other feedback types with the exception of recasts" (p.48).

**Limitations**

This study is limited in terms of the number of participants. Only two small groups of students from high schools in Ranya city (200 students) took part in this

study. Another limitation of the current study was the location. The data were obtained in only one city in the Kurdistan region. In addition, the student data were obtained from only four high schools. However, the teachers' data were gathered in all high schools in Rania because each school has only 3-4 English teachers. So, the results may be restricted and it would have been better and more useful to include more schools from different cities in Kurdistan.

Furthermore, data were collected quantitatively only in the form of questionnaires for the criterion measure of preferences for error correction due to time constraints.

# CHAPTER II

# LITERATURE REVIEW

The following review of literature explores relevant issues in regards to oral corrective feedback (OCF), feedback and errors. This chapter will provide some general review about errors and different preferences and attitudes regarding it. In addition, information with respect to the technique types and the treatment of errors, the agent to whom treats errors and the frequency of OCF treatment will be discussed. Finally, the review also recounts research related to the field of feedback, OCF and errors.

## General Review

In Corder's article (1967) a distinction between systematic and unsystematic errors were made. Corder (1967) introduces the systematic "errors" as those that occur with mainly non-native language speakers, so they are possible to happen when the learners have paucity of knowledge of a second language. While, he introduces other errors as nonsystematic errors, which he calls "mistakes." Nonsystematic errors are committed by learners due to the several situations like slips of the tongue, psychological conditions such as strong emotions, memory lapses and physical states like tiredness (p.166).

Second language learners' errors are classified by Burt and Kiparsky (1975) into two distinct categories: (a) global, and (b) local.

> Global errors are those that cause a listener or reader to misunderstand a message or to consider a sentence incomprehensible, and local errors are those that do not significantly hinder communication of a message. Thus, in error

correction priority should be given to global errors in order to give the student the greatest possible mileage in terms of acquiring the ability to communicate in the target language (as cited in Keshavarz, 2012, p. 141).

In addition to this, according to Harmer (2007) oral mistakes are divided into three categories: Slips, errors and attempts. Slips are mistakes where students are able to correct themselves with the teachers support helping to point out the mistakes; mistakes in which explanation is needed due to learners' deficiency in correcting themselves are identified as "errors"; finally, "attempts" happen when students want to express something but do not know yet how to say it (p.96).

The ambiguity of errors in learning a foreign language should not come as a surprise for teachers. They should expect and see errors as a door that learners receive knowledge from when learning the target language. It is the teacher's responsibility to create a very relaxed atmosphere for the learners to have a very strong will to participate, and feel free to speak without any kind of hesitation. Students feel confidence in an environment that does not stimulate flawless talk and where correction is not continuously carried out. The most important issue that teachers are confronted with inside the classroom and have concentrated on is error treatment i.e. whether to correct an error or ignore it. Here, it means that teachers should select and categories errors in order to correct and make the right decision. In this respect, Hendrickson (1978) suggests some vital questions in regards to error treatment:

Should Learner Errors be corrected?

When Should Learner Errors be corrected?

Which Errors should be corrected?

How Should Learner Errors be corrected?

Who Should Treat Learner Errors?

(cited in Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p.38)

The questions above mentioned by Hendrickson (1978) remain unanswered despite the many studies that have been conducted concerning error correction. Moreover, regarding researchers' attitude concerning the treatment of oral errors i.e. whether they should or should not be treated, varies. Terrell (1977) noted that:

> There is no evidence which shows that the correction of speech errors is necessary or even helpful in language acquisition. Most agree that the correction of speech errors is negative in terms of motivation, attitude, embarrassment and so forth, even when done in the best of situations (cited in Jenna, 2010, p. 11).

Long (1977) argues about the effectiveness of error correction and stated that "error treatment is not so important" (as cited in Makino, 1993, p. 337). Krashen (1982) expresses a dissimilar opinion with regard to error correction and sees it as a "serious mistake" (cited in Jenna, 2010, p.11). Furthermore, DeKeyser (1993) also revealed that "error correction did not have an overall effect on student proficiency in the L2" (cited in Lyster & Ranta, 1997, p. 39).

Teachers who concentrate on accuracy prefer to correct errors while those who focus on fluency believe that correction is unnecessary. Grither (1977) argues that "teachers should give more emphasis to what is correct than to what is wrong" (cited in Walz, 1982, p. 27). Norrish (1983) has a similar idea that "teachers should emphasize the idea of the language as an instrument for communication and

encourage their students to express themselves rather than worrying too much on whether they do it right or not" (cited in Martínez, 2006, p. 3). However, Allwright (1975, cited in Makino, 1993, p. 337) suggested that "learner errors should be corrected". Levine (1975) also supported the idea that learners' errors should not be left in the air. He stated that "if an error is not corrected, both the speaker and the rest of the class will consider it a right utterance to be learnt" (as cited in Martínez, 2006, p. 4).

When to correct an oral error is also very important. There are two options teachers prefer in regards to when OCF should take place. They prefer either to immediately correct the error committed or delay the correction until the end of the activity. Those who concentrated on accuracy found immediate feedback to be useful but when the aim is on fluency they claim that immediate correction is useless. Similarly, the Modern Language Materials Development Centre (1961) advise teachers to "correct all errors immediately" (quoted in Keshavarz, 2012, p. 148).

Furthermore, it is argued when to begin correcting learner's mistakes. Lightbown and Spada (2011, p.138) suggested that mistakes should be corrected from the very beginning of the learning process. This means that they prefer immediate error treatment. They also added that "teachers avoid letting beginner learners speak freely because this would allow them to make errors. Errors could become habits. So, it is better to prevent these bad habits before they happen" (p.139).

As mentioned earlier there is a universal conviction of not leaving an incorrect speech in the air but rather correct it (Martínez, 2006, p. 1). The question on how the error should be corrected is another issue which should be taken into account. Some believe that it is unwise to correct all student errors. Burt feels that

"it is easy to destroy a student's confidence with too many interruptions" (1975, cited in Walz, 1982, p. 2). Hendrickson (1978) suggests that errors which "impede the intelligibility" should be corrected (cited in Jenna, 2010, p. 17). Moreover, Keshavarz (2012) states that "when teachers tolerate some errors, students feel more confident about using the target language than if all their errors are corrected" (p. 149). So, he suggests that teachers must be selective and not correct every error. In addition, Cohen (1975) argues that "errors relevant to a specific pedagogical focus deserve to be corrected before other less important errors" (cited in Keshavarz, 2012, p. 152). Similarly, Burt argues that "an utterance becomes much more comprehensible when the teacher corrects one global error rather than several local ones" (1975, quoted in Walz, 1982, p. 8). In addition to this, Burt and Kiparsky (1972) stated that, "overcorrection cuts off students' sentences, causes them to lose their train of thought, and prevents them from relating to a new sentence." (cited in Walz, 1982, p. 2)

In terms of the agent giving OCF, three possibilities are considered; the teachers, the students (themselves) or other students (peer students). Some students believe that it is mainly the teacher's responsibility to correct a student's error. For the teachers error correction is considered as an extremely tiring and time consuming aspect of their job (Lee, 2005). Despite the fact that, many learners expect teacher's to correct students' errors seeing it a part of their job. Another aspect considered the job of a teacher is their ability to recognize the effect of OCF on students' feelings. This is why OCF is assumed to be one of the most complicated jobs for language teachers and thus, more time should be spent on it.

Despite the teacher another possible agent to correct oral errors are the students themselves. It is argued that self-correction depends on the level of

proficiency of the language learner. Advanced level students are able to correct their mistakes compared to students with lower level of language proficiency (linguistic knowledge).

The final possible agent to correct learners' errors is peer correction. Walz (1982) stated that peer correction has three advantages:

(1) may motivate students who previously thought a foreign language was impossible to learn, because they see their classmates using it correctly. (2) peer correction involves a greater number of students in the running of the class. (3) the corrections tend to be at a level that others in the class can understand (p. 17).

**Review of Related Empirical Studies**

Based on surveys in 15 different countries, Ancker's (2000) study investigated students' and teachers' expectations toward error correction. In this study, the treatment of oral errors i.e. whether or not they should be treated were questioned. The findings revealed a big difference between the students and the teachers' responses. 76% of the students and 26% of the teachers responded that oral errors should be treated. Doubtlessly, the findings showed that most of the students wanted more OCF on their errors than their teachers.

In the area of corrective feedback, an important study of "corrective feedback and learner uptake" carried out by Lyster and Ranta (1997) revealed OCF types. Data was gathered by observing students from grades four and in five different French immersion classrooms. They classified six different OCF types used by four teachers. This study revealed interesting results in relation to OCF types. Their findings revealed the frequency of OCF types as follows: 55% recast, 14% elicitation, 11%

clarification request, 8% metalinguistic feedback, 7% explicit correction, and 5% repetition. The results showed an overwhelming tendency for the teachers to use "recasts" over the other OCF types and the lowest percentage for "repetition" (pp. 51-53).

Katayama (2007) investigated 588 male and female EFL students from several universities in three different cities in Japan. Participants were examined in order to reveal their attitudes towards teachers' OCF, and reveal students' preferences for correction on the types of errors and their preferences for particular methods that are employed to further correct errors. The study revealed some noticeable results that students have positive attitudes towards teacher OCF. Students also preferred their pragmatic errors to always be corrected over the other types of errors such as grammatical, phonological and vocabulary. The results showed that 70% of the respondents preferred their teachers to make them realize the error and thereby enable self-correction (p.284).

A study carried out by Kagimoto and Rodgers (2008) investigated 139 students from two universities in Southern Japan. The study aimed to find students' preferences towards the types of OCF in English classes. The techniques were perceived differently by the participants. The results indicated that metalinguistic and explicit feedback were the most widely accepted approaches by the participants, and they considered both techniques to be useful for OCF whereas the clarification and repetition types were preferred the least type and perceived the least useful of the OCF types. To sum up, the findings revealed that teachers should be cautious with of the techniques that they use when giving OCF to EFL learners' utterances. (p. 868)

According to the related literature on the types of OCF. Yoshida (2008) investigated Japanese teachers and students through audio recording and stimulated

recall interviews in order to explore teachers' choice and learners' preference on OCF types. The findings indicated the differences between teachers and students in choosing techniques for correcting errors. The results revealed that "recasts" were chosen by teachers as the most beneficial type of OCF due to time constraints. They also preferred other types like metalinguistic and elicitation taking into account self-correction While, the learners thought that before receiving OCF, it would be better to have an opportunity to think about their errors.

Kavaliauskien, Anusien and Kaminskien's study (2009) examined students' attitudes towards feedback in various class activities at tertiary level. Two groups of students in the first year, and two groups in the second year took part in this study. The first group consisted of 26 students and the second consisted of 20 students. 130 hours were spent on the students in the second language environment during 2 semesters; 4 hours per week. The findings revealed that feedback is a helpful method for linguistic development. Furthermore, students preferred error correction in writing to speaking activities.

18 native English teachers and 160 English as second language (ESL) students were investigated in order to reveal their preferences on OCF in two language institutes at Northern California universities. The results showed that both the students and teachers came to an agreement that students' errors should be treated, although students demanded more correction compared to their teachers. Moreover, the results revealed the significant different opinions between the teachers and students about the method, timing, and agents of OCF (Park, 2010).

Zhu (2010) analysed college students' attitudes towards OCF in EFL context. Based on the results, the findings uncovered that students have positive attitudes towards teachers' feedback 70% of the students desired teachers to correct all their

mistakes while 30% of them preferred only the serious mistakes to be corrected. In addition, the findings revealed that 63.3% students recommended teachers to correct their errors while, 16.7% preferred their peers and 20% stated self correction as the most suitable agent to correct the errors. (p.129)

Furthermore, Büyükbay and Dabaghi (2010) researched the effectiveness of repetition as OCF in terms of its contribution to student uptake and acquisition. 30 pre-intermediate level students of two university classes took part in the study. The participants were selected randomly and equally divided into two groups 15 students in the experimental group; and 15 in the control group. Data were collected from both groups through observation and videotaping. Moreover, in order to increase the validity and reliability of the findings both classes were taught by the same teacher. The results uncovered that repetition gained higher scores in impact on student's uptake and acquisition, which was employed the experimental group as an OCF technique (p.181)

A simple questionnaire was designed in a study by Zhang, Zhang., and Ma (2010) to reveal teachers' and students' preferences on OCF correction in classroom interaction. This study focused on some issues on whether students' errors should be treated or not. Additionally, the most suitable agent to give OCF, when and how corrective feedback should be given was focused on. The findings revealed that both teachers and students have positive attitudes with regards to OCF with some different opinions in the way errors are practiced. Students wanted overall feedback while teachers thought that it was not necessary. Moreover, students sequenced error types as lexical, grammatical then phonological which teachers should focus on more, while teachers were in the opinion that lexical, phonological then grammatical errors deserved more attention when giving OCF. In addition, the results showed different

opinions between the teachers and students to when errors are to be corrected. Students preferred immediate correction for the phonological errors, and delayed treatment for the grammatical and lexical errors. Whereas, teachers believed immediate feedback for the grammatical and phonological errors, and delayed treatment for the lexical errors should be given. Furthermore, the study indicated that most students prefer explicit and a few preferred metalinguistic as techniques for OCF. However, teachers preferred to employ explicit and metalinguistic to phonological errors, a metalinguistic technique for the grammatical error and explicit feedback for lexical errors. Regarding the treatment of errors, the findings revealed that both teachers and students believed that teachers were the right person to treat students' errors than peer or self-correction (p.307).

Another study regarding the impact of immediate and delayed error correction on EFL learners' oral production was conducted to 20 female intermediate English language learners aged 15 to 20 from the English language institutes in Isfahan, Iran. The participants were divided into two groups equally. Errors were corrected immediately in group 1 and with some delay for the second group, in order to find out the effectiveness of these two approaches on learners' development in speech and the level of their anxiety. The results indicated that delayed error correction has a positive impact on the first group's fluency and accuracy. Moreover, the findings showed that the participants in the second group experienced less anxiety with the delayed OCF in class (Rahimi & Dastjerdi, 2012, p.45).

In a descriptive study, Méndez and Cruz (2012) aimed to find out teachers perceptions in OCF and their practice in EFL classrooms. Data were collected through a questionnarie and a semi-structured interview. Preceptions of the teachers about OCF and their practice in English foreign classrooms were asked. They only

received 15 questionnaires out of 40 among the teachers. Nonetheless, the interviews were recorded with five teachers ages between 25 to 60 who had four to 20 years of teaching experience. The findings revealed that 80% of the instructors agreed on the necessity of correcting students errors. Thus, having positive attitudes towards OCF. Furthermore, the study revealed that the implicit strategy was the most favoured technique when giving OCF. In addition, concerning the agent treating errors teachers were seen to be the right person when giving OCF to peer and self correction (p.74).

In order to find the students' preferences on the strategies employed by teachers in the correction of oral grammar errors in an ELT context at a Turkish University. Ok and Ustacı (2013) collected data from 213 ELT students from four different levels; freshmen, sophomore, junior and senior. The results of the study indicated that the majority of the ELT learners wanted their errors to be corrected by their instructors. Consequently, the senior students wanted to be corrected when they committed errors that could change the meaning. While the freshmen students preferred being warned and demanded more feedback on grammatical errors by their teachers, the sophomore students preferred notes to be taken during a class period and favour individual correction. Moreover, the results showed that the learners wanted their teachers to help them correct their errors by giving choices in their learning process.

**Research Gap**

It is clear that the highest proportion of researches have been carried out on teachers and students' preferences on teacher's feedback without paying much attention in accordance to the participants ages, years of experience, and levels of the

target language speaking proficiency from schools and universities. But none or not much has been focused on students' preferences concerning teachers' OCF in separate or segregate schools taking into account the gender of students and its effect on their attitudes. This present study tries to find out whether positive or negative attitudes increase or decrease in these cases. Meanwhile, it will help the teachers to understand the differences between male and females in the teaching and learning EFL.

**CHAPTER III**

**METHODOLOGY**

**Overview**

This chapter reports on the methodological procedures of the study. First, the research design will be introduced, then information about the pilot study, participants and instrumentation of the study will be provided. Next, data collection procedures will be described, followed by data analysis procedures.

**Research Design**

This descriptive survey research investigated teachers' and students' preferences on oral error correction. Quantitative data collection tools were used to collect the data by designing two questionnaires, one for the teachers and the other one for the students.

**Participants**

Two groups of participants took part in this study. The first group comprised 50 teachers. They were randomly selected based on their willingness to share their ideas and experiences about error correction during the academic years 2013-2014 in Rania City in Iraqi Kurdistan region. Three factors were prominent in the background of these participants: gender, age, and teaching experience.

The second group of participants consisted of 200 students (100 males and 100 females) from four high schools in Rania City. The participants were selected randomly based on their willingness to share their attitude on corrective feedback from the co-educational and separate schools in Rania City. A questionnaire was distributed to 50 students in each school to collect data.

The rationale for the choice of these participants was to find out whether male and female students from different schools had the same preference for error correction. The students were from $10^{th}$ to $12^{th}$ grades learning English as a foreign language with Kurdish as their native language. The background information of the participants consists of four variables namely gender, age, years of studying English, and types of schools they attend.

**Instruments**

The instruments for collecting data consisted of two questionnaires: student questionnaire and teacher questionnaire. Each questionnaire included 22 closed-ended question items. The questionnaires were adapted from Park (2010) after receiving the permission from the author (See Appendix E). The closed- ended questions in both questionnaires consisted of five Likert- scale choices: 1- strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. 2- Always, usually, sometimes, occasionally and never. 3- Effective, very effective, neutral, ineffective and very ineffective, as illustrated in Appendices A and B.

Each questionnaire consisted of two parts. Part one dealt with background information about participants such as gender, age, and years of teaching experience in the case of teachers, and years of studying English, in the case of students.

The second part of the questionnaires concentrated on participants' perspectives about oral error correction in English language classrooms. This part used a 5 Likert-type scale as well, and it was divided into four sections. Each section contained two or more items. Items 1 and 2 dealt with the necessity and frequency of correcting learners' errors, items 3-6 were concerned with the time of giving CF, items 7-11 focused on the types of errors, items 12-19 were about techniques used to

repair mistakes, items 20-22 were aimed at concentrating on the right person to provide corrective feedback.

**Reliability and Validity**

In order to estimate the reliability of the questionnaires, the scale reliability was used to measure the reliability of both student and teacher questionnaires. The analysis conducted by using SPSS programme 20. The results showed that the Cronbach's Alpha reliability for teacher questionnaire was .792 and .703 for student questionnaire. Therefore, the questionnaires were found to be reliable.

As to the validity, the questionnaires were given to two experts (a Kurdish language teacher and an English language teacher) to evaluate the suitability of the questionnaires considering the aim of the survey. They stated that the items were useful and suitable hence it can be claimed that the questionnaires are valid.

Furthermore, the questionnaires were translated into Kurdish (participants' mother tongue) to ensure that participants would fully understand the items. Three teachers helped me in this respect, two English teachers and a Kurdish language teacher. One of the two English language teachers translated the questionnaires into Kurdish, due to the low English proficiency of the participants. The Kurdish language teacher checked the translated version and revised it. Finally, the second English language teacher back-translated the questionnaire into English. Both Kurdish and English versions of the questionnaire were arranged next to each other, so that the participants could choose one of the versions. The purpose of this back translation was to ensure clarity and better understanding of the question items.

**Pilot Study**

The pilot study examined: (1) Kurdish EFL students' attitudes towards classroom OCF? (2) The probable differences between teachers and students' preferences for effective error correction practices regarding when, how and what kinds of feedback should be given to the students. The participants for this pilot study consisted of two groups. The first group comprised 20 teachers and the second group 20 students from the Rania city in Iraqi Kurdistan. The participants were selected randomly from the basic and high schools during the spring semester of the academic years 2013-2014. As to the background of the participants, two variables were taken into consideration: gender and years of studying English or teaching EFL, in the case of teachers.

The result of the pilot study showed that the vast majority of the students agreed that errors should be corrected. Compared to teachers, the students put more emphasis on the necessity of getting corrective feedback. The greatest differences between students and teachers were found on timing of error correction. The students preferred their errors to be corrected at the end of class, whereas teachers preferred to give feedback on learners' errors immediately. While teachers wanted students' "serious spoken errors" to be corrected only, the students wanted all of their errors to be corrected, even the infrequent ones. Furthermore, the results showed the students' preference for explicit feedback, whereas teachers preferred metaliguistic feedback as a technique to correct errors. Both the students and teachers agreed that teachers are the right person to deal with errors.

The data for the pilot study were analyzed using SPSS version 20. In order to estimate the reliability of the pilot study, a questionnaire was given to 20 Kurdish EFL teachers, and another questionnaire to 20 EFL students. The results showed that

the Cronbach's Alpha reliability for the teachers was .885 and for students it was .805. Therefore, both questionnaires were found to be reliable.

**Procedures**

To collect data for the present study, first the researcher took permission from the Directorate of Education in Rania (see Appendix D). Next, the questionnaires were distributed among English teachers and students in high schools after receiving permission from the headmasters. After the questionnaires were filled out by the participants, the data were collected by the researcher. Finally, the questionnaires underwent statistical analyses.

**Data Analysis**

After the collection of the questionnaires, the data were analyzed by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 20.0 according to the research questions stated in chapter one. The responses of respondents in each group were computed to find out the means, standard deviations, means differences, percentages, and frequencies of the variables. Independent Sample T-test was used for comparing two variables like gender, and two groups of participants (teachers and students). Likewise, for comparing more than two variables such as participants' age, types of schools, and the variables of years of studying and teaching experiences, One-Way ANOVA was employed by using Post Hoc- LSD tests for analysing the significant differences of each group.

**CHAPTER IV**

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Overview**

This chapter will present the results of data analyses and will discuss the findings of the study. The findings will be compared and contrasted with those of other research studies in the field. As mentioned in chapter three, two questionnaires were used as the main instrument for collecting data about teachers' and students' perspectives and preferences regarding oral corrective feedback (OCF). The questionnaires were distributed among teachers and students in Rania- the Kurdistan region in Iraq. Altogether 50 EFL teachers and 200 students participated in this study.

**Results**

The main objective of this study was to find answers to the following research questions:

1- What are Kurdish EFL teachers and students' perspectives on classroom OCF?

2- What are Kurdish EFL students and teachers' preferences regarding classroom OCF?

3- Are there any statistically significant differences between teachers and students' perceptions of effective CF practices?

4- Do students' preferences for error correction vary according to their gender, age, number of years they have studied English, and types of school (co-educational vs. separate schools) they attend?

5- Do teachers' preferences for error correction vary according to their gender and teaching experience (i.e., number of years they have taught)?

6- Are male and female students' attitudes towards OCF in co-educational schools similar with those in separate schools?

**Kurdish EFL teachers and students' perspectives on classroom OCF**

*Teachers' reactions to the necessity of OCF, and suitable agents for dealing with errors.* The participants were asked to state their opinions whether errors should be treated or not. More specifically, the teachers were asked to respond to the item, "Students' spoken errors should be treated." As the results in Table 1 below show, 48% of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that students' errors should be corrected with the mean score (M= 3.2200, SD= 1.14802). With regard to the suitable agent for dealing with students' errors, as displayed in Table 1 below, the teachers preferred errors to be corrected by the students themselves the most (M= 3.5000). This finding supports that by Edge (1989) who suggested that "students should be given a chance to correct an error by themselves, so they learn to monitor their own products, enhancing accuracy. Students are proved to be capable of correcting their own errors" (as cited in Hsieh & Lin, 2009, p. 32)

Table 1

*Teachers' answers to the delivering agents and necessity of OCF*

| No | Necessity | Gr | N | f | % | M | SD |
|----|-----------|-----|-----|------|------|--------|---------|
| 1- | Students' spoken errors should be treated. | Ts | 50 | A/SA | 48.0 | 3.2200 | 1.14805 |
|    |           |     |     | Ne   | 26.0 |        |         |
|    |           |     |     | D/SD | 26.0 |        |         |
|    | **Agents** |     |     |      |      |        |         |
| 22- | Students themselves | Ts | 50 | A/SA | 62.0 | 3.5000 | .99406 |
|    |           |     |     | Ne   | 14.0 |        |         |
|    |           |     |     | D/SD | 24.0 |        |         |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, N= Numbers of teachers, f= Frequency A= agree, SA= strongly  agree, Ne= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= strongly disagree.

***Students' reaction to the necessity of OCF, and suitable agents for dealing with errors.*** The participants were asked to express their opinions about the necessity of error correction. More specifically, they were asked to respond to the item: "I want to receive CF on my oral errors." As can be seen in Table 2, the results showed that most of the EFL Kurdish students (83%) who participated in this study have positive perspective towards OCF with the mean score (M= 4.2400, SD= .80074) . The results revealed that Kurdish learners see OCF necessary for learning the target language. The findings of the present study are in line with Oladejo (1993) who found that students show their agreement with the view that CF is necessary.

The students were also asked about their preferences for the agent of error correction. As illustrated in Table 2, the students preferred to be corrected by their teachers the most (M= 4.2500). This finding is in line with the results of Matusiewicz's (2009) study which found that most of the students claimed that teachers are the right person to correct their errors. It's also in line with Ok, S. & Ustacı's (2013) study which found that students prefer teachers to correct their oral errors.

Table 2

*Students' answers to the delivering agents and necessity of OCF*

| No | Necessity | Gr | N | f | % | M | SD |
|----|-----------|----|----|-----|------|--------|--------|
| 1- | I want to receive CF on my oral errors. | Ss | 200 | A/SA | 83.0 | 4.2400 | .80074 |
|    |           |    |    | Ne | 14.5 |        |        |
|    |           |    |    | D/SD | 2.5 |        |        |
|    | **Agents** |   |    |     |      |        |        |
| 21- | Teachers. | Ss | 200 | A/SA | 87.5 | 4.2500 | 89527 |
|    |           |    |    | Ne | 6.5 |        |        |
|    |           |    |    | D/SD | 6.0 |        |        |

*Note: Gr= group, Ss= Students, N= Numbers of students, f= Frequency, A= agree, SA= strongly   agree, Ne= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= strongly disagree.

**Preferences of Kurdish EFL students and teachers for classroom OCF**

***Teachers' answers to frequency, timing of CF, types of errors, techniques of CF.*** The second question was about the frequency of OCF. The teachers were asked: "How often do you give CF on students' errors?" Table 3 shows the mean and standard deviation (i.e., M=3.0400, SD= .94675). It also shows that, 32% of the teachers indicated *always* or *usually* for this item, 32% of them indicated *occasionally* or *never* for this item. Moreover, 36% of the teachers were not sure about it.

Table 3

*Teachers' answers to frequency of OCF*

| No | Frequency | Gr | N | f | % | M | SD |
|----|-----------|----|----|-----|------|--------|--------|
| 2- | How often do you give corrective feedback on students' spoken errors | Ts | 50 | Ne. | 2.0 | 3.0400 | .94675 |
| | | | | Oc. | 30.0 | | |
| | | | | So. | 36.0 | | |
| | | | | Us. | 26.0 | | |
| | | | | Al. | 6.0 | | |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, N= Number of teachers, f= Frequency, Al= Always, Us= usually, So= sometimes, Oc= occasionally, Ne= never.

***The appropriate time of OCF.*** Items 3 to 6 in the questionnaire (See Appendix A) dealt with the most suitable time for OCF. The teachers were asked to indicate their choices on the scale of "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". They were asked to indicate their preferences for the following items: (Item No. 3) As soon as errors are made even if it interrupts the student's speaking, (4) After the student finishes speaking, (5) After the activities and (6) At the end of class.

Table 4 displays the mean, standard deviation, and percentages of teachers' responses on the timing of OCF. The results show that the teachers felt that the best

time for OCF was after an oral speech is over (M= 3.4800, SD= 1.14713). They also shows that, 60% of them indicated *agree* or *strongly agree* for this item, 14% of the teachers were not sure about it, and 26% of them indicated *disagree* or *strongly disagree*. Moreover, teachers preferred to correct errors after the completion of activities the least (M= 2.9400).

Table 4

*Teachers' answers to the timing of OCF*

| No | Timing | Gr | N | M | SD | % | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Ts | 50 | | | A/SA | Ne. | D/SD |
| 3- | As soon as errors are made | | | 2.9400 | 1.15016 | 38.0 | 12.0 | 50.0 |
| 4- | **After finishing speaking** | | | **3.4800** | **1.14713** | **60.0** | **14.0** | **26.0** |
| 5- | After the activities | | | 3.0600 | .99816 | 38.0 | 32.0 | 30.0 |
| 6- | At the end of class | | | 3.1600 | 1.36067 | 48.0 | 12.0 | 40.0 |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, N= Numbers of teachers, A= agree, SA= strongly agree, Ne= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= strongly disagree.

***Types of errors.*** This question included five items (Items 7 to 11) in the questionnaire. The five items represented five different types of errors based on error gravity, i.e., serious, less serious, frequent, infrequent, and individual oral errors that other student may not make.

Table 5 displays the results of teachers' responses to these five types of errors. The results reveal that 72% of teachers (i.e. two-thirds of them) with the mean score (M=3.8400) believed that "serious spoken errors that cause difficulty for the listener" should be corrected first, and they indicated that "less serious errors" were to be corrected the least (M=2.7000). This finding is also consistent with the results of

Tomczyk's (2013) study which revealed that over half of the teachers always or usually agreed that students' serious spoken errors that may affect a listener's understanding should be corrected.

Table 5

*Teachers' answers to types of errors to receive OCF*

| No | Type of Errors | Gr Ts | N 50 | M | SD | Al | Us. | % So. | Oc. | Ne. |
|----|----------------|-------|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 7- | **Serious spoken errors** | | | **3.8400** | **97646** | **26.0** | **46.0** | **14.0** | **14.0** | **0** |
| 8- | Less serious spoken errors | | | 2.7000 | 1.21638 | 6.0 | 20.0 | 36.0 | 14.0 | 24.0 |
| 9- | Frequent spoken errors | | | 3.4400 | .99304 | 12.0 | 40.0 | 32.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 |
| 10- | Infrequent spoken errors | | | 2.8800 | 1.09991 | 6.0 | 22.0 | 40.0 | 18.0 | 14.0 |
| 11- | Individual errors | | | 2.9600 | 1.39913 | 16.0 | 24.0 | 22.0 | 16.0 | 22.0 |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, N= Number of teachers, Al= Always, Us= usually, So= sometimes, Oc= occasionally, Ne= never.

***Techniques of CF.*** This part of the questionnaire consisted of eight OCF strategies (i.e., Items 12-19) these items included: *clarification request*, *repetition*, *implicit feedback*, *explicit feedback*, elicitation, *metalinguistic feedback*, *recasts*, and *no corrective feedback*. (for further details on these techniques see Chapter I).

Table 6 illustrates teachers' opinions with regard to their preferences for OCF strategies. As can be seen, teachers preferred to employ the *implicit feedback* strategy the most when giving OCF (M=3.6000). Moreover, *Metalinguistic feedback* was preferred the least favoured strategy by teachers when providing OCF (M=2.8200, SD= 1.11922)

In addition, 62% of the teachers were in favour of using implicit feedback technique for giving CF, 12% of them indicated that they were not sure whether they wanted to use this strategy or not, and 26% of them considered it as an ineffective or very ineffective technique when giving OCF.

Table 6

*Teachers' answers to* techniques of *OCF*

| N | Techniques of CF | Gr Ts | N 50 | M | SD | Eff./ V.eff. | Ne. | Ineff./ V.Ineff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12- | Clarification request | | | 3.2400 | 1.34862 | 48.0 | 18.0 | 34.0 |
| 13- | Repetition | | | 3.2400 | 1.39328 | 46.0 | 24.0 | 30.0 |
| 14- | **Implicit feedback** | | | **3.6000** | **1.32480** | **62.0** | **12.0** | **26.0** |
| 15- | Explicit feedback | | | 3.0400 | 1.29300 | 42.0 | 26.0 | 32.0 |
| 16- | Elicitation | | | 3.2200 | 1.05540 | 42.0 | 28.0 | 30.0 |
| 17- | No corrective feedback | | | 3.2800 | .90441 | 48.0 | 36.0 | 16.0 |
| 18- | Metaliguistic feedback | | | 2.8200 | 1.11922 | 32.0 | 22.0 | 46.0 |
| 19- | Recast | | | 3.4200 | 1.21370 | 56.0 | 16.0 | 28.0 |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, N= Number of teachers, Effe= effective, V.eff= very effective, Ne= Neutral, Ineff= ineffective, V.Ineff= very ineffective.

**Students' answers to frequency, timing of CF, types of errors, and techniques of CF.** The second question was about the frequency of OCF. The students had to answer: How often do you want your teacher to give corrective feedback on your oral error? Table 7 shows the results (M=3.7100, SD= 1.08711). As illustrated, 60% of the students indicated *always* or *usually* for this item, 13.5% of them indicated

*occasionally* or *never* for this item. Moreover, 26% of the students were not sure about it. This means that most of the students agreed that teachers should give oral corrective feedback to their spoken errors more often.

Table 7

*Students' answers to frequency of OCF*

| No | Frequency | Gr | N | f | % | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2- | How often do you want your teacher to give corrective feedback on your oral error? | Ss | 200 | Ne. | 3.5 | 3.7100 | 1.08711 |
| | | | | Oc. | 10.0 | | |
| | | | | So. | 26.5 | | |
| | | | | Us. | 32.0 | | |
| | | | | Al. | 28.0 | | |

*Note: Gr= group, Ss= Students, N= Number of Students, f= Frequency, Al= Always, Us= usually, So= sometimes, Oc= occasionally, Ne= never.

***The appropriate time of OCF.*** Items 3 to 6 in the questionnaire (See Appendix B) dealt with the most suitable time of OCF. The students were asked to indicate their choices on the scale of "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". More specifically, they were asked to indicate their preferences for the following items: (3) As soon as errors are made even if they interrupts my conversation, (4) After I finish speaking, (5) After the activities, and (6) At the end of class.

Table 8 displays the mean, standard deviation, and the percentages of students' responses on the timing of OCF. The results show that students felt that the best time for OCF was after an oral speech is over. 81.0 % of the students with the mean score (M= 4.0150, SD= .96926) "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that their errors should be corrected after the completion of an oral task. On the other hand, the students' least preference was to be corrected as soon as the error was made (M= 2.7100).

Table 8

*Students' answers to timing of OCF*

| No | Timing | Gr Ss | N 200 | M | SD | % A/SA | Ne. | D/SD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3- | As soon as errors are made | | | 2.7100 | 1.26646 | 32.5 | 14.5 | 53.0 |
| 4- | **After I finish speaking** | | | **4.0150** | **.96926** | **81.0** | **8.5** | **10.5** |
| 5- | After the activities | | | 3.3350 | 1.18312 | 52.0 | 18.5 | 29.5 |
| 6- | At the end of class | | | 3.1400 | 1.32255 | 47.0 | 18.5 | 34.5 |

*Note: Gr= group, Ss= Students, N= Numbers of students, A= agree, SA= strongly agree, Ne= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= strongly disagree.

***Types of errors.*** This question included five items (Items 7 to 11) in the questionnaire. The five items represented five different types of errors based on error gravity, i.e., serious, less serious, frequent, infrequent, and individual oral errors.

As Table 9 illustrates, students (M= 3.5550) believed that "serious spoken errors that cause difficulty to the listener" should be corrected first, and "less serious errors" were to be corrected the least. Moreover, 60.5% of the students had the opinion that teachers should treat and concentrate more on the serious errors rather than the other error types, i.e. less Serious, frequent, infrequent and individual spoken errors. Ok, & Ustacı's (2013) study also revealed that students believe that errors which may lead to communication breakdown should be corrected.

Table 9

*Students' answers to types of errors to receive OCF*

| No | Type of Errors | Gr | N | | | % | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Ss | 200 | M | SD | Al | Us. | So. | Oc. | Ne. |
| 7- | **Serious spoken errors** | | | **3.5550** | **1.34013** | **29.5** | **31.0** | **18.0** | **8.5** | **13.0** |
| 8- | Less serious spoken errors | | | 2.8450 | 1.21174 | 12.0 | 16.0 | 31.0 | 26.5 | 14.5 |
| 9- | Frequent spoken errors | | | 3.2200 | 1.41123 | 27.5 | 15.5 | 23.0 | 19.5 | 14.5 |
| 10- | Infrequent spoken errors | | | 2.9650 | 1.35386 | 19.5 | 13.5 | 28.5 | 21.0 | 17.5 |
| 11- | Individual errors | | | 3.2950 | 1.39200 | 27.0 | 20.5 | 21.5 | 17.0 | 14.0 |

*Note: Gr= group, Ss= Students, N= Number of Students, Al= Always, Us= usually, So= sometimes, Oc= occasionally, Ne= never.

***Techniques of CF.*** This part of the questionnaire consisted of eight OCF strategies (i.e., Items 12-19) these items included: *clarification request*, *repetition*, *implicit feedback*, *explicit feedback*, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, *recasts*, and *no corrective feedback*. (for further details on these techniques see Chapter I).

As can be seen in Table 10, the results show that students preferred "clarification request" strategy when receiving OCF the most and "No corrective feedback" was considered the least favoured technique. This finding is in line with Park's (2010) study which found that "No corrective feedback" had the lowest mean among the students. This finding is also in line with the results of Taipale's (2102) study which indicate that clarification requests is the most preferred technique to correct errors among the students.

Moreover, item No. 12 "Clarification request" received high percentage among students (83.5%) with the mean of 4.1100, and standard deviation 1.02133.

Table 10

*Students' answers to* techniques of *OCF*

| No | Techniques of CF | Gr | N | M | SD | % | | |
| | | Ss | 200 | | | Eff./ V.eff. | Ne. | Ineff./ V.Ineff. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12- | **Clarification request** | | | **4.1100** | **1.02133** | **83.5** | **8.0** | **8.5** |
| 13- | Repetition | | | 3.8900 | 1.18530 | 68.5 | 16.0 | 15.5 |
| 14- | Implicit feedback | | | 3.5750 | 1.26585 | 61.5 | 18.5 | 20.0 |
| 15- | Explicit feedback | | | 3.9850 | 1.22977 | 72.0 | 11.5 | 16.5 |
| 16- | Elicitation | | | 3.3800 | 1.10531 | 51.5 | 27.0 | 21.5 |
| 17- | No corrective feedback | | | 2.1050 | 1.40494 | 18.0 | 9.5 | 72.5 |
| 18- | Metaliguistic feedback | | | 3.2250 | 1.12280 | 46.0 | 29.5 | 24.5 |
| 19- | Recast | | | 3.2250 | 1.34664 | 44.5 | 22.5 | 33.0 |

*Note: Gr= group, Ss= Students, N= Number of Students, Effe= effective, V.eff= very effective, Ne= Neutral, Ineff= ineffective, V.Ineff= very ineffective.

**Statistical significant differences between teachers and students' perceptions concerning effective CF practices**

This research question consists of some components such as 'necessity of OCF', 'frequency of OCF', 'timing of OCF', 'types of errors', ' techniques of OCF', and ' the suitable agent for dealing with errors'.

To compare teachers and students' responses to the first question (i.e., 'should oral errors be corrected', in the case of teachers; and 'I want to receive CF on my oral errors', in the case of students) descriptive statistics and independent sample t-test were run, as displayed in Table 11 below.

Table 11

Descriptive and T-test statistics *for the necessity of OCF*

| No | Item | Gr | N | f | % | M | SD | MD | T | P |
|----|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1- Students' spoker | | Ts | 50 | D/SD | 26.0 | 3.2200 | 1.14802 | | | |
| Errors Should be | | | | Ne | 26.0 | | | | | |
| treated. | | | | A/SA | 48.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | -1.0200 | -5.910 | .000 |
| 1 - I want to receive | | Ss | 200 | D/SD | 2.5 | 4.2400 | .80074 | | | |
| corrective feedback | | | | Ne | 14.5 | | | | | |
| when I make mistal | | | | A/SA | 83.0 | | | | | |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, Ss= Students, N= Number of participants, f= Frequency, A= agree, SA= strongly agree, Ne= Neutral, D= Disagree, SD= strongly disagree

As the results show the mean score of the teachers (M= 3.2200, SD= 1.14802) is lower than that of the students (M= 4.2400, SD= .80074). This indicates that the students believe that their oral errors should be corrected. In other words, they have more positive attitudes towards OCF compared to the teachers. The mean difference of -1.02000 with (t= -5.910, p=.000 level) shows that the difference between the attitude of students and teachers towards OCF is significant.

Furthermore, as displayed in Table 11, 83% of the students had positive attitude towards CF while only 48% of teachers were in favor of providing CF to students. Therefore, it can be concluded that EFL Kurdish students have more positive attitudes towards CF compared to EFL teachers.

This finding is in line with that of other researchers (Katayama, 2007; Kazemi, Araghi, & Davatgari's, 2013; Matusiewicz, 2009; Mohseni & Pour's 2012; Molavi,

2012; and Othman, 2012; Park, 2010). For example, Katamaya (2007) found that Japanese students have positive attitude towards teachers' CF. Also, Kazemi, Araghi, & Davatgari (2013) found that the majority of Iranian EFL learners have positive attitudes towards oral CF and prefer to receive constant CF. Matusiewicz's (2009) study indicated that students believed corrective feedback is completely necessary and very useful. Similarly, the results of Mohseni & Pour's (2012) study indicated that Iranian EFL students also regarded that CF is something positive to be done. The results of Molavi's (2012) study indicated that Iranian students have positive attitudes towards receiving corrective feedback from their teachers. This finding is also in line with Othman's (2012) study which found that Malaysian students perceived OCF positively, and they have positive attitudes towards EC. Park's (2010) study also revealed that students wanted to receive corrective feedback and showed more desire towards CF compared to teachers.

Furthermore, independent sample t-test and descriptive statistics were run to compare the responses of students and teachers to the second question (frequency of CF). As can be seen in Table 12, the results revealed that the mean of the students (M= 3.7100, SD= 1.08711) was higher than that of the teachers' (M= 3.0400, SD= .94675), (t= -3.994, MD= -.67000, p= .000 level). This finding indicates that there was a significant difference between teachers and students preferences with regard to the frequency of OCF.

Table 12

*Descriptive and T-test statistics for the frequency of OCF*

| | | | | % | | | | Comparison of Responses on the Items Male vs. Female Students | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Frequency** | | | **%** | | | | | | |
| **No** | **Item** | **Gr** | **N** | **f** | **%** | **M** | **SD** | **MD** | **T** | **P** |
| 2- How often do you give corrective feedback on students' spoken errors? | | Ts | 50 | Ne. | 2.0 | 3.0400 | .94675 | | | |
| | | | | Oc. | 30.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | So. | 36.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | Us. | 26.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | Al. | 6.0 | | | **-.67000** | **-3.994** | **.000** |
| 2- How often do you Want your teacher to give corrective feedback on your spoken errors | | Ss | 200 | Ne. | 3.5 | 3.7100 | 1.08711 | | | |
| | | | | Oc. | 10.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | So. | 26.5 | | | | | |
| | | | | Us. | 32.0 | | | | | |
| | | | | Al. | 28.0 | | | | | |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, Ss= Students, N= Number of participants, f= Frequency Al= Always, Us= usually, So= sometimes, Oc= occasionally, Ne= never.

Also the results in Table 12 show, 60.0 % of the students answered "always" or "usually", while only 32% of teachers marked "always" or "usually" for this item. On the other hand, 13% of the students chose "occasionally or" never while 32% of the teachers selected "occasionally" or "never" for this item. Moreover, 26.5% of the students and 36% of the teachers were undecided about this item. This means that most of the students agreed that teachers should give oral corrective feedback to their spoken errors more often. This finding is in line with that of Firwana's (2011) who found that the majority of students wanted to receive CF many times. The students think that correcting errors more often may be beneficial to language learning and may help them stop making further errors. This finding also supports the result of Tomczyk's (2013) study which indicated that a large majority of students had positive attitudes on receiving oral corrective feedback. This finding is also in line

with the results of Ok & Ustacı's (2013) study which indicated that the majority of ELT learners wanted their errors to be corrected by their instructors. Similarly, it is in line with Othman's (2012) study which indicated that students were keen to receive OCF from their teachers more often.

Items 3 to 6 in both questionnaires (See Appendices A and B) dealt with the most suitable time of OCF. Both the students and teachers were asked to indicate their choices on the scale of "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

Table 13 below displays the mean, standard deviation, significance and the t-test results of teachers and students' responses on the timing of OCF and Table 4 shown above illustrates the percentages of teachers and students' responses on the timing of OCF. The greatest differences between students and teachers were found in item No. 4.

As the results in Table 13 below shows, both students and teachers felt that the best time for OCF was after an oral speech is over. Moreover, only item No. 4 showed the statistically significant different views between the teachers (M= 3.4800, SD= 1.14713) and students (M= 4.0150, SD= .96926) about the timing of giving feedback. The mean difference of -.53500 with the (t= -3.038, at p= .003 level) indicates that students think differently than teachers. This finding is in line with Park's (2010) study which showed that both teachers and students believe the best time for teachers to give OCF is after students have finished their speech. In contrast with this finding, Firwana's (2011) study found that most of the students preferred that their errors should be corrected immediately.

Furthermore, the results revealed that students rejected immediate correction and preferred delayed OCF, i.e. after an oral activity is finished because they may want their teachers to focus more on fluency rather than accuracy, or perhaps

because immediate correction may increase their stress levels. Moreover, teachers might belief that it would be better to let the students convey their message and then correct their errors improve their fluency in English. Along the same line, Grittner (1977) believes that "teachers should give more emphasis to what is correct than to what is wrong" (as cited in Walz, 1982, p. 27). This finding is in line with Tomczyk's (2013) study which found that both teachers and students preferred to delay correction till the end of students' speech. The finding of the current study is also in line with Mohseni & Pour's (2012) study which found that teachers were against immediate correction.

The five items (Items 7 to 11) in both the teachers and students' questionnaires represented five different types of errors which should be given priority in OCF based on error gravity, i.e., serious, less serious, frequent, infrequent, and individual oral errors. The findings indicate that, like teachers, students have a similar opinion that teachers should treat and concentrate more on the serious errors rather than the other error types.

The findings indicate that there was no statistical significant difference between teachers and students' opinions on the types of errors that should treated.

Table 13

*Significant differences between teachers and students' perceptions of effective CF practices*

| No | Items Timing | Gr | N | M | SD | MD | T | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4- | After finishes speaking | Ts | 50 | 3.4800 | 1.14713 | -.53500 | -3.038 | .003 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 4.0150 | .96926 | | | |
| | **Techniques of CF** | | | | | | | |
| 12- | Clarification request | Ts | 50 | 3.2400 | 1.34862 | -.87000 | -4.266 | .000 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 4.1100 | 1.02133 | | | |
| 13- | Repetition | Ts | 50 | 3.2400 | 1.39328 | -.65000 | -3.036 | .003 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 3.8900 | 1.18530 | | | |
| 15- | Explicit feedback | Ts | 50 | 3.2200 | 1.29300 | -.09450 | -4.810 | .000 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 3.9850 | 1.22977 | | | |
| 17- | No corrective feedback | Ts | 50 | 3.2800 | .90441 | 1.17500 | 7.255 | .000 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 2.1050 | 1.40494 | | | |
| 18- | Metaliguistic feedback | Ts | 50 | 2.8200 | 1.11922 | -.40500 | -2.283 | .023 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 3.2250 | 1.12280 | | | |
| | **Delivering Agents** | | | | | | | |
| 21- | Teachers | Ts | 50 | 3.4000 | 1.21218 | -.85000 | -4.651 | .000 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 4.2500 | .89527 | | | |
| 22- | Students themselves | Ts | 50 | 3.5000 | .99406 | -.58500 | -3.079 | .002 |
| | | Ss | 200 | 4.0850 | 1.23507 | | | |

*Note: Gr= group, Ts= Teachers, Ss= Students, N= Number of participants.

Another part of the questionnaire consisted of eight OCF strategies (i.e., Items 12-19) these items included: *clarification request*, *repetition*, *implicit feedback*, *explicit feedback*, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, *recasts*, and *no corrective feedback*. (for further details on these techniques see Chapter I).

As can be seen, there is a great differences between teachers and students responses for item No. 12 regarding clarification request strategy. That is, while students preferred "clarification request" strategy when receiving OCF the most (M= 4.1100), teachers preferred to employ the *implicit feedback* strategy the most when giving OCF (M= 3.6000).

With reference to items 14 and 15, the results show that students prefer their errors to be corrected directly while teachers prefer to correct them indirectly. This finding is in contrast with that of other researchers (Kazemi, Araghi, & Davatgari, 2013; Lasagabaster & Sierra 2005; Loewen 2005; Lyster & Ranta, 1997; Yoshida, 2008). Kazemi, Araghi, and Davatgari (2013) found that Iranian EFL learners preferred their errors to be corrected indirectly. Lasagabaster and Sierra (2005), found that students preferred to receive explicit correction more compared to teachers (as cited in Russell, 2009). Loewen's (2005, as cited in Al-Faki, 2013) advises teachers to correct students' errors by providing more explicit CF, which could also help them to improve their language. Lyster & Ranta (1997) found that teachers have a great tendency to use recasts as an effective technique of OCF rather than other techniques. Yoshida's (2008) study explored that teachers prefer to use recasts as a technique to correct learners' errors in Japanese foreign language classrooms, whereas students prefer to have enough time to think about their errors before receiving CF.

As can be seen in Table 14, item No. 12 had a high percentage among students (83.5%) while the percentage was low (48.0%) among teachers. In addition, 72.0 % of the students chose "ineffective" or "very ineffective" for item No. 17, while 48.0 % of the teachers regarded it as effective, and 34.0% considered it as ineffective.

Table 14 below displays the results of the differences between teachers and students with regard to the choice of OCF strategies.

Table 14

*Items with the mean, standard deviation scores and descriptive statistics differences between teachers and students for the techniques of OCF (%)*

| N | Items | Gr | Effe./ V.eff. | Ne. | Ineff./ V. Ineff. | M | SD |
|---|-------|----|------|-----|--------|---|----|
| 12- | Clarification request | Ts | 48.0 | 18.0 | 34.0 | 3.2400 | 1.34862 |
| | | Ss | 83.5 | 8.0 | 8.5 | 4.1100 | 1.02133 |
| 13- | Repetition | Ts | 46.0 | 24.0 | 30.0 | 3.2400 | 1.39328 |
| | | Ss | 68.5 | 16.0 | 15.5 | 3.8900 | 1.18530 |
| 14- | Implicit feedback | Ts | 62.0 | 12.0 | 26.0 | 3.6000 | 1.32480 |
| | | Ss | 61.5 | 18.5 | 20.0 | 3.5750 | 1.26585 |
| 15- | Explicit feedback | Ts | 42.0 | 26.0 | 32.0 | 3.0400 | 1.29300 |
| | | Ss | 72.0 | 11.5 | 16.5 | 3.9850 | 1.22977 |
| 16- | Elicitation | Ts | 42.0 | 28.0 | 30.0 | 3.2200 | 1.05540 |
| | | Ss | 51.5 | 27.0 | 21.5 | 3.3800 | 1.10531 |
| 17- | No corrective feedback | Ts | 48.0 | 36.0 | 16.0 | 3.2800 | .90441 |
| | | Ss | 18.0 | 9.5 | 72.5 | 2.1050 | 1.40494 |
| 18- | Metaliguistic feedback | Ts | 32.0 | 22.0 | 46.0 | 2.8200 | 1.11922 |
| | | Ss | 46.0 | 29.5 | 24.5 | 3.2250 | 1.12280 |
| 19- | Recast | Ts | 56.0 | 16.0 | 28.0 | 3.4200 | 1.21370 |
| | | Ss | 44.5 | 22.5 | 33.0 | 3.2250 | 1.34664 |

*Note: Gr= group, Ss= Students, Effe= effective, V.eff= very effective,
Ne= Neutral, Ineff= ineffective, V.Ineff= very ineffective.

As illustrated in Table 14, the results show that students want their errors to be treated, and not neglected and revealed that there is a difference between teachers and students in two cases. First, two-thirds of the students believed that giving no correction is an ineffective or very ineffective technique, while 16.0% of the teachers believed that "no corrective feedback" is an ineffective or very ineffective technique.

This finding is similar to the findings of Kazemi, Araghi, & Davatgari's (2013) study that "No CF or teacher's ignoring errors" techniques received the least favoured for correcting oral errors, while in contrast teachers regarded the method as effective. Secondly, students valued explicit feedback as a highly effective technique to correct their mistakes, while teachers preferred the implicit corrective feedback method.

As can be seen from Table 13 and 14 shown above, a discrepancy exists between teachers and students regarding techniques of OCF. The mean of the students' responses in every item (12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18) was higher than the teachers, except items 17 and 19 (i.e. "No corrective feedback" and "recasts"). This indicates that students prefer various OCF techniques to be employed by their teachers when correcting errors.

Moreover, there is a great difference between teachers and students in the mean of item No. 12 (i.e., clarification request). As can be seen in Table 13 and 14, this item received high percentage among students (83.5%) with the mean of 4.1100, and standard deviation 1.02133, while among the teachers this technique received only 48.0% with the mean M= 3.2400 and standard deviation 1.34862 with a mean difference -.87000. Therefore, the difference between teachers and students in this item is significant with a (t= -4.266, at p= .000 level) of significance. This shows that the majority of students preferred clarification requests the most compared to the teachers. This result may be due to the fact that students prefer their errors to be corrected with polite expressions such as "Could you say that again" or "Excuse me".

Another significant difference between teachers and students was found in item No. 13. This item concerned using repetition as a technique when correcting learners' errors. Students did not share the same opinion (M= 3.8900, SD= 1.18530)

with the teachers (M= 3.2400, M.D= -.65000) with regard to the effectiveness of repetition in treating errors. The difference between the attitudes of teachers and students in this regard is significant at (t = -3.036, p= .003 level).

Item No. 15 is also significant with a (t= -4.810 p= .000 level). The results show that, the students have different views about the effectiveness of explicit feedback (M= 3.9850, SD= 1.22977) compared to the teachers (M= 3.0400, M.D= -.094500).

Based on the findings in Table 13 regarding the choice of effective techniques for correcting errors, a significant difference was found between the teachers and students (item No. 17). The students (M= 2.1050, SD= 1.40494) have different opinions about item No. 17 (No corrective feedback) compared to the teachers (M= 3.2800, SD= .90441). The mean difference of 1.17500 with (t= 7.255, p= .000 level) shows that this item is significant. This shows that this technique (No corrective feedback) received the least favoured technique among the students. In other words, the students wanted their errors to be corrected, not ignored.

Moreover, the analysis of item No. 18 (i.e., metalinguistic feedback) indicates that there is a significant difference between teachers and students regarding the use of this OCF strategy. Metalinguistic feedback received the mean (3.2250) with standard deviation (1.12280) among the students, which was higher than the teachers (M= 2.8200, SD= 1.11922). The findings show that, this item is significant with a (t= -2.283, p= .023) level.

Table 13 illustrates the participants' responses to the item "who do you prefer to correct your errors?" According to the findings of the present study, the students preferred to be corrected by their teachers the most (M= 4.2500), while the teachers preferred errors to be corrected by the students themselves the most (M= 3.5000). In

addition, peer correction was the least favoured agent among both the teachers and students to correct errors.

As the results in Table 13 illustrate, item No. 21 received the mean (M= 4.2500, SD= .89527) among the students which was higher than the teachers ((M= 3.4000, SD= 1.21218). The findings show that this item is significant with a (M.D= -.85000, t= -4.651, p= .000). Thus, there is a statistically significant difference between students (M= 4.0850, SD= 1.23507) and teachers (M= 3.5000, SD= .99406) regarding the provision of OCF by teachers. With regard to item No. 22 (self-correction), (M.D= -.58500, t=-3.079, at p= .002 level). In addition, peer correction was the least favoured agent among both teachers and students. This finding supports Matusiewicz's (2009) results that peer correction is presented as the least liked to correct errors among the students. He found that most of the students claim that teachers are the right person to correct their errors. The results are also in line with Ok, S. & Ustacı's (2013) study which found that leaners prefer teachers to correct their oral errors. Following the teachers, self-correction was the next favoured agent by the students.

**Student's preferences for error correction according to their gender, age, number of years they have studied English, and types of school (co-educational vs. separate schools) they attend**

*Gender.* In Kurdish society gender difference can still be considered a variable. The aim here is to find out whether gender differences affect the students' negative or positive preferences' towards OCF. Table 15 illustrates the findings for gender differences among the students.

Items numbers 7 to 11 are related to the students' responses regarding the treatment of the types of oral errors. The findings indicated that significant differences exist among male and female students in item No. 11. More specifically, female students (M= 3.4900, SD= 1.46680) have different perceptions compared to male students (M= 3.1000, SD= 1.46680) regarding item No. 11 "My individual errors (i.e. errors that other students may not make)". The mean difference of (M.D= -.39000 with t= -1.996, p= .047 level) indicates that this question is significant. This is perhaps because female students may believe that correcting their individual errors would help them not to repeat the error.

Of all the techniques of OCF students only have different opinions with respect to items No. 15 and 19, as shown in Table 15 below. The data obtained from item No 15 shows that female students (M= 4.2200, SD= 1.15102) had different perception compared to male students (M= 3.7500, SD= 1.26631). This item is significant at the value (t= -2.747, p= .007), which may be related to the nature of the female students or being unaware that they had committed an error compared to the male students. In addition, this may also be the reason why they demanded to be corrected indirectly.

Table 15

*Mean, percentages and significant T-test results of male and female student*
*responses on items of OCF. M vs. F students*

| | | | | | | | **Comparison of Response on the Items** | | |
| | | | | | | | **Male vs. Female Students** | | |
| **Items** | **Ge** | **N** | **f** | **%** | **M** | **SD** | **MD** | **T** | **P** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11- My individual errors (i.e., errors that other students may not make). | Ms | 100 | Ne. Oc. So. Us. AL. | 21.0 13.0 27.0 13.0 26.0 | 3.1000 | 1.46680 | -.39000 | -1.996 | .047 |
| | Fs | 100 | Ne Oc. So. Us. AL. | 7.0 21.0 16.0 28.0 28.0 | 3.4900 | 1.29096 | | | |
| 15- "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback: The teacher gives the correct form…..) | Ms | 100 | Ven./En. N E/VE. | 22.0 11.0 67.0 | 3.7500 | 1.26631 | -.47000 | -2.747 | .007 |
| | Fs | 100 | Ven./En. N E/VE. | 11.0 12.0 77.0 | 4.2200 | 1.15102 | | | |
| 19- I went to the park. (Recast: The teacher repeats the student's utterance ….) | Ms | 100 | Ven./En. N E/VE. | 18.0 27.0 55.0 | 3.5700 | 1.19979 | .69000 | 3.739 | .000 |
| | Fs | 100 | Ven./En. N E/VE. | 48.0 18.0 34.0 | 2.8800 | 1.40187 | | | |
| 20- Classmates | Ms | 100 | SD/D Nu A/SA | 30.0 17.0 53.0 | 3.2800 | 1.23157 | .40000 | 2.229 | .027 |
| | Fs | 100 | SD/D Nu A/SA | 42.0 17.0 41.0 | 2.8800 | 1.30485 | | | |
| 22- Myself | Ms | 100 | SD/D Nu A/SA | 13.0 8.0 69.0 | 3.8100 | 1.32341 | -.55000 | -3.222 | 001 |
| | Fs | 100 | SD/D Nu A/SA | 10.0 7.0 83.0 | 4.3600 | 1.07797 | | | |

*Note: Ge= gender, Ms= Males, Fs= Females, N= Number of participants,
    f= Frequency.

With regard to item No. 19 of the questionnaire (see Table 15 above), the results revealed that male students (M= 3.5700, SD= 1.19979) have different attitudes regarding "recasts" compared to female students (M= 2.8800, SD= 1.40187) with a mean difference of (MD= .69000 & t= 3.739 & p= .000). This shows that "recasts" are considered more significant for male students as an OCF technique. As a result it could be said that male students wanted their errors to be corrected without emphasis on their errors. This may be due to the male students' anxiety or humiliation in front of their fellow classmates. As a result the male students indicated "recasts" as a more effective technique when having their errors treated compared to the female students.

As can be seen from the results of the T-test illustrated in Table 15 for item No. 20, significant differences among groups were found since the amount of T score observed is significant (t= 2.229, p= .027). As for item No. 22 the results revealed that female students (M= 4.3600, SD= .83236) have different attitudes regarding the agent treating oral errors compared to the male students (M= 3.8100, SD= 1.32341) with a mean difference of (MD= -.55000 & t= -3.222 & p= .001). This may be related to socio-cultural reasons considering that females have lower status in Kurdistan and they are weaker than men. In an unequal society where females are looked down upon by the opposite sex, female students may prefer self-correction to prove that they are as strong as men.

*Age.* In order to find out and compare students' preferences towards OCF regarding their age, a One- Way ANOVA was employed. The results show that there is no statistical significant difference in the students' opinion with regard to their age except in items No. 10, 11, and 22.

The results in Table 16 indicate that the students aged 15 received a lower mean score (M= 2.2500, SD= 1.48477) compared to other age groups. The results also show that the 15-year-old students did not share the same opinion compared to other age groups: 17 (M= 3.3208, M.D= -1.07075*) and 19 (M= 3.2857, M.D= -1.03571*). This may be due to the fact that students aged 17 and 19 have more experience than 15-year-old students and they may believe that it would be better to deal with their common errors. The amount of F score observed in item No. 10 is significant (F= 2.371, p= .041).

Table 16

*Significant ANOVA results of students' perceptions on OCF according to their age*

| N | Items | Age | M | SD | Comparing Age Variables | M.D | F | P |
|---|-------|-----|---|----|------------------------|-----|---|---|
| 10 | Infrequent spoken errors. | 15 | 2.2500 | 1.48477 | 15 & 17 | -1.07075* | 2.371 | .041 |
| | | 16 | 26613 | 1.42511 | 15 & 19 | -1.03571* | | |
| | | 17 | 3.3208 | 1.18927 | 16 & 17 | -.65946* | | |
| | | 18 | 2.9787 | 1.25956 | | | | |
| | | 19 | 3.2857 | 1.48805 | | | | |
| | | 20 | 3.2000 | 1.09545 | | | | |
| 11 | My individual errors i.e., errors that other students may not make. | 15 | 3.6667 | 1.30268 | 16& 17 | -.84327* | 2.878 | .016 |
| | | 16 | 2.8548 | 1.41244 | 16&20 | -1.34516* | | |
| | | 17 | 3.6981 | 1.23389 | | | | |
| | | 18 | 3.2766 | 1.29719 | | | | |
| | | 19 | 3.1905 | 1.72102 | | | | |
| | | 20 | 4.2000 | 83666 | | | | |
| 22 | Myself | 15 | 3.6667 | 1.37069 | 16&18 | .64756* | 2.305 | .046 |
| | | 16 | 4.3710 | 1.11963 | 17& 18 | .55961* | | |
| | | 17 | 4.2830 | 1.11592 | | | | |
| | | 18 | 3.7234 | 1.36258 | | | | |
| | | 19 | 3.8095 | 1.28915 | | | | |
| | | 20 | 4.0000 | 1.22474 | | | | |

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Another significant difference among the students of different ages was found in item No. 11. The amount of F score observed is significant (F= 2.878, p= .016). The students were asked to state their opinions about the types of errors that are to be treated. As can be seen in Table 16, the students of age 16 with a mean score (2.8548) have different opinion compared to the age group of 17 (M= 3.6981, M.D= -.84327*) and the age group of 20 (M= 4.2000, M.D= -1.34516*). This indicates that senior students want their individual errors to be treated more than junior students. This may be because of the fact that students of ages 17 and 20 have reached maturity, whereas the younger students have not and may believe that the focus on individual errors is less necessary than the other errors.

Another significant difference among the students was also found in item No. 22. The students were asked to express their opinions regarding the right agent to deal with their errors. The results in Table 16 show that the students of age 16 (M= 4.3710, SD= 1.11963) did not have the same opinion with regards to the right agent to treat their errors compared to the age group of 18 (M= 3.7234, M.D= .64756*). Moreover, the students of age 17 received a higher mean score (M= 4.2830, SD= 1.11592) than the age group of 18 (M= 3.7234, M.D= 1.36258). The One- Way ANOVA tests for item No. 22 showed that the amount F score observed is significant (F= 2.305, p= .046). The results illustrate that the students of age 16 and 17 have different opinions and preferences on having their errors corrected compared to the students of age 18. Students of age 16 and 17 prefer self-correct. This may be related to these students' inner feelings that they prefer self-correction and this is quite psychological. It may also be due to the fact that anxious students consider self-correction more useful when correcting errors. This finding is in line with the results

of Ok & Ustacı's (2013) study which indicated that most of the students prefer to correct their errors on their own.

*Number of years they have studied English.* Participants were divided into four groups with regard to the number of years they had studied English namely groups A: 6-8 years, group B: 8-10 years, group C: 10-12 years, and group D: over 12 years.

The results of ANOVA and Post Hoc (LSD) tests including the mean differences and F values are illustrated in Table 17. As can be seen, the results show that item No. 3 is significant (p= .034). Group C students did not share the same opinion with group A. (M= 2.5100, SD= 1.16771). This may be due to the fact that the learners in group C prefer to receive immediate correction more than students in group A. Another reason for this may be related to their age, i.e., the younger group may not like to be corrected while they are speaking.

As presented in the results of the ANOVA and Post Hoc (LSD) tests in Table 17, the students in group D received a lower mean score compared to the three other groups (M= 2.1667, SD= 1.33945). This shows that, the students in group D did not share the same views with the other groups (6 to 8, 8 to 10 and 10 to 12 years). The difference is significant as the amount of F score observed is (F= 8.057, p= .000).

Table 17

*Significant ANOVA results of students according to their years of studying English*

| N | Items | Years of studying English | M | SD | Comparing years of studying English | M.D | F | P |
|---|-------|---------------------------|---|----|-------------------------------------|-----|---|---|
| 3 | As soon as errors are made even if it interrupts the student's speaking. | 6-8<br>10-12 | 2.5100<br>3.2258 | 1.16771<br>1.28348 | 6-8 &10-12 | -.71581$^*$ | 2.950 | .034 |
| 7 | Serious spoken errors that may cause problems in a listener's understanding. | 6-8<br>8-10<br>10-12<br>12$^+$ | 3.6300<br>3.7255<br>3.8387<br>2.1667 | 1.34581<br>1.13276<br>1.21372<br>1.33945 | 6-8 & 12$^+$<br>8-10&12$^+$<br>10-12&12$^+$ | 1.46333$^*$<br>1.55882$^*$<br>1.67204$^*$ | 8.057 | .000 |
| 10 | Infrequent spoken errors. | 6-8<br>8-10<br>12$^+$ | 2.7800<br>2.9216<br>3.7222 | 1.41835<br>1.42609<br>1.01782 | 6-8 & 12$^+$<br>8-10& 12$^+$ | -.94222$^*$<br>-.80065$^*$ | 2.891 | .037 |
| 12 | Could you say that again? | 6-8<br>8-10<br>10-12<br>12$^+$ | 4.1500<br>4.0000<br>4.5806<br>3.3889 | .93609<br>1.14891<br>.50161<br>1.33456 | 6-8 &10-12<br>6-8 & 12$^+$<br>8-10 10-12<br>8-10& 12$^+$<br>10-12&12$^+$ | -.43065$^*$<br>.76111$^*$<br>-.58065$^*$<br>.61111$^*$<br>1.19176$^*$ | 5.829 | .001 |
| 15 | Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback) | 8-10<br>10-12<br>12$^+$ | 3.7059<br>4.2903<br>3.5556 | 1.22138<br>1.18866<br>1.38148 | 8-10&10-12<br>10-12&12$^+$ | -.58444$^*$<br>.73477$^*$ | 2.653 | .050 |
| 16 | Yesterday, I….. (Elicitation: The teacher asks the student to correct and complete the sentence.) | 6-8<br>8-10<br>10-12<br>12$^+$ | 3.4200<br>3.7843<br>2.8710<br>2.8889 | 1.14750<br>.90142<br>1.11779<br>.90025 | 6-8 & 8-10<br>6-8 &10-12<br>8-10&10-12<br>8-10&12+ | -.36431$^*$<br>.54903$^*$<br>.91335$^*$<br>.89542$^*$ | 6.135 | .001 |
| 19 | I went to the park. (Recast: The teacher repeats the student's utterance…) | 6-8<br>8-10<br>10-12<br>12$^+$ | 3.2100<br>2.9804<br>3.8065<br>3.0000 | 1.40198<br>1.33402<br>1.16674<br>1.13759 | 6-8 &10-12<br>8-10&10-12<br>10-12&12$^+$ | -.59645$^*$<br>-.82606$^*$<br>.80645$^*$ | 2.728 | .045 |

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Depending on the years of studying English, group D students of more than 12 years have contradictory preferences on the types of errors that are to be corrected. However, there was no statistical difference between the other three groups for item No. 3. This may be due to the fact that their mean scores are close to each other.

Item No 10 as shown in Table 17 above reveals that there were significant differences among the groups. Group D students have different opinions regarding the types of errors that are to be treated compared to groups A and B. The amount of F score is significant (F= 2.891, p= .037). Additionally, there were no differences in the responses to item No. 10 from groups A and B students due to the fact that the mean scores are close.

Table 17 shows that item No. 12 regarding the effectiveness of OCF techniques is significant with an (F= 5.829 p= .001 level) among the students. The results revealed that group D students have different opinion with regards to OCF techniques compared to the other groups A, B and C. The results regarding the mean scores show that students in group D have a lower mean score compared to the other three groups. This may be due to the fact that older students do not pay as much attention to use polite phrases when speaking to their teachers such as "Could you say it again" or "Excuse me" compared to the other younger groups because of their years of studying English.

Moreover, group D students considered the technique "clarification request" not as effective (M= 3.3889) compared to group A (M= 4.1500, M.D= .76111[*]), group B (M= 4.0000, M.D= -.58065[*]), and group C (M= 4.5806, M.D= 1.19176[*]).

Furthermore, group A students also shared different opinions regarding OCF techniques compared to group C with a MD= -.43065*. In addition, group B did not have the same opinion compared to group C (M= 4.5806, MD= -.58065*). Group C students may have a strong desire to be corrected with this "clarification request" technique or they may prefer their teachers to pay more attention to psychological factors by using some expressions that affect their feelings.

Item No. 15 presented in Table 17 above, reveals that significant differences among the years of studying English were found with an (F= 2.653, p= .050 level) and was shown significant. The results revealed that, group C students had positive attitudes towards OCF with mean (M= 4.2903) compared to group B (M= 3.7059, M.D= -.58444*), and group D (M= 3.5556, M.D= .73477*). This may be because students in this group viewed "explicit feedback" as an effective technique when receiving OCF compared to the other groups. They may also believe that the "explicit feedback" technique would help them improve the language that they are learning or they may not have the ability to find their errors that is why they preferred explicit correction.

The One- Way ANOVA tests for item No. 16 shows that, the amount F score observed is significant (F= 6.135, p= .001). The results illustrate that, group A students did not share the same opinion with regards to the effectiveness of "Elicitation" (M= 3.4200, SD= 1.14750) as a technique to correct errors compared to group B (M=3.7843, M.D= -.36431[*]), and group C with (M=2.8710, M.D= .54903[*]).

Moreover, group B students also did not share the same opinions compared to group C with (M.D= .91335[*]), and group D with (M= 2.8889, M.D= .89542[*]) This may be due to the reason that group B students with (8-10 years of studying English) have seen the effectiveness of using "elicitation" as a method of OCF compared to the other groups. These results indicate that older students viewed "elicitation" as an ineffective technique when treating errors.

Item No. 19 (see Table 17 above) is significant with an (F= 2.728, p= .045 level among the students. The results illustrate that, group A students had different opinions with regard to the effectiveness of the "recasts" as a technique (M= 3.2100) compared to group C (M= 3.8065 M.D= -.59645*). Furthermore, group B students

also did not have the same opinion (M= 2.9804) compared to group C (M.D= -.82606*). Group C students did not share the same opinion (M= 3.8065, SD= 1.13759) as group D with a mean difference (M.D= .80645*). This may be because group C students (who had been studying English between 10 to 12 years) believed that "recasts" (not pointing out the error) are the most effective OCF technique employed to treat oral errors, whereas the other groups prefer clear and overt correction from their teachers.

*Types of school they attend.* The One- Way ANOVA tests results shown in Table 18 illustrate the significant differences of the students' preferences on OCF in accordance to their types of schools (Boys, Girls, and Co-educational). Based on the findings presented in Table 18 below, item No 1 received the highest mean (M= 4.5000, SD= .58029) among the students in the boy's school compared to the students of the girl's school (M= 4.2800) and the students of co-educational schools (M= 4.0900).

Furthermore, item No. 1 that illustrates the necessity of receiving OCF the students of the boy's school (M= 4.5000, SD= .58029) have different opinions than the students of the girl's school (M= 4.2800, SD= .80913). The mean differences of (.41000*) with F score 4.301 shows that this item is significant at p= .015 level. This may be because the students of the boy's school believe that OCF is necessary to improve their English language more than the students of the girl's school. Even though both schools of students believed that OCF is a necessity, the male students see it additionally necessary.

Table 18

*Significant ANOVA results of students according to their school*

| It N | Items | Types of Schools | N | M | SD | Comparing Types of schools | MD | T | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | I want to receive corrective feedback | Boys Girls Co-Ed | 50 50 100 | 4.5000 4.2800 4.0900 | .58029 .80913 .91115 | B &Co-Ed | .41000* | 4.301 | .015 |
| 13 | I go? (Repetition: The teacher highlights error by using intonation.) | Boys Girls Co-Ed | 50 50 100 | 4.1200 4.4200 3.5100 | .91785 .75835 1.34461 | B &Co-Ed G& Co-Ed | .61000* .91000* | 12.342 | .000 |
| 15 | "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback: | Boys Girls Co-Ed | 50 50 100 | 3.7400 4.3400 3.9300 | 1.42585 .93917 1.22479 | B & G | -.60000* | 3.247 | .041 |
| 19 | I went to the park. (Recast) | Boys Girls Co-Ed | 50 50 100 | 3.6600 2.9000 3.1700 | 1.13587 1.28174 1.42882 | B & G B &Co-Ed | .76000* .49000* | 4.285 | .015 |
| 20 | Classmates. | Boys Girls Co-Ed | 50 50 100 | 3.4600 2.8400 3.0100 | 1.14660 1.26749 1.32188 | B & G B& Co-Ed | .62000* .45000* | 3.300 | .039 |
| 22 | Myself | Boys Girls Co-Ed | 50 50 100 | 3.8600 4.4600 4.0100 | 1.44293 .97332 1.21018 | B & G G&Co- Ed | -.60000* .45000* | 3.399 | .035 |

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Moreover, item No. 13 (see Table 18 above) revealed that the students of the boy's school did not have the same opinions (M= 4.1200, SD= .91785) compared to the students of the Co-educational school (M= 3.5100, M.D= .61000*) in terms of the effectiveness of "repetition" as an OCF technique. The amount F score shown is (F= 12.342, p= .000). The students of the girl's school (M= 4.4200, SD= .75835) also did not share the same opinions as the students of Co-educational school (M= 3.5100, M.D= .91000*) regarding the effectiveness of "repetition" as an OCF technique. This may be because students from the Co-educational school do not want

their errors to be highlighted by means of "repetition" with changing intonation. Students may also feel embarrassed and/or humiliated in front of their classmates. Another reason is that, the Co-educational school students do not prefer self-correction because by using this technique teachers may prefer to encourage students to self-correct the errors.

As can be seen in Table 18, item No. 15 is significant with an (F= 3.247, p= .045 level). The results show that, the students in the boys' school have different views about the effectiveness of "explicit feedback" (M= 3.7400, SD= 1.42585) compared to the students of the girls' school (M= 4.3400, M.D= -.60000*). This may be related to the gender differences; the male students could not listen to explanation for a long time compared to the females. Female students have a tendency to get further information and explanation about everything in detail, so it is related to the nature of females in general. When male students are given OCF in front of the opposing sexes, they regard it negatively i.e. they consider it as criticism rather than OCF.

Furthermore, the students of the boy's school (M= 3.6600, SD= 1.13587) have different opinions regarding item N0. 19 compared to the students of the girls' school (M= 2.9000, M.D= .76000*), and the students of the Co-educational school (M= 3.1700, M.D= .49000*). The results indicates that this item is significant (F= 4.285, p= .015) level. These differences may be related to different factors like nature of the male students and their tendency to feel powerful, these are why they may just want to be corrected without any notification of their errors. Another reason is that teens usually want to show others that they are the best or behave as if they are always right. When they are given OCF among others, they may lose self-confidence.

Item No. 20 shows students' preferences regarding the treatment of errors. The item is significant with F score 3.300 at p= .039 level. Therefore, the results show that the students of the boys' school have different attitudes (M= 3.4600, M.D= 1.14660) compared to the students of the girls' school (M= 2.8400, M.D= .62000*), and the students of the co-educational schools (M= 3.0100, M.D= .45000*). This reveals that the male students preferred their errors to be corrected by their classmates while the female students from the girls' school do not. This may be because females feel embarrassed when their errors are corrected by another classmate.

Moreover, there is a significant difference among the students for item No. 22 "Myself". The students of the boys' school did not share the same opinions (M= 3.8600, SD= 1.44293) with female students of the girls' school (M= 4.4600, M.D= -.60000*). On the other hand, the students of the girls' school have different opinions (M= 4.4600, SD= .97332) compared to the students of the co-educational schools (M= 4.0100, M.D= .45000*). This item is significant with F score at p= .039 level.

**Teacher's preferences for error correction according to their gender and teaching experience (i.e., number of years they have taught)**

***Gender and teachers' preferences for OCF M vs. F.*** Table 19 illustrates the results of the teachers' preferences towards timing, types and methods of OCF techniques and the treatment of OCF according to the teacher's gender. An independent- sample T-test was employed to investigate the significant differences in the score of the gender differences of the teachers at P≤0.05 level of significance.

The results show that only items No. 4, 11 and 22, related to gender differences, were significant, which indicate that both male and female teachers have similar opinions about the OCF techniques except for items 4,11and 22.

According to the results, as illustrated in Table 19, item No. 4 "after the student finishes speaking" received the highest mean by male teachers (M= 3.9600, SD= 1.01980) compared to female teachers (M= 3.0000, SD= 1.08012) with a mean difference of (MD= .96000 & t= 3.231, p= .002).

Table 19

*Significant differences between gender of the teachers and their preferences for OCF*

| No | | Ge. | N | M | SD | M.D | T | P |
|----|---|-----|---|---|-----|-----|---|---|
| 4 | After the student finishes speaking | Ms | 25 | 3.9600 | 1.01980 | .96000 | 3.231 | .002 |
| | | Fs | 25 | 3.0000 | 1.08012 | | | |
| 11 | My individual errors (i.e., errors that other students may not make). | Ms | 25 | 2.4400 | 1.44568 | -1.0400 | -2.806 | .007 |
| | | Fs | 25 | 3.4800 | 1.15902 | | | |
| 22 | Students themselves | Ms | 25 | 3.8000 | .95743 | .60000 | 2.078 | .043 |
| | | Fs | 25 | 3.2000 | 1.08012 | | | |

*Note: Ge= gender, Ms= Males, Fs= females, N= number of participants.

The findings in Table 19 regarding gender differences among the teachers show that the female teachers (M= 3.4800, SD= 1.15902) have different opinions than male teachers (M= 2.4400, SD= 1.44568) with regard to item No. 11 (MD= -1.04000, and the t= -2.806 & p= .007). This indicates that female teachers agreed that students' individual spoken errors should be corrected and every single error should be treated even if it is made only by one student.

Moreover, with regard to item No. 22 ("Students themselves", as the agent), the results show that male teachers (M= 3.8000, S.D= .00000) have different opinions regarding treatment of errors compared to female teachers (M= 3.2000, SD= 1.03280). The mean difference of .60000 with T-score of 2.078 indicates that

this item is significant at P= .043 level. In other words, the results revealed that only male teachers preferred students to self-correct.

***Years of teaching English and teachers' preferences for OCF.*** Table 20 indicates the significant differences of the teachers' opinions on items according to the years of teaching experience. The results of the ANOVA and Post Hoc (LSD) tests in Table 20 for item No. 1 reveal that there is a significant difference among the groups. The amount of F score observed is significant (F= 6.935, p= .001). Teachers of one year of teaching English received a lower mean (M= 1.7143, SD= 1.11270) compared to the group of teachers between two to five years of teaching English experience (M= 3.5000, M.D= -1.78571*), the six to nine years of teaching English experience (M= 3.2143, M.D= -1.50000*) and the group of teachers with more than ten years of teaching English experience (M= 3.7273, M.D= -2.01299*).

The results show that most of the teachers who have only one year of teaching experience disagreed with the idea that student errors should be treated, whereas the other groups of teachers all agreed that errors should be treated. This may be because teachers of one year of teaching experience focus more on fluency than accuracy or they may have been presented with a new curriculum while the other groups of teachers follow the old program about the treatment of errors. Another reason may be that these teachers may not feel confident about giving fear OCF. In addition, these teachers may feel that OCF is time consuming. In contrast with this finding, Holy and King (1971) found that "beginning teachers correct almost all errors and even filled in students pauses" (as cited in Walz, 1982, p.2).

The results in Table 20 of the ANOVA test for item No 2 reveal significant differences (F= 5.068, p= .004) considering the years of teaching English among different groups of teachers. The results show that teachers with one year of teaching

English experience receive a lower mean (M=2.0000, SD= .57735) compared to the teachers who have two to five years of teaching English experience (M= 3.4444, M.D= -1.44444*), six to nine years of teaching English experience (M= 2.9286, M.D= .92857*), and more than ten years of teaching English experience (M= 3.1818, M.D= -1.18182*). The findings suggest that teachers with less experience never or occasionally provide OCF compared to the other groups of teachers. These results may be due to the fact that less experienced teachers disregard giving OCF or they may be unaware of the OCF techniques that are employed to give feedback to students with different emotions i.e. angry, embarrassed, anxious and so on.

Table 20

*Significant ANOVA results of teachers' perceptions on OCF according to their years of teaching English*

| N | Items | Years of teaching English | M | SD | Comparing years of teaching English | M.D | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students' spoken errors should be treated. | 1 | 1.7143 | 1.11270 | 1& 2-5 | -1.78571* | 6.935 | .001 |
| | | 2-5 | 3.5000 | 1.09813 | 1 & 6-9 | -1.50000* | | |
| | | 6-9 | 3.2143 | .97496 | 1 & 10⁺ | -2.01299* | | |
| | | 10⁺ | 3.7273 | .64667 | | | | |
| 2 | How often do you give corrective feedback on students' errors | 1 | 2.0000 | .57735 | 1& 2-5 | -1.44444* | 5.068 | .004 |
| | | 2-5 | 3.4444 | .92178 | 1 & 6-9 | .92857* | | |
| | | 6-9 | 2.9286 | .73005 | 1 & 10⁺ | -1.18182* | | |
| | | 10⁺ | 3.1818 | .98165 | | | | |
| 4 | After the student finishes speaking. | 1 | 2.2857 | 1.11270 | 1& 2-5 | -1.43651* | 3.455 | .024 |
| | | 2-5 | 3.7222 | 1.01782 | 1 & 6-9 | -1.42857* | | |
| | | 6-9 | 3.7143 | 1.20439 | 1 & 10⁺ | -1.25974* | | |
| | | 10⁺ | 3.5455 | .93420 | | | | |
| 5 | After the activities. | 1 | 2.1429 | .89974 | 1& 2-5 | -.85714* | 3.165 | .033 |
| | | 2-5 | 3.0000 | .90749 | 1 & 6-9 | -1.28571* | | |
| | | 6-9 | 3.4286 | .85163 | 1 & 10⁺ | -1.12987* | | |
| | | 10⁺ | 3.2727 | 1.10371 | | | | |
| 16 | Yesterday, I….. (Elicitation: The teacher asks the student to ...) | 1 | 2.8571 | .89974 | 2-5 & 6-9 | 1.02381* | 3.348 | .027 |
| | | 2-5 | 3.6667 | 1.08465 | 6-9& 10⁺ | -.81169* | | |
| | | 6-9 | 2.6429 | .92878 | | | | |
| | | 10⁺ | 3.4545 | .93420 | | | | |

The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

For item No. 4 the results show that teachers of one year of teaching experience did not have the same opinion regarding the correction of students' errors after completing their speech (M= 2.2857, SD= 1.11270) compared to the teachers with two to five years (M= 3.7222, M.D= -1.43651*), teachers with six to nine years (M= 3.7143, M.D= -1.42857*), and with teachers that have more than ten years of teaching English experience (M= 3.5455, M.D= -1.25974*). In other words, significant differences were found among different groups; the amount of F score observed was significant (F= 3.455, p= .024).

Likewise, with regard to item No. 5 "After the activity" the results revealed that teachers with one year of teaching English experience received the lowest mean (M= 2.1429, SD= .89974) compared to the group of teachers with two to five (M= 3.0000, M.D= -.85714*), six to nine (M= 3.4286, M.D= -1.28571*), and more than ten (M= 3.2727, M.D= -1.12987*) years of teaching English experience. Significant differences among the groups were found with an F= 3.165, at p= .033.

The results in Table 20 regarding item No. 16 revealed that there is a statistically significant difference (F= 3.348, p= .027) with regard to the years of teaching English among the teachers. That is teachers with 2 to 5 years of teaching English experience (M= 3.6667, SD= 1.08465) have different opinions compared to the teachers with 6 to 9 years of teaching English (M= 2.6429, M.D= 1.02381*) regarding the effectiveness of "elicitation" as an OCF technique. Likewise, teachers between six to nine years of teaching English experience (M= 2.6429, SD= .92878) have different opinions with teachers with more than ten years of teaching English experience (M= 3.4545, M.D= -.81169*).

**Male and female students' attitudes towards OCF in co-educational and separate schools**

***Comparing males' preferences on OCF in different types of schools.*** In order to find out male and female students' attitudes towards teacher's corrective feedback, two different male and female schools were compared, e.g. co-educational and segregate. The perceptions on OCF of the two different types of schools were compared to reveal their preferences on OCF. The following will present students' preferences regarding OCF.

The results, as illustrated in Table 21, revealed that the male students of segregate schools received a higher mean (M= 4.5000, SD= .58029) regarding the necessity of OCF compared to the male students of the Co-educational schools (M= 4.1200, SD= .91785). In addition, with regard to the necessity of OCF, a large majority of the students (96%) in the segregated schools believed that OCF is necessary, 54% of them strongly agreed, and 42% agreed, whereas 82% of the male students in co-educational schools believed that OCF is necessary, 38% strongly agreed, and 44% agreed. On the other hand, 6% of the students in co-educational schools disagreed or strongly disagreed and 12% were not sure, while no one disagreed or strongly disagreed in separated schools regarding the necessity of OCF. These findings reveal that the types of schools affect students' opinions regarding OCF.

Table 21

*Mean and percentages of males' preferences on OCF from different types of schools*

| N | Items | Ge. | Types of School | M | SD | % | | | | |
|---|-------|-----|-----------------|---|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | | | | | SA | A | N | D | SD |
| 1 | I want to receive corrective feedback | Ms | Sep. | 4.5000 | .58029 | 54.0 | 42.0 | 4.0 | - | - |
| | | | Co-Edu | 4.1200 | .91785 | 38.0 | 44.0 | 12.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 |

*Note: (-) means absence of data. Ge = gender, M= males, Sep. & Co-Edu= separate & Co-educational school

***Comparing females' preferences on OCF in different types of schools.*** Table 22 reveals the results of the opinions of female students in both separate and co-educational schools with regard to OCF. The females in the segregated schools also received a higher mean (M= 4.2800, SD= .80913) than the female students in the co-educational schools (M= 4.0600, SD= .91272) regarding the necessity of OCF. 78% of female students of the separated school agreed or strongly agreed that OCF is necessary, 50% of them strongly agreed, and 28% agreed, whereas 76% of the female students in the co-educational schools believed that OCF is a necessity, 36% of the students strongly agreed and 40% agreed. Only 4% of the female students in the co-educational schools disagreed or strongly disagreed, while none of the female students in the segregated schools disagreed or strongly disagreed. These results indicate that female students from the separated schools believe that OCF is more necessary than students in the co-educational schools.

Table 22

*Mean and percentages of females' preferences on OCF from different types of schools*

| N. | Items | Ge | Types of School | M | SD | SA | A | N | D | SD |
|----|-------|-----|-----------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
|    |       |     |                 |      |      | | **%** | | | |
| 1 | I want to receive corrective feedback | Fs | Sep. | 4.2800 | .80913 | 50.0 | 28.0 | 22.0 | - | - |
|   |                      |    | Co-Edu | 4.0600 | .91272 | 36.0 | 40.0 | 20.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |

*Note: (-) means absence of data, Ge = gender, Fs= females, Sep. & Co-Edu= separate & Co-educational school.

The results in Tables 21 and 22 show that male and female students of the separated schools did not share the same opinions regarding OCF compared to the male and female students in the co-educational schools. This means that students prefer OCF when they are of the same sex, i.e., when they are only boys or only girls. In other words, they may have a negative attitude towards OCF in front of members of the opposite sex i.e. they may consider CF as a negative criticism and may lose their self- confidence. Furthermore, the results revealed that male students of both the segregated and co-educational schools have more positive attitudes regarding OCF compared to female students in the segregated and co-educational schools. These results may be related to psychological and cultural reasons. In the Kurdish culture, girls are shyer than boys. Whenever they are corrected, they feel embarrassed and avoid participating in the classroom discussions again because they tend to think of other students' criticisms. Coleman (1996) found that "women students were more embarrassed by their mistakes" (cited in Cook, 2008, p.152)

**Conclusion**

This chapter of the study dealt with the results and summary of the findings. Different sections of this chapter dealt with different variables included in the

present study such as gender, age, types of schools, and years of studying and teaching English. Furthermore, the findings were related to those of previous studies.

# CHAPTER V

## Summary of Findings, Conclusion, Pedagogical Implications and Suggestions for Further Research.

### Overview

This chapter summarizes the research findings. As presented in Chapter 4, the results showed that there are some differences and similarities between teachers and students perspectives regarding oral CF. Also significant discrepancies were found with regard to participants' age, gender, years of studying and/or teaching English and types of schools. These will be discussed below.

### Summary of the Findings

The main objective of this study was to find answers to the following questions:

1- What are Kurdish EFL Teachers and learners' perspectives on classroom OCF?

2- What are Kurdish EFL students and teachers' preferences regarding classroom OCF?

3- Are there any statistically significant differences between teachers and students' perceptions of effective CF practices?

4- Do student's preferences for error correction vary according to their gender, age, number of years they have studied English, and types of school (co-educational vs. separate school) they attend?

5- Do teacher's preferences for error correction vary according to their gender and teaching experience (i.e., number of years they have taught)?

6- Are male and female students' attitudes towards OCF in co-educational school similar with their attitudes in separate schools?

The main findings of the study are presented below.

**Kurdish EFL Teachers and Students' Perspectives on Classroom Oral CF**

As illustrated in Chapter IV, the results showed that most of the EFL Kurdish students who participated in this study have more positive perspective towards OCF than teachers. The results revealed that Kurdish learners see OCF necessary for learning the target language. This finding is in line with Katamaya's (2007) study who found that Japanese students have positive attitudes towards teachers' error correction. Similarly, the results of Agudo's (2012) study indicated that Spanish EFL students believed that teacher's CF has a positive effect on learning the target language. The results are also in line with Firwana's (2011) study, in which it was found that the vast majority of Palestinian EFL students have positive attitudes towards oral CF.

**Differences between Teachers and Students' Perceptions of Effective CF Practices with Regard to**

**The necessity and frequency of OCF.** The findings showed that both teachers and students agreed on the necessity of error correction. Students in particular showed great desire to receive feedback more often. This finding is in line with the results of Park's (2010) study in which it was found that students desired to receive CF and they emphasized the necessity of error correction more than teachers. Similarly, the findings of the present study are in line with those of Tomczyk (2013) who found that the majority of the students agreed to receive CF of their errors.

Oladejo (1993) also found that students show their agreement with the view that CF is necessary.

**The timing of OCF.** The result of the present study showed that teachers and students shared the same point of view on the timing of giving and receiving CF, respectively. The majority of them agreed that error should be dealt with after finishing a speaking task; however, students preferred this timing of CF more suitable than teachers. Furthermore, both teachers and students disagreed with correcting errors during students' speaking activity. In other words, both the teachers and students were in favour of delaying CF. This finding is in line with the results of Park's (2010) study in which it was found both teachers and students wanted to delay CF to the end of their speech.

**Type of errors teachers and students prefer to be corrected.** The third part in each of the two questionnaires dealt with the preference of students and teachers with reference to the types of errors to be corrected first. The results revealed that there was a similarity between teachers and students preferences in this case. That is, both teachers and students were in favour of correcting serious spoken errors and ignoring less serious ones.

**Techniques for correcting errors.** The fourth part of the questionnaire was about the preference of students and teachers with regard to CF. The results indicated a disparity between the teachers and students in this case. The teachers regarded implicit feedback as a more effective technique to use compared to the other techniques, whereas the students preferred "clarification request" as more effective.

This finding is in line with the results of Taipale's (2102) study which indicate that clarification requests is the most preferred technique to correct errors among the students.

**Agents for treating errors.** The last part of the questionnaire was about the right person to correct students' errors. Based on the findings, a difference was found between the views of students and teachers regarding the right agent to correct errors. Students considered teachers to be the most favoured agents to treat their errors, whereas a majority of teachers favoured students themselves to correct their errors rather than teachers or other classmates. The results showed that teachers believe that it would be better to give enough time to the students to correct their errors. This finding supports Edge's (1989) views who suggested that "students should be given a chance to correct an error by themselves, so they learn to monitor their own products, enhancing accuracy. Students are proved to be capable of correcting their own errors" (as cited in Hsieh & Lin, 2009, p. 32)

**Relationship between Teachers' Background Information and OCF**

**Gender.** The results showed no significant differences between male and female teachers concerning the necessity and frequency of error correction. In other words, both male and female teachers found EC necessary, however male teachers believed that students' errors should be corrected more often compared to female teachers. The findings also showed that male teachers are more in favour of giving feedback after an oral activity is over than female teachers. Moreover, female teachers were in favour of taking care of individual errors more than male teachers. Furthermore, both male and female teachers have a slight different opinion on using

techniques for giving CF, i.e. both groups were in favour of (clarification request, repetition, implicit feedback, explicit feedback, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, recasts, and no CF). Likewise, the results illustrated that male teachers prefer errors to be corrected by students themselves more than female teachers.

**Years of experience**. Considering years of teaching experience, the survey revealed that teachers with more than ten years of teaching English agreed more with the idea that students' errors should be corrected compared to other groups. Moreover, with regard to the frequency of error correction teachers with less experience especially teachers with only one year experience never or occasionally give feedback on students' errors. This may be due to the fact that they have limited proficiency in English hence they avoid correcting errors more often. In addition, teachers of one year of teaching English did not have the same view compared to other groups on timing of error correction. The findings indicate that experienced teachers preferred correction when students finished their speech, while less experienced ones did not do so. Finally, teachers with two to five years of teaching English have different views regarding the effectiveness of elicitation techniques for correcting errors compared to the teachers with six to ten years of experience.

**Students' Preferences for CF According to their Gender, Age, and Years of Studying English**

Gender. Regarding the impact of students' gender on their views towards CF, the results indicated that the male students have more positive attitudes towards the necessity of CF and wished to get feedback more often than female students. Concerning the right time for receiving feedback, both male and female students

wanted to get feedback after the completion of an oral activity. For the types of errors, the findings revealed that both the male and female students *always* or *usually* wanted their individual errors to be corrected but the female students wanted more.

Moreover, the results indicated that female students think that explicit feedback is more effective for correcting errors while male students prefer recasts as an effective technique of CF.

A discrepancy was also found between male and female students regarding to who should correct their errors. The findings showed that male students prefer peer correction, while the female students preferred self-correction.

**Years of studying English**. As to the variable of years of studying English, the results showed that students with 10 to 12 years of studying English believed that they should receive immediate feedback compared to those with six to eight years of studying English. The results also indicated that students who studied English more than 12 years do not want to receive CF on their serious spoken errors as compared to other groups (6-8, 8-10, and 10-12). In addition, students who studied English more than 12 years wanted their infrequent errors to be corrected as compared to the students of the other groups. Moreover, all groups of students except those with more than 12 years of studying English preferred "Clarification request" as the most favoured technique of CF. This may be because students with more than 12 years of studying English may prefer teachers as an agent to correct their errors. Likewise, explicit feedback was a favoured technique among students who studied English for ten to twelve years. Moreover, among the students who studied English between six to eight and eight to ten years, elicitation was the favoured technique of CF, and recasts was a popular technique among 10 to 12 and over 12 years of studying

English. In fact, recasts were the most favoured feedback technique among a group of students who studied English from 10 to 12.

**Age**. As to the students' age, the findings of this study revealed that 15 year-old students do not want their infrequent errors to be corrected. Likewise, the students of age 16 did not share the same opinion on correcting individual errors compared to the students of age 17 and 20. This may be due to the fact that younger students think that it is not good for teachers to concentrate on students' individual errors more than other types. Moreover, the results showed that "myself" as an agent to correct errors was the most favour among the younger students of age (15 to 16 years old) compared to older students (18 to 19 years old).

**Students' Preferences for Error Correction According to the Type of School (Co-Educational vs. Separate Schools) they Attend**

With regards to types of school, the results showed that students in boys school think differently about the necessity of error correction compared to students of the girls and co-educational schools. Repetition was not a popular technique among the students in co-educational schools for correcting errors compared to the students in segregated schools. Also, the results showed that the students of girls' school think that explicit feedback was more effective than the other techniques, whereas recasts were preferred among the students of boys' school. In addition, students' attitudes about "who should deal with learners' errors" were different. Students in boys schools have a positive attitude about peer correction, whereas students in the girls and co-educational schools prefer self-correction.

Furthermore, comparing males and females' preferences for corrective feedback in different types of schools, the findings revealed that the male students of

single-sex schools put more emphasis on the necessity of CF than males of co-educational schools. Similarly, female students who studied in single-sex schools emphasized the necessity of feedback more than female students who studied in co-educational schools. This may be because of the psychological or cultural problem that exits between genders or it may be related to a society where they live in which gender differences are very common. Due to these problems they prefer their mistakes to be corrected only by members of the same gender to save face. In other words, they do not want to receive feedback in front of members of the opposite sex.

**Recommendation**

Due to the findings of the present study, the following recommendations can be suggested for teachers to consider:

- Teachers should treat students' errors, but should be aware that immediate correction is not appropriate; they should provide feedback after an oral activity is over.

- Teachers should treat all types of errors and should not ignore some and concentrate only on one or two types. As Truscott (1999) argues "If teachers are inconsistent in their corrections, these corrections are as likely to be harmful as they are to be helpful" (p. 4).

- Teachers should be aware of the fact that committing errors when learning a FL is quite natural. Therefore, they should tell their students not to be afraid of making errors in their speech. As Harmer (2001, p.100) says "errors are part of a natural acquisition process. When second language learners make errors, they are demonstrating part of the natural process of language learning". Teachers should also explain that providing feedback is not a

criticism, it is just used to help students improve their English. As Harmer (2001) suggests "teachers should be seen as providing feedback, helping that reshaping process rather than telling students off because they are wrong." (p.100).

- Based on the findings of the current study, beginning teachers at high schools should provide CF because students preferred their errors to be corrected more often.

- Teachers should use various techniques to deal with students' errors. They should not choose only one technique and become a slave to a single technique to correct students' errors since students have different preferences with respect to CF strategies.

- Due to the findings of the current study, the majority of the students preferred self-correction first, then teachers intervention. Thus, teachers should promote this idea and let the students explore their own errors first and only if they were not able to do so teachers should provide feedback.

- Gender, age, types of schools of the students should be taken into consideration by teachers when they give corrective feedback, because students' opinions on OCF vary based on these variables.

**Suggestion for Further Research**

As mentioned earlier this study was limited to four public high schools in Rania City. Therefore, further studies may also be conducted with a larger population including both public and private schools at different levels and in other cities of Kurdistan region.

The study was also limited in the number of participants. Further research can be done with larger participants. Also, in this study the researcher used only questionnaires for collecting data on the participants' preferences towards error correction. Further studies can consider qualitative data such as interview, as well.

**Conclusion**

This chapter summarized the findings of the present study about Kurdish EFL teachers and students' opinions about OCF as well as their preferences for oral error correction in high schools in the Rania city in Kurdistan. Furthermore, based on the findings some recommendations and suggestions for further research were proposed to help improve the teaching and learning of English in Kurdistan, Iraq.

# REFERENCES

Agudo, J. d. (2012). Investigating Spanish EFL students´ beliefs and preferences regarding the effectiveness of corrective feedback. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 2*(19), 121-131.

Al-Faki, I. M., & Siddiek, A. G. (2013). The effect of timely interference of English language teachers on the improvement of learners' oral performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature, 2*(6), 223-235.

Ancker, W. (2000). Errors and Corrective Feedback: Updated Theory and Classroom Practice. *Forum*, *38*(4), 20-25.

Azar, A. S., & Molavi, S. (2013). Iranian EFL Learners' Attitudes toward Correction of Oral Errors. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences, 4*, 801-818. Retrieved 4 15, 2013, from http://www.ejsbs.c-crcs.com/content.asp?Units_id=16.

Büyükbay, S., & Dabaghi, A. (2010). The effectiveness of repetition as a corrective feedback. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(3), 181-193.

Chaudron, C. (1998). Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Cited in Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., & Ma, L. (2010). A brief analysis of corrective feedback in oral interaction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(3), 306-308. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.3.306-308.

Cook, V. (2008). *Second Language Learning and Language Teaching* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Hodder Education, an Hachette UK Company.

Corder, S. P. (1967). "The significance of learners' errors". *International Review of Applied Linguistics 5*: 161-170.

DOYON, P. (2000). An eclectic and intuitive approach to corrective feedback. *Journal of Liberal Arts and Science, Asahi University, 26*, 43-59.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition (Oxford Applied Linguistics): Oxford University Press_ USA.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S., Elder, C., Erlam, R., Philp, J., & Reinders, H. (2009). *Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning, testing and teaching.* Bristol UK: Short Run Press Ltd.

Firwana, S. S. (2011). A comparison between Palestinian EFL teachers' and students' attitudes toward oral errors and their correction. *Faculty of Arts, Islamic University of Gaza, 19*(02), 1527-1558.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The practice of English language teaching* (3rd ed.). Longman.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to Teach English.* England : Longman.

Hsieh, C.-n., & Lin, C. y. (2009). Error correction in Speech Class. (J. Linzmeier, M.-f. Chung, & W.-t. Shih, Eds.) *Department of Applied English, Ming Chuan University, 3*, 25-38.

Jenna, L. (2010). Corrective feedback and uptake in the advanced learner classroom. Unpublished MA Thesis. *University of Vienna*.

Kagimoto, E., & Rodgers, M. P. (2008). Students' perceptions of corrective feedback. *In K. Bradford Watts, T. Muller, & M. Swanson (Eds.), JALT2007 Conference Proceedings*, 868-879.

Karra, M. (2006). Second Language Acquisition: Learners' Errors and Error Correction in Language Teaching. *ProZ.com Translation Article Knowledgebase*. Retrieved from ProZ.com: http://www.proz.com/translation-articles/articles/633/.

Katayama, A. (2007). Learners' perceptions toward oral error correction. *In K. Bradford-Watts (Ed.), JALT2006 Conference Proceedings*, 284-299.

Kazemi, R., Araghi, S. M., & Davatgari, H. (2013). Iranian EFL learners' preferences toward classroom oral error correction: with a main focus on their proficiency level. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 03*(11), 1996-2003.

Kavaliauskien, G., Anusien, L., & Kaminskien, L. (2009). Classroom practice: error correction at tertiary level. *Studies About Languages*(14), 65-72.

Keshavarz, M. H. (2012). *Contrastive analysis & error analysis.* Tehran: Rahnama Press.

Lee, I. (2005). Error correction in the L2 writing classroom: what do students think? *TESL CANADA JOURNAL, 22*(02), 1-16.

Leiter, J. (2010). Corrective feedback and uptake in the advanced learner classroom. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Vienna.

Li, S. (2010). The effectiveness of corrective feedback in second language acquisition: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning Research Club, University of Michigan*, 309-365. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00561.x

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2011). *How Languages are Learned.* Oxford University Press.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 37-66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Language Teaching, 46*(01), 1-40.

Makino, T.-Y. (1993). Learner Self-Correction in EFL Written Compositions. *ELT Journal, 47*(4), 337-341. doi:10.1093/elt/47.4.337.

Martínez, S. G. (2006). Should we correct our students errors in l2 learning? 1-7. Retrieved from 123People: http://encuentrojournal.org/textos/16.8.pdf.

Matusiewicz, K. B. (2009). Correction techniques preferred by students during the process of learning the foreign language. *Psychology of Language and Communication, 13*(01), 39-52.

Méndez, E. H., & Reyes Cruz, M. d. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Bogotá, Colombia, 14*(2), 63-75.

MIYAO, M. (1999). Error analysis to understand your students better. *Tokyo Kasei Tsukuba college* , 203-216.

Mohseni, A., & pour, L. E. (2012). Iranian EFL learners and their teachers' preferences for oral error correction. *Journal of Language and Translation, 3*(1), 9-16.

Molavi, S. (2012). Iranian EFL learners' attitudes toward correction of oral errors. *The European Journal of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 801-818.

Ok, A. P. D. S. & Ustacı, H. Y. (2013). Preferences of ELT students on the strategies instructors use in the correction of oral grammar errors. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 4*(8), 244-254.

Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in FSL: Learners' preferences. *TESL CANADA JOURNAL, 10*(02), 71-89.

Othman, W. M. (2012). The role of feedback in Malaysian ESL secondary school classrooms. *Unpublished Doctoal dissertation*, 1-266.

Park, H.-S. (2010). Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction. Unpublished master's thesis, California state university, Sacramento.

Pawlak, M. (2014). *Error Correction in the Foreign Language Classroom.* Berlin-Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag.

Rahimi, M. (2010). Iranian EFL Students' Perceptions and Preferences for Teachers' Written Feedback Do Students' ideas Reflect? *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills, 2*, 78.

Rahimi, A., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2012). Impact of immediate and delayed error correction on EFL learners' oral production: CAF. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 3*(1), 45-54.

Rezaei, S., Mozaffari, F., & Hatef, A. (2011). Corrective feedback in SLA: classroom practice and future directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 1*(1), 21-29. Retrieved 4 14, 2013, from http://tuvaro.com/ws/?source=86ca0a68&q=Corrective%20Feedback%20in%20SLA:Classroo%20Practice%20and%20Future%20Directions.

Russell, V. (2009). Corrective feedback, over a decade of research since Lyster and Ranta (1997): Where do we stand today? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 6*(1), 21-31.

Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. II, pp. 593–610). New York and London: Routledge.

Taipale, P. (2012). Oral errors, corrective feedback and learner uptake in an EFL setting. Unpublished master's thesis, *Department of English Languages University of Jyväskylä*, 3-65.

Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of oral errors and their corrective feedback: Teachers vs. students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(5), 924-931.

Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*(4), 1-22.

Ur, P. (1999). *A Course in Language Teaching.* The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, United Kingdom, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching*. (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yang, W. (2010). A tentative analysis of errors in language learning and use. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(3), 266-268. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.3.269-273.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' Choice and Learners' Preference of Corrective Feedback Types. *Language Awareness, 17*(1), 78-93. doi:10.2167/la429.0.

Walz, J. C. (1982). *Error Correction Techniques for the Foreign Language Classroom. Language in Education: Theory and Practice, No. 50.* Washington, D.C: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., & Ma, L. (2010). A brief analysis of corrective feedback in oral interaction. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*(3), 306-308. doi:10.4304/jltr.1.3.306-308.

Zhu, H. (2010). An analysis of college students' attitudes towards error correction in EFL context. *English Language Teaching, 3*(4), 127-130.

**APPENDIXES**

**Appendix A**

**Teachers' Questionnaire**

**Dear Teachers,**

The aim of this questionnaire is to collect data about your opinion concerning error correction. Your contribution is important for this research and will help improve the teaching and learning of English in Kurdistan, Iraq. The questionnaire consists of two parts. Please read the instructions for each part carefully and give your honest responses.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

**Part I: background information**

- Name: (Optional)……………………………………………………
- Gender: Male: (    )   Female: (    )
- Age: ……………………………..
- Nationality: ………………………………………..
- Place of Residence: City: …………………… , Province: …………………………….
- Your first language:

| Kurdish | Arabic | Turkish | Other (please specify)……………….. |
|---------|--------|---------|--------------------------------------|

- How long have you been teaching English?

| 1 year | 2-5 years | 6-9 years | More than 10 years |
|--------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|

**Part II: General Statements**

**Instructions:** In this part, we would like you to tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements by simply marking the appropriate boxes. Please do not leave out any of the items.

- **Tick (√) in the box that reflects your opinion about each of the following statements.**

1- Students' spoken errors should be treated.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

2- How often do you give corrective feedback on students' spoken errors?

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ Students' spoken errors should be treated at the following time.

3- As soon as errors are made even if they interrupts the student's speaking.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

4- After the student finishes speaking.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

5- After the classroom activities are over.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

6- At the end of class.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ How often do you treat each of the following types of errors in oral communication classes?

7- Serious spoken errors that cause a listener to have difficulty understanding the meaning of what is being said.

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

8- Less serious spoken errors that do not cause a listener to have difficulty understanding the meaning of what is being said.

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

9- Frequent spoken errors.

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

10- Infrequent spoken errors.

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

11- individual errors made by only one student.

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ How do you rate each type of spoken error correction below?

> Teacher: Where did you go yesterday?
>
> Student: I **go** to the park.

12- Could you say that again?

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

13- I go? (Repetition: The teacher emphasizes the student's grammatical error by changing his/her tone of voice.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

14- You went to the park yesterday? (Implicit feedback: The teacher does not directly point out the student's error but indirectly corrects it.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

15- "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback: The teacher gives the correct form to the student with a grammatical explanation.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

16- Yesterday, I ………. (Elicitation: The teacher asks the student to correct and complete the sentence.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

17- Really? What did you do there? (No corrective feedback: The teacher does not give corrective feedback on the student's errors.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

18- How does the verb change when we talk about the past? (Metalinguistic feedback: The teacher gives a hint or a clue without specifically pointing out the mistake.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

19- I went to the park. (Recast: The teacher repeats the student's utterance in the correct form without pointing out the student's error.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

❖ The following person should treat students' errors.

20- Classmates

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

21- Teachers

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

22- Students themselves.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

**Appendix B**

**Students' questionnaire**

Dear students,

The aim of this questionnaire is to collect data about your opinion concerning error correction. Your contribution is important for this research and will help improve the teaching and learning of English in Kurdistan, Iraq. The questionnaire consists of two parts. Please read the instructions for each part carefully and give your honest responses. Please note that this is not a test and your responses will not affect your grades in any course; they will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

Part 1: Background Information

- Name: (optional) …………………………………………
- Gender: Male: (     )      Female: (     )

- Age: ………………….................
- Nationality: ……………………
- Place of Residence: City……………, Province …………….
- Your first Language:

| Kurdish | Arabic | Turkish | Other (please specify)……………… |
|---------|--------|---------|-----------------------------------|

- How long have you been studying English?

| 6-8 years | 8-10 years | 10-12 years | More than 12 years |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------------|

Part II: General Statements

Instructions: In this part, we would like you to tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements by simply marking the appropriate boxes. Please do not leave out any of the items.

- Please choose only one answer for every statement.
- Tick (√) in the box that reflects your opinion about each of the following

statements.

1- I want to receive corrective feedback (e.g., provide a hint for me to self-correct, tell me that I made an error, or correct my error.) when I make mistakes.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

2. How often do you want your teacher to give corrective feedback on your spoken errors?

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ When do you want your spoken errors to be treated?

3. As soon as errors are made even if they interrupts my conversation.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

4. After I finish speaking.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

5. After the classroom ctivities are over.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

6. At the end of class.

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ How often do you want each of the following types of errors to receive corrective feedback?

7. Serious spoken errors that may cause problems in a listener's understanding.

| Always(100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

8. Less serious spoken errors that do not affect a listener's understanding.

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

9. Frequent spoken errors.

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

10. Infrequent spoken errors

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|

11. My individual errors (i.e., errors that other students may not make.)

| Always (100%) | Usually (80%) | Sometimes (50%) | Occasionally (20%) | Never (0%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |

❖ How would you rate each type of spoken error correction below?

| Teacher: Where did you go yesterday? <br> Student: I go to the park. |
|---|

12. Could you say that again?

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

13. I go? (Repetition: The teacher highlights the student's grammatical error by using intonation.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

14. I went there yesterday, too. (Implicit feedback: The teacher does not directly point out the student's error but indirectly corrects it.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

15. "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback: The teacher gives the correct form to the student with a grammatical explanation.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

16. Yesterday, I….. (Elicitation: The teacher asks the student to correct and complete the sentence.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

17. Really? What did you do there? (No corrective feedback: The teacher does not give corrective feedback on the student's errors.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

18. How does the verb change when we talk about the past? ( Metaliguistic feedback: The teacher gives a hint or a clue without specifically pointing out the mistake.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

19. I went to the park. (Recast: The teacher repeats the student's utterance in the correct form without pointing out the student's error.)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ The following person should treat students' errors.

20. Classmates

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |

21. Teachers

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |

22. Myself

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix C**

**Students' questionnaire in Kurdish and its back-translation in English**

Dear students,

The aim of this questionnaire is to collect data about your opinion concerning error correction. Your contribution is important for this research and will help improve the teaching and learning of English in Kurdistan, Iraq. The questionnaire consists of two parts. Please read the instructions for each part carefully and give your honest responses. Please note that this is not a test and your responses will not affect your grades in any course; they will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your kind cooperation.

خوێندکارانی ئازیز،

ئامانجی ئەم راپرسیه  بۆ کۆکردنەوەو بەدەستهێنانی زانیارییە دەربارەی رای تۆ لەسەر   چۆنیەتی راست کردنەوەی هەڵەکانی فێرخواز. بەشداریکردنی ئێوە بایەخی زۆری هەیە بۆ ئەم لێکۆلینەوەیە وە دەبێتە هۆکارێکی یارمەتیدەر بۆ باشتر کردن و پێشخستنی  چۆنیەتی فێرکردن و وتنەوەی زمانی ئینگلیزی لە کوردستانی عێراق. ئەم راپرسیه پێکهاتوه لە دوو بەش. تکایه   رینماییەکان بۆ  هەر  بەشێك بە  وردی بخوێنەوەو وەڵامی خۆت بە راشکاوی و راستگۆیانه هەڵبژێره.  تکایه ئەمه  بزانه  که ئەوه تاقیکردنەوه نیه و وه  به  هیچ  جۆرێك وەڵامەکانت کار لە نمرەکانت ناکات ؛ ئەوه تەنها بۆ مەبەستی توێژینەوه بەکار دەهێنرێت.

سوپاس بۆ هاوکاریتان .....

Part I: background information

- Name: (Optional) …………………………………………………
- Gender: Male: (     )   Female: (      )
- Age: …………………………….
- Nationality: …………………………………………..
- Place of Residence: City: …………………., Province: …………………………….
- Your first language: ( زمانی دایك ) زمانی یەکەمت

| Kurdish | Arabic | Turkish | Other (please specify)……………… |

- How long have you been studying English?  چەند ساڵە وانەی زمانی ئینگلیزی دەخوێنی ؟

| 6-8 years | 8-10 years | 10-12 years | More than 12 years |

Part II: General Statements

ڕێنمایی :لە ئەم بەشەی ڕاپرسیەدا ، ئێمە دەمانەوێت بزانین تۆ تا چ ڕادەیەك ڕازی یاخود نارازیت لەگەڵ ئەو پرسیارانەی خوارەوە ئەویش بە دەستنیشان کردنی تەنها یەك هەڵبژارده بەدانانی نیشانەی ڕاست  (√) لە تەنیشتیەوە . تکایە هیچ برگەیەك بەجێ مەهێڵە.

- ئەو زانیاریانە هەڵبژێرە کە دەگونجی لەگەڵ تۆ، دڵنیابە لەوەی کەتەنها یەك هەڵبژارده دەستنیشان بکەی.

1- I want to receive corrective feedback (e.g., provide a hint for me to self-correct, tell me that I made an error, or correct my error.) when I make mistakes.

1 – دەمەوێت هەڵەکانم ڕاستبکرێتەوە (بۆ نمونە: ئاماژەم بۆ بکات بۆئەوەی ڕاستی بکەمەوە ، یا پێم بڵێت کە هەڵەم کردوە، یا هەڵەکەم بۆ ڕاست بکاتەوە) کاتێك کەهەڵە دەکەم.

| Strongly Agree زۆر ڕازیم | Agree ڕازیم | Neutral ڕازیم و نارازیم | Disagree نارازیم | Strongly Disagree زۆر نارازیم |

2- How often do you want your teacher to give corrective feedback on your spoken errors?

٢ـ تا چەند دەتەوێت مامۆستا هەڵەکانت ڕاست بکاتەوە لەکاتی دەربڕیندا؟

| Always (100%) هەمیشە | Usually (80%) بەزۆری | Sometimes هەندێ جار(50%) | Occasionally جارو بار(20%) | Never (0%) هیچ کاتێك |

❖ When do you want your spoken errors to be treated?

لە چ کاتێکدا دەتەوێت هەڵەکانت بەهەند وەربگرێت؟

3- As soon as errors are made even if they interrupts my conversation.

٣ – لەکاتی هەڵەکردنمدا هەتا ئەگەر بێتە هۆی قسەپێبڕینیشم.

| Strongly Agree زۆر ڕازیم | Agree ڕازیم | Neutral ڕازیم و نارازیم | Disagree نارازیم | Strongly Disagree زۆر نارازیم |

4- After I finish speaking.

٤ – دوای ئەوەی کە قسەکانم تەواو کرد.

| Strongly Agree زۆر ڕازیم | Agree ڕازیم | Neutral ڕازیم و نارازیم | Disagree نارازیم | Strongly Disagree زۆر نارازیم |

5- After the classroom activities are over.

۵ـ دوای چالاکییەکان.

| Strongly Agree<br>زۆر رازیم | Agree<br>رازیم | Neutral<br>رازیم و نارازیم | Disagree<br>نارازیم | Strongly Disagree<br>زۆر نارازیم |
|---|---|---|---|---|

6- At the end of class.

۶ـ لەکۆتایی وانەکەدا.

| Strongly Agree<br>زۆر رازیم | Agree<br>رازیم | Neutral<br>رازیم و نارازیم | Disagree<br>نارازیم | Strongly Disagree<br>زۆر نارازیم |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ How often do you want each of the following types of errors to receive corrective feedback?

<u>تا چەند یەكێك لەو جۆرە راستكردنەوانەی خوارەوەت دەوێت بۆ راستكردنەوەی هەڵەكانت لەكاتی قسەكردندا؟</u>

7- Serious spoken errors that may cause problems in a listener's understanding.

۷ـهەڵەیەكی كاریگەر كە ببێتە هۆی كێشە لە تێگەیشتن بۆ گوێگر.

| Always (100%)<br>هەمیشە | Usually (80%)<br>بەزۆری | Sometimes<br>(50%) هەندێ جار | Occasionally<br>(20%) جارو بار | Never (0%)<br>هیچ كاتێك |
|---|---|---|---|---|

8- Less serious spoken errors that do not affect a listener's understanding.

۸ـ هەڵەیەك كە كاریگەری كەم بێت و كار نەكاتە سەر تێگەشتنی گوێگر.

| Always (100%)<br>هەمیشە | Usually (80%)<br>بەزۆری | Sometimes<br>(50%) هەندێ جار | Occasionally<br>(20%) جارو بار | Never (0%)<br>هیچ كاتێك |
|---|---|---|---|---|

9- Frequent spoken errors.

۹ـ هەڵەی باوو و هەمیشەیی لە دەربریندا.

| Always (100%)<br>هەمیشە | Usually (80%)<br>بەزۆری | Sometimes<br>(50%) هەندێ جار | Occasionally<br>(20%) جارو بار | Never (0%)<br>هیچ كاتێك |
|---|---|---|---|---|

10- Infrequent spoken errors.

۱۰ـ هەڵەی دەگمەن لە دەربریندا.

| Always (100%)<br>هەمیشە | Usually (80%)<br>بەزۆری | Sometimes<br>(50%) هەندێ جار | Occasionally<br>(20%) جارو بار | Never (0%)<br>هیچ كاتێك |
|---|---|---|---|---|

11- My individual errors (i.e., errors that other students may not make).

۱۱ـ هەڵە تاكییەكانم (واتا هەڵەیەك كە قوتابییەكانی تر نەیكەن).

| Always (100%)<br>هەمیشە | Usually (80%)<br>بەزۆری | Sometimes<br>(50%) هەندێ جار | Occasionally<br>(20%) جارو بار | Never (0%)<br>هیچ كاتێك |
|---|---|---|---|---|

❖ How would you rate each type of spoken error correction below?

چۆن پلە بۆ هەریەك لەم شیوازانەی خوارەوە دادەنێی بۆ راستكردنەوەی هەڵەی قسەكردن یان دەربرین ؟
بۆ نموونە:

> Teacher: Where did you go yesterday?
> Student: I <u>go</u> to the park.

12- Could you say that again?

۱۲- دەتوانی جارێکی تر دووبارەی بکەیەوە؟

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسوودە | بەسوودە | بەسوود ، بێ سوودە | بێ سوودە | زۆر بێ سوودە |

13- I go? (Repetition: The teacher highlights the student's grammatical error by using intonation.)

۱۳- I *go* (دووبارەمکردنەوە : مامۆستاکە دەستنیشانی هەڵەی ڕێزمانی قوتابییەکە بکات بە گوتنی ووشەکە بە تۆنێکی جیاواز)

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسوودە | بەسوودە | بەسوود ، بێ سوودە | بێ سوودە | زۆر بێ سوودە |

14- I went there yesterday, too. (Implicit feedback: The teacher does not directly point out the student's error but indirectly corrects it.)

۱٤- I went there yesterday, too ( ڕاستکردنەوەی ناڕاستەوخۆ: مامۆستاکە ڕاستەوخۆ هەڵەی قوتابی دەرنەخات، بەڵکو بە ناڕاستەوخۆ ڕاستی بکاتەوە).

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسوودە | بەسوودە | بەسوود ، بێ سوودە | بێ سوودە | زۆر بێ سوودە |

15- "Go" is in the present tense. You need to use the past tense "went" here. (Explicit feedback: The teacher gives the correct form to the student with a grammatical explanation.)

۱٥-( Go ) لە کاتی ڕانەبردووە . پێویستە ڕابردوو بەکار بێنی "went" . (مامۆستا ڕاستەوخۆ هەڵەکە ڕاست بکاتەوە لەگەڵ پێدانی زانیاری ڕێزمانی لە هەمان کاتدا).

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسوودە | بەسوودە | بەسوود ، بێ سوودە | بێ سوودە | زۆر بێ سوودە |

16- Yesterday, I ………. (Elicitation: The teacher asks the student to correct and complete the sentence.)

۱٦- …… Yesterday, I ( لێ وەرگرتن : مامۆستا داوا لە قوتابییەکە بکات بۆ ڕاستکردنەوە و تەواوکردنی ڕستەکە).

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسوودە | بەسوودە | بەسوود ، بێ سوودە | بێ سوودە | زۆر بێ سوودە |

17- Really? What did you do there? (No corrective feedback: The teacher does not give

corrective feedback on the student's errors.)

١٧- ?Really? What did you do there ( بەبێ راستکردنەوە : واتا مامۆستاکە هیچ راستکردنەوەیەك نەدا
لەسەر هەڵەی قوتابییەکە).

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسودە | بەسودە | بەسود ، بێ سودە | بێ سودە | زۆر بێ سودە |

18- How does the verb change when we talk about the past? (Metalinguistic feedback: The

teacher gives a hint or a clue without specifically pointing out the mistake.)

١٨- چۆن فرمانەکە دەگۆڕی کاتێك کە باس لە رابردوو دەکەی؟ ( مامۆستا ئاماژەیەك بدا بەبێ ئەوەی دەستنیشانی
هەڵەکە بکات).

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسودە | بەسودە | بەسود ، بێ سودە | بێ سودە | زۆر بێ سودە |

19- I went to the park. (Recast: The teacher repeats the student's utterance in the correct form

without pointing out the student's error.)

١٩- I went to the park ( دارشتنەوە : مامۆستاکە ووتەی قوتابییەکە دووبارە بکاتەوە بەشێوە بەشێوە راستییەکەی بەبێ
ئاماژە بۆ هەڵەی قوتابییەکە).

| Very Effective | Effective | Neutral | Ineffective | Very Ineffective |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر بەسودە | بەسودە | بەسود ، بێ سودە | بێ سودە | زۆر بێ سودە |

❖ The following person should treat students' errors.

ئەم کەسانەی خوارەوە پێویستە هەڵەکانی قوتابی بەهەند وەربگرن و چارەسەری بکەن.

20- Classmates ( ٢٠- هاوپۆلەکانم )

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر رازیم | رازیم | رازیم و نارازیم | نارازیم | زۆر نارازیم |

21- Teachers ( ٢١- مامۆستاکانم )

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر رازیم | رازیم | رازیم و نارازیم | نارازیم | زۆر نارازیم |

22- Myself

(٢٢- بۆ خۆم )

| Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| زۆر رازیم | رازیم | رازیم و نارازیم | نارازیم | زۆر نارازیم |

**Appendix D**

**Approval Letter by Directorate of Education in Rania- Ministry of Education-**

**KRG**

| وزارة التربية | | ومزارەتی پــەروەردە |
|---|---|---|
| المديرية العامة للتربية السليمانية | **Kurdistan Regional Government** | بەرێوەبەرایەتی گشتی پەروەردەی سلێمانی |
| مديرية تربية رانيه | *Council of Ministers* | بەرێوەبەرێتی پەروەردەی رانیە |
| قسم الإدارة | *Ministry of Education* | بەشی کارگێری |

ژمارە : ١٦.٦٦
ڕۆژ کوردی: ٢٧ / /
ڕۆژ زایینی: ١ / ٢٠١٣

بۆ/ گشت خوێندنگا و قوتابخانەکان

بابەت/ گشتاندن

تکایە لەکاتی سەردانی کردنی بەرێز( م. زیرەك رسول سعید ) ماستەر لە زمانی ئینگلیزی هاوکار و
هەماهەنگی بکەن بۆ مەبەستی وەرگرتنی (( داتا )) لەسەر نامەی ماستەرەکەی.

## لەگەڵ ڕێزدا...

سیف الدین قادر اسماعیل
بەرێوەبەری پەروەردە

وێنەیەك بۆ/
↳ بەرێز بەرێوەبەری پەروەردە.
↳ بەرێز (مامۆستا زیرەك رسول سعید ).
↳ خولاو.

ابراهیم

٢٠١٣/١٠/٢١      ١٢:٢٣:٢٧ م      ١٦٢

**Appendix E**

**Written Permission from Hyang-Sook Park**

박향숙

To Me

Sep 25, 2013

Dear Zirak Saeed,

You may use the questionnaires that I used for my thesis.

Good luck on your thesis!

Regards,

Hyangsook Park
나의 iPhone에서 보냄

2013. 9. 23. 오후 9:41 Zirak Saeed <ziraksaeed@ymail.com> 작성: