Bilingual/Bi-annual Pakistan Studies English / Urdu Research Journal VOl.No.09, Issue No. 01

January -June, 2019

A Study of the Types of Oral Errors that University Students Want to Have Corrected in an EFL Classroom in Quetta, Pakistan:

By

[1]Ahmed Faraz

Abstract:

This research study aims to investigate university students' attitudes towards the types of oral error correction in Quetta, Pakistan. A quantitative research design was adopted in this study in order to answer the research questions. However, total 202 students of different departments of University of Balochistan took part in the research which include 159 males and 43 females. They have English as a compulsory subject in their course. Researcher utilized a questionnaire from the previous study of Katayama (2007) for the collection of the data. A close-ended questionnaire contained four parts and seventeen items based on the research questions of oral errors corrections. The data of the present research was analysed on Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 for obtaining the results of the research questions. The findings of the study indicated that learners have positive attitudes towards the types of oral errors corrections and they considered them very important for learning speaking skills in English. The students found them beneficial for their learning and desired corrections for their mistakes. Similarly, this research study suggests that further research may be conducted to find further opinions of learners as well as teachers on oral errors corrections.

Keywords: Errors and mistakes, Oral errors corrections, Positive attitudes towards types of oral error correction.

Introduction:

The research study is based on the types of oral error correction that university students want to have corrected in an EFL classroom in Quetta. It is necessary to know about the term error and another similar word mistake which is used as a synonym of error. Error and mistake are two separate words and the researchers have differently defined them in order to clarify the difference between the two terms. However, the two terms have been used interchangeably in this research study.

When learners do not put something in practice which they have learnt, they make mistakes. While learners make errors when they try out

[1]M.Phil. Scholar Department of English Literature University of Balochistan Quetta Pakistan

something that is completely new and get it wrong (Bartram & Walton, 1991). An error occurs when there is a violation of rules of system whereas a mistake is the result of handling restrictions due to lack of skill (Jie, 2008). It is crucial to make a different definition between mistakes and errors, technically two very different phenomena. Brown (1994) stated that:

> *A mistake refers to a performance that is either a random guess or a slip in it is a failure to utilize a known system correctly, on the other hand, an error refers to idiosyncrasies in the inter language of the learner that is operating at the time in second language speech (Brown, 1994, p. 205).*

The learners commit errors in their learning processes; therefore, they need feedback for their errors. There are several types of feedbacks i.e. written or oral which can be given on the errors of learners in the EFL classrooms.

Information given for improvement in acquiring English language is called feedback, and it is an essential part of learning. Researchers have different opinions on feedback. Feedback has progressive impacts when it is compared to the further teaching aspects (Black and William, 1998). Similarly, it is crucial in the processes of higher education (Ramsden, 2003). The response to the learners' utterances with an error is called corrective feedback (Baleghizadeh & Rezaei, 2010). Consequently, oral corrective feedback is a kind of corrective feedback, therefore, teachers' response towards the incorrect usage of the target language of learners is called oral corrective feedback see (Walsh 2006).

The main objectives of the study are to determine the types of oral error correction university students want to have corrected in an EFL classroom in Quetta, Pakistan. The learners come for study to Quetta from different areas of Balochistan. They join English language academies to lessen the difficulties they encounter in their courses.

Literature Review:

This study is based on the types of oral errors correction that students want to have corrected in the EFL classrooms. This portions of the study discusses errors and mistakes, feedback, corrective feedback, oral corrective and literature review of previously done researches on the similar topics.

Errors and Mistakes:

Similarly, Ellis (1997) explained the difference between the two terms that mistakes have indication on the learners' inefficient performance i.e. they occur when the learners do not perform correctly against existing knowledge. In contrast, the errors are the indication of the

breaks in knowledge of learners because learners produce errors without identifying what is correct and what is incorrect. Moreover, Selinker (1972) defined error that it is the deviant form that does not have a particular form of knowledge. Similarly, it has reflections on a learner's current stage in the processes of language developments. Whereas, according to Tomczyk (2013), "an error is the form of foreign language produced by learner, which reflects his/her contemporary competence and which does not belong to the target language system. (p. 924)

Feedback:

Feedback has a crucial part in the learning processes because without feedback learners may not learn properly what they aim to learn. Therefore, Winne and Butler (1994) briefly explained feedback that it is the information with which a learner can confirm, add, over write, tune, or restructure information in memory. An important aspect of learning performance is based on feedback because it provides information about learners' task performance (Hattie, 1987). Similarly, Hattie and Gan (2016) argued that the learning theory of information processing indicates the learners' mental ability to utilize feedback.

Corrective Feedback:

There are different kinds of corrective feedback to correct the errors of the learners in the EFL classrooms. Corrective feedback denotes to practical information that the performer obtains when they indicate a break between the desired performance as well as the current performance (Wiggins, 1993). Russell and Spada (2006) are of the opinion that corrective feedback shows a proof that a learner has an error in a language form. Additionally, Alhaysony (2016) stated about errors that the neutral part of learning and speaking are errors that attracts the attention of almost all the students in speaking skill particularly to practice the target language for achieving the fluency. Therefore, teachers should give feedback to the learners.

Oral Corrective Feedback:

Oral corrective feedback is a kind of corrective feedback that is given orally on the errors of learners. Walsh (2006) remarked that oral corrective feedback refers to the teachers' several responses to the wrong usage of learners' target language. Teachers have interest in oral error correction and help their learners to correct their target language learning process. Similarly, Brookhart (2008) stated about oral feedback that it is a type of feedback given orally during the interaction with people. It may include an individual, a group or the complete class.

Oral corrective feedback is the indication of error in the usage of the learners of target language (Karbalaei, Alireza & Karimian, 2014). It is a way to provide reformed input to students and they give improved results in response (Calsiyao, 2015). Likewise, Mendez and Cruz (2012 stated that oral corrective feedback is the reaction of the teacher towards

the improvement of the learner utterance. In short, OCF is the process of giving correction on oral errors of the students by their teachers or students.

Alhaysony (2016) conducted a research study on students' perceptions regarding corrective feedback in oral communication. The results of the present study highlighted a positive attitude and high preferences for corrective feedback and learners favoured the correction of their spoken errors. The students liked explicit correction no corrective feedback was the least favoured method. The learners also wanted correction in the end of their speaking activity or after the class. The findings also showed that teacher is the most suitable person to correct the errors, followed by self-correction and lastly peer correction. Additionally, students desired to receive error correction for their different speaking errors. Hence, the study indicated that the frequent and serious errors of the learners are needed to be corrected firstly and the less serious and infrequent errors secondly.

Ahmad, Saeed and Salam (2013) had a research study on the effects of corrective feedback in Pakistan. The objectives of the study were to explore instructors' opinions about present practices of corrective feedback on written works, to find out teachers' views regarding the effects of corrective feedback on students' academic achievements, and to give suggestions based on the findings of the research.

The findings showed that corrective feedback improves students' learning and those students who got CF, performed better in the examination. The study also concluded with the suggestion that teachers must be encouraged to give corrective feedback because it increases students' self-esteem. Thus, the research indicated that CF improves communication and writing skills and helps learners to improve their reading weaknesses.

Research Objectives:

The present research study is based on the following research objective mentioned below:

- To determine the types of oral error correction university students, want to have corrected in an EFL classroom in Quetta.

Research Questions:

The researcher addresses the following research question to investigate the perceptions of the students regarding oral errors correction in EFL classrooms.

- What types of oral errors correction university students want to have corrected in an EFL classroom in Quetta?

Research Design:

The present research adopts a survey research design because the study aims to investigate the perceptions of the EFL learners about oral error corrective feedback. According to Creswell (2015), survey research is a popular design in education and researchers utilize these designs in quantitative researches in which investigators conducts a survey to a sample or to entire population of people to portray their attitudes, opinions, behaviours and characteristics.

Research Sampling:

Total 202 participants took part in this research and they were male as well as female students of University of Balochistan. The male participants in the study are 159 and female participants are 43. Table 6.1 shows the demographic information:

Table 1

Demographic Information

1	**Gender**	**Male**	**Female**
		159	43
2	**Departments and number of participants**		
	English	**Chemistry**	**Mathematics**	**Journalism**	**Economics**
	34	33	50	37	48
	Statement	**Yes**	**No**
3	Do you also speak English outside of class?	101	101
4	Do you want to improve your speaking skills in English?	196	06

Instrumentation:

The present research study is quantitative in nature. Therefore, researcher utilizes a close ended questionnaire for the collection of data which was previously used by Katayama (2007) but some changes were made in it. The adapted close-ended questionnaire has four (4) parts based on four (2) research questions. The following Table 5.2 shows the distribution of items in the questionnaire:

Table 2

The distribution of items in the questionnaire

Construct	**Items**
Learners' perceptions on oral error correction	1, 2, 3, 4
How often students want to be corrected	5,6,7,8,9
The types of oral error correction	10,11,12,13,14,15,16

Process of Data Collection:

Researcher collected the data for the present research study separately from different departments by surveying them. The questionnaire was distributed among the students and they were guided carefully before allowing them to fill the questionnaire. Researcher explained every question along with its components to them with Urdu translation so that the students may understand every component of the questionnaire and provide valid data. Researcher would help the students to comprehend the component of question of the questionnaire when they had any confusion regarding any question.

Data Analysis:

Researcher used Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 20 to analyse the collected data in order to answer the research question.

Findings:

The results of the research questions are discussed below in the section 7.1

Data Analysis of the Research Question:

What types of oral errors correction Pakistani university undergraduates want to have corrected in an EFL classroom?

In order to answer the research question of the study, "What types of oral errors correction Pakistani university undergraduates want to have corrected in an EFL classroom?", descriptive statistics was performed in SPSS (version, 20). Frequencies and percentages were calculated to analyse the responses of 202 students on the five items clustered in the questionnaire on attitudes of students towards oral errors correction in an EFL classroom. Each item is analysed separately in the following Tables from 3 to 7:

Table 3

Grammar

Degree of Response	Frequency	Percentage
Always	119	58.9%
Often	43	21.3%
Occasionally	20	09.9%
Rarely	06	03.0%
Never	14	06.9%
Total	202	100%

Based on the findings shown in the table 3 above, majority of 80 % (162 students) accentuated that their grammatical oral errors need to be

rectified. On the other hand, 12.9% (26 students) expressed that their errors should be occasionally corrected. On the contrary, only 6.9% (14 students) ignored this view. The overall findings indicate that majority of the students have positive attitude towards correction of the grammar errors in their speaking in EFL classrooms. Thus, this implies that teachers should help their students to improve their grammar competence in their spoken English.

Table 4

Pronunciation, accent & intonation

Degree of Response	Frequency	Percentage
Always	58	28.7%
Often	55	27.2%
Occasionally	60	29.7%
Rarely	22	10.9%
Never	07	03.5%
Total	202	100%

Based on the outcomes depicted in the table 4 above, majority of 55.2% (113 students) emphasized that their errors in Pronunciation, accent and intonation should be corrected in the EFL classrooms. However, 40.6% (82 students) desired that their errors should occasionally be corrected. Whereas, only 03% (07 students) considered this view ineffective. The complete results of the table denote that majority the students have positive preferences towards the correction of errors in Pronunciation, accent & intonation for their improvement in spoken English. Thus, the data infers that teachers should concentrate on the students' errors in Pronunciation, accent & intonation to help them improve their speaking skill.

Table 5

Vocabulary (words, phrases) usages

Degree of Response	Frequency	Percentage
Always	68	33.7%
Often	37	18.3%
Occasionally	46	22.8%
Rarely	45	22.3%
Never	06	03.0%
Total	202	100%

Based on the verdicts in the table 5 above, majority 52% (105 students) stressed on the correction of vocabulary (words, phrases) usages that occur in their speaking. However, 45.1% (91 students) desired that their errors in vocabulary usages should occasionally be corrected. Whereas, only 03% (06 students) did not favour this view. The general results of the table direct that maximum number of the students have positive approach towards the correction of the wrong usages of vocabulary in their speaking and want their teacher to correct them. Thus, the data of the above table infers that teachers need to correct the errors of vocabulary usages in the spoken English of the students in the EFL classrooms for the improvement of their oral competence in speaking.

Table 6

Inappropriate expressions (e.g., when offering a drink in English)

Degree of Response	Frequency	Percentage
Always	58	28.7%
Often	42	20.8%
Occasionally	55	27.2%
Rarely	30	14.9%
Never	17	08.4%
Total	202	100%

Based on the results presented in the table 6 above, majority 49.5% (100 students) preferred the correction of their inappropriate expressions in their English speaking. Moreover, 42 % (85 students) occasionally wished their teachers to correct their errors of inappropriate expressions that occur during speaking English. However, only 08.4% (17 students) rejected to be corrected for their inappropriate expressions. The entire results describe that majority of the students have affirmative mind-set about the correction of the wrong usages of inappropriate expressions during their speaking in the EFL classrooms. Thus, the data of the above table suggests that should not ignore the correction of inappropriate expressions i.e. offering a drink in English, to help the students in enlightening their speaking skill in English.

Table 7

Organization of discourse (e.g., how to negotiate or persuade)

Degree of Response	Frequency	Percentage
Always	48	28.8%
Often	45	22.3%
Occasionally	37	18.3%
Rarely	32	15.8%
Never	40	19.8%
Total	202	100%

Based on the facts presented in the table 7 above, majority 51.1% (93 students) favoured the rectification of the organization of the discourse in the EFL classroom for the speaking skill. Similarly, 34.1% (69 students) expressed their views that their errors in organization of discourse should occasionally be corrected. While, 19.8% (40 students) negated this view. The complete findings of the table explain that majority of the students have optimistic attitude approach towards the correction of errors regarding the organization of discourse in their spoken English. Therefore, the data suggests that teachers must concentrate on the correction of organization of discourse errors in order to enhance the speaking ability of the students in the EFL classrooms.

Discussions of Findings:

This section discusses the findings of the present study in detail in order to answer the research questions of the present research study.

Research Question:

What types of oral errors correction Pakistani university undergraduates want to have corrected in an EFL classroom?

Based on the findings in the section 7.1, of the first item of the research question above, majority of the students accentuated that their grammatical oral errors need to be rectified. This indicates that grammar has huge importance in the correction of oral errors. Therefore, majority of the learners chose the correction of grammar in the EFL classroom. Harvina (2014) stated that:

> *Teachers are supposed to give a sufficient knowledge and example of grammatical to train the students to comprehend speaking contact form. So, it is important to teach the students how to make a good understanding based on speaking situation. This helps the students understand how to get good understanding in comprehending message and meaning based on speaking (*Harvina 2014, *p. 217).*

Similarly, the findings of the second item of the research question displayed that majority of the learners emphasized that their errors in Pronunciation, accent and intonation should be corrected in the EFL classrooms. The correction of the errors of pronunciation, accent and intonation is very crucial for the better competency of speaking. These findings support the findings of Baz, Balcikanl and Cephe (2016) who stated that learners agreed on the statement that students' pronunciation or grammatical errors may be corrected in class.

Moreover, the results of the third item of the research question showed that most of the students stressed on the correction of vocabulary (words, phrases) usages that occur in their speaking. For learning English, learners learn vocabulary to improve their English language skills

therefore, they strongly showed positive attitude for the correction of vocabulary in their speaking. The findings can be compared with the findings of the research study of Katayama (2007) in which the students show positive attitude for vocabulary correction.

However, the findings of the fourth item of the research question revealed that majority students preferred the correction of their inappropriate expressions in their English speaking. The learners mostly do not know the usage of many expressions i.e. how to offer a drink in English and hence, they commit errors in their speaking. Therefore, they had positive attitude towards the correction of the inappropriate expressions in their speaking.

Furthermore, the findings of the fifth item of the first research question explained that mostly students favoured the rectification of the organization of the discourse in the EFL classroom for the speaking skill. The organization of discourse means how to persuade someone to do a work and therefore, learners desired the correction of organization of discourse in their speaking.

Conclusion:

The present research study intended to determine the types of oral errors correction Pakistani university students want to have corrected in an EFL classroom. The findings of the different types of oral correction are mentioned below.

1. The first item of the research question showed that majority of the learners wanted their grammatical errors to be corrected.

2. The second item of the research question indicated that the learners emphasized that their errors in Pronunciation, accent and intonation should be corrected in the EFL classrooms.

3. The third item of the research question revealed that mostly students stressed on the correction of vocabulary (words, phrases) usages that occur in their speaking.

4. The fourth item of the research question highlighted that majority students preferred the correction of their inappropriate expressions in their English speaking. The learners mostly do not know the usage of many expressions i.e. how to offer a drink in English and hence, they commit errors in their speaking.

5. The fifth item of the research question discussed that majority of the students favoured the rectification of the organization of the discourse in the EFL classroom for the speaking skill.

Overall, the findings of the five items of the research question indicated that the learners have positive attitudes towards all the types of oral correction in an EFL classroom. Therefore, the findings are in the

lines with the results of Katayma (2007), Harvina (2014), Baz et al., (2016) and Alhasony (2016).

Limitations of the Study:

There are certain limitations of the present research study. Firstly, the researcher conducted the present study in the University of Balochistan, Quetta. Secondly, the researcher involved only the students of five departments of this university in the research; therefore, the findings of this study cannot be generalized to all the university students of Pakistani universities not even to the other universities of Balochistan too. Thirdly, researcher the researcher utilized questionnaire to collect the quantitative data from the students of five departments. Therefore, it can be concluded that some students may not have answered the questionnaires sincerely.

References:

Ahmad, I., Saeed, M., & Salam, M. (2013). Effects of corrective feedback on academic achievement of students: Case of Government Secondary Schools in Pakistan. *International Journal of Science and Research, 2*(1), 36-40.

Alhaysony, M. (2016). Saudi EFL preparatory year students' perception about corrective feedback in oral communication. *English Language Teaching, 9*(12), 47-61. doi: 10.5539/elt. v9n12p47.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Rezaei, S. (2010). Pre-service teacher cognition on corrective feedback: A case study. *Journal of Technology & Education, 4*(4), 321-327.

Bartram, M., & Walton, R. (1991). *Correction, mistakes management: A positive approach for language teacher.* Hove: Language Teaching Publication.

Baz, E. H., Balçıkanlı, C., & Cephe, P. T. (2016). Perceptions of English instructors and learners about corrective feedback. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 1*(1), 54-68.

Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principal, Policy and Practice, 5*(1), 7-74.

Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students.* Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principals of language and teaching*. New York: Prentice Hall Regents.

Calsiyao, Irene S. (2015). Corrective feedback in classroom oral errors among Kalinga- Apayao State College Students. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research, 3*(1), 394-400.

Creswell, J.W (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Boston: Pearson.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Genc, Z. (2014). Correction spoken errors in English language teaching: Preferences of Turkish EFL leaners at different proficiency levels. *Education and Science, 39*(174), 259-271.

Hattie, J. (1987). Identifying the salient facets of a model of students learning: A synthesis of meta-analysis. *International Journal of Educational Research, 11,* 187-212.

Hattie, J. Gan, M. (2016). Instruction based on feedback. In Mayer, R. E., & Alexander, P. A. (Eds.). *Handbook of research on learning and instruction* (pp. 249-269), New York: Routledge.

Harvina, H. (2014). Grammatical errors in speaking made by third year English department students STKIP Abdi Pendidikan. *Al-Talim Journal, 21*(3), 206-219.

Jie, X. (2008). Error theories and second language acquisition. *US-China Foreign Language, 6*(1), 35-42.

Karbalaei, Alireza and Abdolkarim Karimian. (2014). On the effect of type of teacher corrective feedback on Iranian EFL learners' writing performance. *Indian Journal. Sci. Res, 7*(1) 965-981.

Katayama, A. (2007). Students' perceptions toward corrective feedback to oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*(4), 289-305.

Mendez, E.H., & Cruz, R. (2012). Teachers' perceptions about oral corrective feedback and their practice in EFL classrooms. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development, 14*(2), 63-75.

Philip, J. (2003). Constraints on noticing the gap: Nonnative speakers' noticing of recast in NS-NNS interaction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 25,* 99-126.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge Publishers.

Russell, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. In Norris, J. & Ortega, L. (Eds.), Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching (pp. 133-164). Amsterdam: Benjamin.

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics 10,* 209-230.

Tomczyk, E. (2013). Perceptions of oral errors and their corrective feedback: Teachers vs. students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 4*(5), 924-931. doi: 10.4304/jltr.4.5.924-931.

Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse.* New York: Routledge Publishers.

Wiggins, G. P. (1993). *Assessing student performance.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Winne, P.H., & Butler, D. L. (1994). Student cognition in learning from teaching. *International Encyclopaedia of Education, 2, 5738-5775.*