Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review
www.plhr.org.pk

Exploring Errors Treatment Impacts on Undergraduate Learners in English Language Classrooms at Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat

Niaz Rehman*[1] Dr. Said Imran[2] Dr. Mansoor Ali[3]

1. Ph. D Scholar, Department of English, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat, KP, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat, KP, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor, Department of English, Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat, KP, Pakistan

| *Corresponding Author | saidimran@kust.edu.pk |

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to develop a comprehensive understanding about the various impacts of language teachers' written or oral corrective feedback techniques and strategies on learners' language learning. This study also investigates learners' attitudes and perceptions about their teachers' corrective feedback strategies applied in the classrooms. Using inappropriate approaches in learner errors treatment process can hold back learner language learning performance in the classroom. This study employs mixed method approach by collecting data through questionnaire and interview. Quantitative data is collected from 219 students by using five-point Likert scale questionnaire. To determine the results, descriptive analysis and regression analysis is applied; while qualitative data is analyzed through thematic analysis. Research study concluded that teacher's attitude and strategies during learner errors treatment process can cast enormous positive or negative impacts on learner language learning. Learners recommended appropriate and well accepted feedback strategies for their better learning in language classrooms.

Introduction

With the globalization, today language learners are required to be more competent and proficient in different communication skills while learning the English language as a second/foreign language. Errors and mistakes are an integral part and parcel of the entire language learning process. Researchers are of the view that errors are essential in the learner language learning as well as performing in the target language and they cannot be avoided. Salajegheh et al. (2022) stated that CF enhanced language learning process and is required to be employed when learners personally need it during language learning in the classrooms. About the perplexing concepts of errors treatment Ellis (2017) stated that, "error treatment in Language classroom is to be discussed in term of whether errors should be corrected; when, how, and by whom" (p. 701).

Generally, complexities and issues faced by a language teacher in the errors treatment process are often due to its dynamic and changing nature. The proper knowledge about errors treatment techniques and language learning approaches made the research study quite complicated. As a language teacher, one needs to be equipped with several

essential theoretical concepts and foundations and should also be aware of what we are performing in the classrooms (Miroslaw Pavolak, 2014&Ali.A et al, 2022). Theoretical foundations need to be combined with the various principles for acquiring optimal effectiveness and cognitive feedback of reinforcement theory along with approaches for communicative language teaching.

Keeping these theories and concepts in mind, a teacher can decide in the language classroom, that whether s/he should treat or pay no heeds to the learner errors. If situations indicate that learner error treatment is essential then teachers should know, when and how to correct them and what will be the overt or covert impacts or influences of these treatments on L2 or foreign language learners during language learning.

In language classroom, the role of a teacher is very vital and significant; because teacher often help and guide the learners in their language learning. Teacher also positively attribute toward learners needs and interest in order to achieve proficiency in the language learning process. It is also fact that learners' often trust on teacher for their assistance during language learning process. A general strategy used by the teacher to help the learners in the classroom activities is to monitor student performance as well as to provide corrective feedback in their language learning in the classrooms (Ananda et al., 2017).

Ustacı and Ok-Selami (2014) stated that learners' always preferred to get indications from their language teachers; so that learner can treat their own mistakes and errors without losing confidence and confidentiality. Kencana (2020) demonstrated in the research finding that, "teacher should focus on linguistic errors especially grammar, punctuation, spelling, vocabulary and organization".

Duong and Nguyen (2022) suggested that language teacher focus based errors treatment is more encouraging and compatible in learner language learning. Izadpanah, Sadighi and Akbarpour (2022) indicated that explicit errors treatment is often more effective in learner both oral and written activities because it enhance learner level of awareness and grammatical accuracy. In short; for a language teacher, errors treatment in English Language classrooms is a complicated and thorny problem due to different perspectives and dynamic contexts. Keeping in mind the dynamic and complicated nature of research area, focus on its study is much needed in language classes, especially in English Language classrooms.

Literature Review

The Concepts of Errors and Error Treatment

The terms error is not a new or unknown notion. About the concept of 'error' in language learning, Ellis (1994) stated that, "An error can be defined as; a deviation from the norms of target language" (p. 51).

Error takes place or happen, when the deviation or variation arises in learner language productions as a consequence of lack of knowledge about target language; it indicates a lack of competence in the learner" (Corders, 1967).

Richards and Schmidt (2002) defined the term errors treatment in Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics as:

"Strategies or techniques used by a teacher or more advance learner to correct errors in a learner's speech. Error treatment may be direct (teacher supplies the correct form) or

indirect (the teacher points out the problem or issue and asks the learner to correct it if possible)" (p. 185).

The phenomenon of errors in language learning is very common; about the value and significance of errors, Alobo (2015) stated that "Committing errors in L2 learning is inevitable and it is part and parcel of L2 learning process, as such should not be frowned at by teachers" (p. 635).

According to Li, S. (2014), Errors treatment or errors correction refers to language teacher or peer responses / reactions to learners' during second or foreign language erroneous productions. Errors treatment, a fundamental and important part of language teaching and learning, mostly applied in second or foreign language classrooms. Learners' errors treatments often have consequences and the most important causes given by the researchers is its negative or discouraging impact on learners' self-confidence as well as on their motivations (Ha & Murray, 2021; Lyster et al., 2013&Gul.N et al,2022).

About errors treatment techniques or approaches used in second or foreign language learning, researchers have raised series of questions. It indicates various decisions a language teacher or instructor has to make within few seconds during his/ her teaching activities in the language classrooms according to learner's error (Ha & Nguyen, 2021).

Conducting a research to know the effects or impact of feedback on learners is too far to be concluded. Teachers' and learners' expectations and perceptions toward errors treatment in the classroom are always found to be divergent as well as changing in nature.

Theoretical Concepts and Framework of the Research Study

Mackey, Gass and McDonough (2000) pointed out four types of errors in the analysis of second language. The four types of error that is used by the teacher's during corrective feedback are phonology, morph syntax, usage of words, and semantics. The error treatment sequence is usually coded as consisting of three parts: learner initial error, feedback, and learner uptake.

Lyster and Ranta (1997), in their research work provided the well known and important approaches of errors treatment in language learning in the classrooms. They distinguished six types of corrective feedback based on their study upon teachers in French language.

Explicit Verses Implicit Correction

Errors correction in oral activities can be found in both explicit and implicit manners. Explicit treatment or explicit correction comprises a clear and to the point indication mistake made by the learner in language learning (Ellis, Loewen, &Erlam, 2006). The main purpose of explicit types of correction is to provide grammatical explanations or direct feedback to the learners during language teaching activities (Long, 1996).

Implicit types of errors correction is used in the language learning classroom, when a language teacher did not want to indicate the learner mistakes or errors in a direct manner. According to Bitchener and Knock (2010), implicit errors correction draw learners' attention to their errors during various language skills; but it doesn't make them correct. This type of correction is dangerous, damaging and sometime embarrassing for language learner in their language learning activities in the classroom (Yoshida, 2008).

Recasts

Another term used in error correction approaches is recast, which is normally used for error correction in the first language acquisition or learning (Farrar, 1992). In EFL context, recast means the response provided by a teacher or language expert to the students. It is used to "reformulates the learner utterance" however, in this process or types of correction teacher responses to learners often not included. For example "used this phrase or words", "you can say that" etc. (Lyster & Ranta, 1997)

Numbers of researchers are of the view that learner perceptions about recast are essential to categorize it either explicit or implicit, because sometime learner may not be able to know about the recast as used as a form of errors treatment. Therefore, a researcher like Nassaji (2015) has pointed out the vagueness and demerit of using recast techniques for learner correction in the language classrooms.

Clarification Request

Clarification request is a type of corrective feedback often used in language learning classrooms. Ellis (2009) has further categorize it as an implicit correction, because it refers to a clue by the teacher or language corrector, that the utterances of learners in the language learning activities have not been clearly understood by the listeners. Therefore, the teacher usually wants to imply this technique for clarifications, in order to reformulate learner utterances. It is also used to indicate that learners should not clearly understand that they have committed error in their utterances (Spada & Frohlich, 1995).

Meta-linguistic Corrections

Meta-linguistic correction is another types of CF, it is sometimes called as "meta-linguistic clues" (Lyster & Ranta, 1997 and Ali.M et al,2021), It occurs when the language teacher addresses various types of queries or remarks and gives information to learners which is related to their utterances or expressions with the aim of obtaining required information from the students in the language classroom. The teacher or language corrector may provide information by focusing on learner grammar patterns and structures etc.

Repetition

Repetition as a type of corrective feedback, it often occurs in the language classrooms when teacher want to repeat the learner same utterances again and again. The basic purpose of repetition is that learner should concentrate on their errors. It is also used to create question marks and clear clues in about the possible responses the mind of language learner.

Elicitation

Another type of corrective feedback is elicitation. In this approach teacher try to extract the right answer from the language learner. According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), there are three types of strategies related to the elicitation techniques. Out of these strategies, one involves the learners to complete the specific utterances which has been provided by his/her teacher in the classroom. A second strategy is providing comments like asking questions, the purpose of this technique is to elicit a correct pattern from the language learner. The final strategy used in the elicitation process, involves teachers to ask learners by reformulating their speeches or expression. All these techniques used in the corrective feedback process are considered overt corrections, because it simply asks the students to attempt again and again (Smith, 2010).

Need and Frequency of Corrective Feedback

The required number of CF selected by teacher and language experts play vital role to determine how it should be administered in the language classrooms. Brookhart (2008) stated that deciding the amount of required corrective feedback can be the most difficult and puzzling decision for a language teacher. For the sack of understanding, she suggested to adopt the Goldilocks famous principle, that is "Not too much, not too little, but just right" (as also cited in Brookhart, 2008). According to this well known principle, language teachers should be able to know the strong and weak points of a learner's production. Teacher should also focus on two or three important and crucial points in learners' productions according to pre-established required language learning objectives.

Amrhein & Nassaji, (2010) stated that, teachers should think collectively on their learners' viewpoint, the nature of learning and learners' expressions or performances, as well as pre-establish language learning intentions and objectives.

Appropriate Timing of Feedback

Feedback or errors correction may be categorize as; either a delay or immediate correction in learner learning. Brookhart (2008) has suggested that when deciding about the appropriate timing of the learners' errors treatment, teacher should consider the situations and context of the learners. Commonly, the suitable timing for learner correction is when he or she is engaged in the activity where errors are occurring. Consequently, it is considered an inappropriate practice when feedback is provided to the learners for their assignment after the completions of two or three weeks. Clariana (1999) suggested that the appropriate timing of the CF should be decided according to the need and complexity of required tasks.

Types of Approaches and Strategies in Errors Treatment

Several kinds of approaches and strategies are used in ELT classrooms for errors treatment and corrections; the well known among those proposed by Chaudron (1977), who has distinguished four types of treatment:

1. Errors treatment or correction which enables learners' autonomous skills to correct errors themselves.

2. Feedback that enables the learners, to elicit the correct or suitable response from the learner in the classroom.

3. Any correction/ treatment by teacher that demand some improvement from language learners.

4. Feedback which show some approval or disapproval in learner expressions during language learning activities

James (1998) indicated the following three important principles during learners' errors treatment process in the language classrooms. Firstly, strategy or techniques which enhance learners' accuracy in written or verbal expressions. In second strategy during errors treatment process, teacher considered the affective factors of students. Teacher should also care about the correction which might not be face-threatening to the learners. Thirdly, most of the researchers believe that indirect errors correction is more beneficial in various language learning activities.

Review of Conducted Studies

Hamidun et al. (2012) evaluated the impact of teachers' feedback in enhancing the motivation of learners by following an action research in Thailand. The researcher found through classroom observations that the learners had not enough motivation of participation in the production of language. Thus, they used direct immediate feedback to enhance their motivation. Resultantly, it was noticed that the learners showed a good response to the direct feedback and it boosted up their motivational level.

Abedi (2015) attempted to find the opinions of students regarding oral error correction strategies of their teachers in EFL context in Iran. The findings showed that the opinions of students were in harmony with the actual practices of error correction of their teachers. In other words, the students desired indirect CF, while direct strategies of CF were used by their teachers. Similarly, Amanda et al (2017) conducted a qualitative research in Indonesia on EFL learners to discover their choices toward oral error correction by their teachers. The findings revealed that the most desired type of CF was the repetition among learners.

Tesnum (2019) performed a study on the various effects of oral correction feedback (OCF) on students' speaking skills i.e. fluency, pronunciation and grammar in EFL context. The study utilized an experimental design and observations as tool for data collection. Twenty students participated in the experimental group. The students were EFL learners at intermediate level. The results of the study showed that explicit and at the moment OCF has positive effects on EFL students' development of grammar. However, it did not help in enhancing the students' competency with regard to pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar.

Nemati et al. (2019) investigated the impact of written corrective feedback (WCF) of teachers regarding the learning of simple tense through implicit and explicit knowledge by students. Eighty-seven (87) English students of introductory level took part in the research. The findings revealed that positive effects in this context.

Saeli and Cheng (2019) discovered that learners' preferences and perceptions play a significant role in receiving feedback and then using it. Most of the students (10/15) reported that they prefer to receive unfocused CF and the amount/frequency of error correction was not disturbing them. Although the students were not able to tell as to why they prefer unfocused CF, but they referred to the fact that they had insufficient knowledge of grammar. Thus, they are unable to identify the mistake by themselves.

Karim and Nassaji (2020) emphasized that teachers need to be conscious of the proficiency level of learners and they need attention to the error type which they address. Similarly, Wagner and Wulf (2016) recommended that treatable errors can be addressed in a better way with direct CF as it permits the students to deduce the rules naturally.

Ha, Murray and Riazi (2021) performed a study employing explanatory sequential research design to survey the responses of EFL learners with regard to OCF and the function of individual differences in this matter in Vietnam. Two hundred and fifty high school students filled in questionnaires and fifteen students were interviewed after. The students preferred both output-prompting CF and input-prompting CF for all types of errors. They strongly preferred meta-linguistic feedback whereas they least preferred the request for clarification. Karim and Nassaji (2018) supported direct WCF in their study which included fifty-three (53) ESL students of moderate proficiency. The students participated in a number of tests where grammatical and non-grammatical errors were

examined. The results showed that those groups who were given CF performed much better than the control group. This showed that CF is highly effective regardless of whatever its form is. In the same manner, Nusrat et al (2019) conducted a research on ninety (90) learners in ESL context to evaluate the impacts of WCF on the accuracy of learners in correct use of past tense, article structures and prepositions in writing. The analysis showed that those learners committed fewer errors who received direct WCF which confirm to the effectiveness of this technique.

Rummel (2014) performed a research on seventy-two (72) students in advance level at Laos University in Kuwait for a period of seven weeks. The findings indicated that the EFL students who received WCF outperformed those learners who were not given WCF. Similarly, Guo (2015) conducted a study with one hundred and fifty-seven (157) EFL learners in a Chinese university for a period of seven weeks. The findings showed that those learners who got WCF in four months performed quite well as compared to those who did not get WCF.

Zarei, Ahour and Seifoori (2020) carried out a study in Iran to examine the potential effects of emergent, implicit and explicit strategies of teachers' feedback on the perceptions, motivation and attitude of EFL students. Three experimental groups i.e. emergent, implicit and explicit comprising fifty-four EFL students participated in the research. The statistical analysis revealed significant differences among the various types with regard to their impact on the motivation of students.

Roothooft (2014) inquired about the oral correction process and differences in teacher's practices and beliefs in language learning classrooms. She also pointed out and recorded the responses of 10 EFL teachers in Spain, out of these teachers; five were from private language academy while other five were from language institute at university. The teacher has recorded the responses through open ended questionnaire. The questionnaire used in the research described observations, teaching practices and the responses provided by the teachers during errors treatment practices in various situations & context. Errors treatment provided by the teacher in the English classroom and the responses of surveys were coded as an errors correction, CF, recast, clarification request, elicitation, feedback, repetition and translations in language.

About appropriate and suitable CF strategies Papangkorn (2015) suggested that,

"In speaking classes, errors can be corrected both immediately and delayed, while the correction in writing classes is normally delayed so as to allow for teachers to collect written work and respond" (p. 1842).

Ha, Nguyen and Hung (2021) have conducted the research about the belief of foreign language teachers and learners in the Vietnamese English context. The research has also highlighted the importance of feedback, need of correction, appropriate timing of correction and its various types. About 250 learners were selected for questionnaire, while 15 for interview. Researchers have also selected 24 language teachers from four different public secondary schools in Vietnam. The research findings indicated that there were many similarities or dissimilarities between the learners and teachers beliefs and opinions.

Both the writers Ustacı and Ok-Selami (2014) are of the view, "Students prefer error correction for their writing performance; they did not like being corrected during speaking activities" (p. 31).

Researcher are also of the view that advanced learner mostly believe that teachers types of correction depends upon the type of errors or mistakes committed by the students in the language classrooms. For instances, in grammar or in pronunciations, immediate errors treatment is often useful and preferable; because in delayed corrections or postponed feedback, student often forget many things Immediate repair can also be advantageous for phonological errors when students follow repetition and recast (Lyster, 1998). Language experts and linguists also suggest that, if errors slow down the comprehension of learners or it lead to more errors in the learning activities might be treated instantly.

Another research conducted by Rassaei and Moinzadech (2012) stated that during language learning, errors correction with meta-linguistic clues are often more effective for enhancing learners language accuracy in the target language learning. The study further indicated that this technique is also effective in delayed as well as immediate post tests.

Anada et al. (2017) have tried to conduct a research on EFL learners in the Indonesian context. The basic purpose of research was to know about the learners preferences about their lecturers' oral errors treatment practices in the classrooms. The research finding and results indicated that most of the students needs and preferred teacher repetitions in the language classrooms during orals corrective feedback.

Roothooft and Breeze (2016) indicated in their research that learners mostly preferred and willing to receive explicit errors corrections such as meta linguistic correction; while their teachers mostly used and preferred implicit types of corrections such as elicitation. On the contrary, Zhu and Wang's (2019) research about EFL learners in Chinese context indicated that learners mostly preferred and like immediate corrections than the corrections made through explicit manners.

According to Ustacı and Ok-Selami (2014) stated that if a language teacher desire to achieve Language proficiencies in the learners' language skills should encourage the learners for self correction. The teacher should also allocate maximum time to his or her students in the classrooms. In order to avoid damage students the fluency, teacher should provide feedback to the learners at the end of the activities in the language learning classrooms (Gul.N,et al,2022).

Gumbaridze (2012) states that, correction method cannot be ideal and unique for all kind of learners' since what can seem appropriate for one student can be discouraging and de-motivating for another. The best way of correcting speaking activities appropriately and productively is to explore students' feelings and beliefs about it – how and when they would likely to be corrected, otherwise it will produce negative impacts on ESL learners in ELT classrooms.

Moreover, researchers have also suggested that teacher should consider the overall situations and learner levels in the language classrooms. In the class, when most of the learners know about the exact words or correct pattern; but a single student don't know than he or she shouldn't be corrected, doing so learner will feel ashamed. It is very important as well as complicated for a language teacher to know about when and when not to correct. In the language institutions, feedback from teachers and learners about errors treatment is also essential for improving learner language learning proficiencies in the classrooms.

Material and Methods

Research Design/ Method

Method used in the research study is a mixed method approach. This method comprises the philosophical assumptions and concepts that, conduct the study till course compilation and breakdown of data; and the combination of qualitative and quantitative tactics in numerous stages during the research development process.

Research Type

In this research, researcher has selected and used Sequential Explanatory Mixed Method approach due to its suitability and requirement in the research.

According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2018), Sequential Explanatory Mix Method is a type of mix method approach or techniques where researcher combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches and then analyze it various phases in a proper sequence. In this research, priority has been given to qualitative aspect of the study (Creswell et al, 2003) to get the in depth understanding of the problem.

Instruments / Tools used in Data Collection

The researcher has used two types of data collection tools/scales in the research study. Researcher has designed a semi structured questionnaire of five Likert Scales. Questionnaire was formulated and ordered as per the check list and guidelines given by Bell and Waters (2014). Researcher has also conducted a semi structured interview with BS English students for exploring errors treatment impacts on undergraduate learners in English language classroom at Kohat University of Science & Technology.

Data Collection Method

Collection of valid and high quality data is foundational for successful and valid research (Wohlin & Wesslen, 2003). In this research, for quantitative data (questionnaire) researcher has selected about 219 learners' as a sample through probability simple random sampling techniques out of total enrolled students' in BS English programme in English department at Kohat University of Science & Technology, Kohat.

Whereas, for qualitative data (interview), students' were selected through purposive sampling techniques among all available learners in BS English classes, on the bases of their interest and willingness to the study. Researcher has interviewed 11 students in the study during data collection process. Participants for interview were selected through purposive base sampling to explore the errors treatment impacts on English language learners in English language classroom.

Procedure for Data Analysis

Researcher has collected two types of data in this research. Both types of data processed and analyzed separately. Quantitative data was analyzed through appropriate statistical tests which are descriptive analysis, and regression analysis on SPSS software. While qualitative data is analysis through various important themes, categories and codes used frequently in the study. According to Braun and Clark (2007), "thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting patterns within data"(p.79). Results and finding drawn on the basis of these themes, categories and codes retrieve from the interview in the study.

Results and Discussions

Quantitative Data Analysis and Discussions

Quantitative data collected in the first phase and analyzed in the form of figure and tables as proposed by Creswell (2007). In quantitative approach, descriptive statistical analysis is applied by the researcher to describe the perceptions, attitude and opinion of the learners in the form of means, ranges, percentages, frequencies and standard deviations. To find out the impacts of errors treatment on learner learning, the researcher has employed multi linear regression analysis in the quantitative data second phase.

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

It is used to know about the perceptions of learners about errors treatment and its very impacts on learners learning. It is used to find out the answer of the first research question.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Errors Treatment impacts on language learners (N = 219)

ECP1	f	%
Strongly Disagree	28	12.8
Disagree	28	12.8
Neutral	56	25.6
Agree	59	26.9
Strongly Agree	48	21.9
Total	219	100.0
ECP2	f	%
Strongly Disagree	20	9.1
Disagree	30	13.7
Neutral	34	15.5
Agree	74	33.8
Strongly Agree	61	27.9
Total	219	100.0
ECP3	f	%
Strongly Disagree	14	6.4
Disagree	62	28.3
Neutral	43	19.6
Agree	72	32.9
Strongly Agree	28	12.8
Total	219	100.0
ECP4	F	%
Strongly Disagree	9	4.1
Disagree	18	8.2
Neutral	84	38.4
Agree	65	29.7
Strongly Agree	43	19.6
Total	219	100.0
ECP5	F	%
Strongly Disagree	17	7.8
Disagree	33	15.1
Neutral	31	14.2
Agree	76	34.7

Strongly Agree	62	28.3
Total	219	100.0
ECP6	F	%
Strongly Disagree	22	10.0
Disagree	42	19.2
Neutral	54	24.7
Agree	62	28.3
Strongly Agree	39	17.8
Total	219	100.0

Note: f = frequency, %= percentage

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Impacts of Teacher Attitude during Error Correction on language Learner (N = 219)

TA7	F	%
Strongly Disagree	13	5.9
Disagree	27	12.3
Neutral	27	12.3
Agree	84	38.4
Strongly Agree	68	31.1
Total	219	100.0
TA8	F	%
Strongly Disagree	26	11.9
Disagree	22	10.0
Neutral	36	16.4
Agree	81	37.0
Strongly Agree	54	24.7
Total	219	100.0
TA9	F	%
Strongly Disagree	61	27.9
Disagree	36	16.4
Neutral	58	26.5
Agree	43	19.6
Strongly Agree	21	9.6
Total	219	100.0
TA10	F	%
Strongly Disagree	35	16.0
Disagree	13	5.9
Neutral	47	21.5
Agree	66	30.1
Strongly Agree	58	26.5
Total	219	100.0
TA11	F	%
Strongly Disagree	68	31.1
Disagree	38	17.4
Neutral	41	18.7
Agree	37	16.9
Strongly Agree	35	16.0
Total	219	100.0

Note: f = frequency, %= percentage

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics of Teacher Strategies during Error Correction on Learner Learning (N = 219)

LL12	*f*	%
Strongly Disagree	13	5.9
Disagree	31	14.2
Neutral	51	23.3
Agree	87	39.7
Strongly Agree	37	16.9
Total	219	100.0
LL13	*f*	%
Strongly Disagree	14	6.4
Disagree	34	15.5
Neutral	31	14.2
Agree	71	32.4
Strongly Agree	69	31.5
Total	219	100.0
LL14	*f*	%
Strongly Disagree	18	8.2
Disagree	23	10.5
Neutral	47	21.5
Agree	65	29.7
Strongly Agree	66	30.1
Total	219	100.0
LL15	*f*	%
Strongly Disagree	18	8.2
Disagree	31	14.2
Neutral	34	15.5
Agree	89	40.6
Strongly Agree	47	21.5
Total	219	100.0
LL16	*f*	%
Strongly Disagree	13	5.9
Disagree	19	8.7
Neutral	44	20.1
Agree	85	38.8
Strongly Agree	58	26.5
Total	219	100.0

Note: f = frequency, %= percentage

Table 4
Cronbach's Alpha and Descriptive Statistics of Error Correction in Learner Learning

Scales	K	M(SD)	Actual Range	"a"
Error Correction Perception	6	20.452(4.721)	1.058 – 1.688	0.724
Teacher Attitude During Error Correction	5	16.100(4.456)	1.411– 2.140	0.694

| Teacher Strategies During Error Correction on Learner Learning | 5 | 18.0183(4.777) | 1.232–1.552 | 0.863 |

Note: k = Number of Items, a = *Cronbach* Alpha Coefficient, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation

Regression Analysis

Regression analysis is a parametric approach used in the research. It makes assumptions about the available data used in the analysis. Regression analysis is used in the research to find out the possible impact of independent variables on dependent variable.

Similarly, simple linear regression analysis was administrated to evaluate the prediction of error correction and teacher attitude on the student's learner learning in BS English classrooms at university level. It was hypothesized that error correction of learners influences students' learning at the university level.

Table 4

Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting the impacts of Error Correction of Learner with Teacher Attitude on language learner (N=219)

Predictors		Teachers Attitude		
		B	$SE\ B$	β
Step 1				
Error Correction of Learner		.203	0.048	.209***
Total R^2	.503***			

Note:$p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001$

Table 5

Simple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting the impacts of Teacher Attitude Learner Learning

Predictors		Learner Learning		
		B	$SE\ B$	β
Step 1				
Teacher Attitude		.196	0.047	.198***
Total R^2	.409***			

Note:$p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001$

Table 7

Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Predicting Error Correction, Teacher Attitude and Learner Learning

Predictors		ΔR^2	B	$SE\ B$	β	ΔF
Step 1		.373				129.353
Teacher Attitude			.215	0.058	.216***	
Step 2		.503				33.989
Error Correction Perception			.187	0.052	.189***	
Teacher Attitude:	Total = R^2	.373***				
Error Correction Perception: Total = R^2		.319***				

Note: Adapted from "Error Correction," "Control variable included Teacher Attitude"
     *$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$

Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data was collected through interview and analyzed in the form of themes, categories and codes as suggested by Braun and Clark (2006).

Table 8
List of important Themes, Categories and Major Codes

Themes	Categories	Major codes
Teacher Errors Treatment Importance	• Teacher Approach • Teacher Techniques • Contexts	• Errors • Mistake • Nature of Errors
Teachers Errors Treatment Approach	• Oral feedback • Written correction • Correction in Grammar	• • Consideration of Activity • Consideration of Situations • Consideration of Appropriate timing
Learners Errors Treatment Perception	• Appropriate Strategies • Appropriate Attitude • Consideration of Context	• Formal English Language Discussion • Need of Error Correction • Beneficial for learner • Suitable Approach for ET
Teacher Attitude During Errors Treatment	• Good and Friendly • Conducive Environment • Harsh and criticizing attitude • Encouraging	• Positive Impacts • Positive Role of ET • Negative Role of ET • Creating Anxiety
Teacher Strategies and Techniques	• Explicit Vs Implicit • Direct Vs Indirect • Immediate Vs Delay	• Helpful in Learner Learning • Encourage learner • Discourage and dishearten the learner
Impact of Errors Treatment on Learners	• Positive Impacts • Negative Impacts • No Impacts	• Impact, • Learner, • Language Proficiency, • De-motivations, • Motivations

Findings

Quantitative data results received through research questionnaire shows that most of the students/ learners have clear and comprehensive knowledge and perceptions about errors treatment process and its various impacts on language learners. Learners also like to be corrected during language learning process in a polite and appropriate way so that they may learn without getting dishearten.

Qualitative data also indicates that both male and female gender has shown significance differences of attitudes towards the impact of teacher errors treatment on learner learning. This difference is much high in female as compare to male learners. It implies that female learner in language classroom can get easily de-motivated and dishearten, if teacher treat their errors improperly.

Along with achieving the research objectives, the study has also provided many other finding. In this study most of the learners were well satisfied with the attitude, strategies and approaches used by their teachers during errors treatment process in the language classrooms. Research study also depicted that male learners often like direct and explicit errors treatment in the class in appropriate way, while female learners want their errors to be treated indirectly or implicitly in the classrooms.

Research findings show that teacher attitude is playing a very crucial role in learners' errors treatment process in language classroom. If teacher is polite and provide comfortable environment to the students in the class, learner learning will be enhanced. On the contrary, if teacher attitude during learner errors correction is harsh, rude, strict or less cooperative then it will cast negative impacts on learner in language learning process.

Research study also found that majority of the learner considered errors correction or corrective feedback essential for language learning. Learners considered corrective feedback the integral part of language learning process.

Study also highlighted that learners believed on the philosophy of honour, self respect and cultural sensitivity; they like their errors to be treated with great care in language classroom so that they can get correction without getting discouraged or de-motivated.

Conclusion

Research study identify that most of the students/ learners have clear and comprehensive knowledge and perceptions about errors treatment process and its various impacts on language learners in language classroom in the second or foreign language context.

It can be concluded on the basis of finding and results that teacher errors correction has positive and negative impact on learners learning. If teacher pointed out the learners or corrects the students errors directly; number of the students often feel humiliated and ashamed, and in future students never gave positive response to the teacher in front of the class. On the contrary, if teacher treats their errors in a friendly environment through exercises and homework, it cast positive impacts on learners learning; as a result learners feel comfortable during language learning activities in the classrooms.

In this study majority of the learners considered errors correction or corrective feedback essential for language learning. Learners considered corrective feedback the integral part of language learning process. In the research, major portion of the students wanted to be corrected in language learning activities so that they can achieve language competence and proficiency in the second or target language learning.

Recommendations

On the basis of study results and findings, following recommendations are suggested to minimize the negative impacts of errors treatment on learners in the language classrooms.

(a) Language Teacher should fix or spare some time for the class to communicate with the learners and focus on specific items like pronunciation, structure and grammar in which learners are weak and committing errors. Doing so, learner errors can be minimized in the classrooms.

(b) In most of the cases, teacher should not directly point out the learner errors in language classroom. On the contrary, teacher should highlight it generally in the class.

(c) The best strategy for learners' errors correction as indicated by learners is, developing encouraging, conducive, indirect, polite, and frank environment in the language learning classrooms.

(d) Language Teacher should try to create conducive environment for English speaking/listening in the classroom. The environment where student can express their views and ideas freely without being suppressed or discouraged owing to the teacher attitudes or corrective feedback strategies in the classroom.

(e) Learners especially female students have recommended that teacher should not correct or treat the learner errors in front of the class in order to avoid de-motivation of a learner.

(f) It is also suggested that learner errors should be corrected by the teacher through exercises, home work assignment or in the form of debates where learners should be encouraged to learn language in a better way in the classrooms.

(g) Teacher should promote friendly environment in the classroom. Moreover, teacher should not discourage by scolding o taunting in front of the whole class.

(h) To maximize the fluency and proficiency of a language learner, it is also suggested that teacher should provide corrective feedback to the learner politely.

(i) There should be group activities in the classrooms, where students can participate and teacher can get the idea from these group activities about students' problems in the various areas and treat the learners' problems in language accordingly

(j) It is also proposed that, teacher should use well accepted strategies and approaches as recommended by the researcher and language experts as per situations and contexts in the language classrooms.

References

Abedi, D. (2015). Are Iranian EFL Learner Opinions about Oral Corrective Feedback Strategies in Line with their Teachers' Actual Classroom Practices? *International Researchers,* 4(2), 21–32.

Ali, A., Gul, N., & Sabih-Ul-Hassan, S. (2022). An Investigation into the Reading Comprehension Problems Faced by the Pakistani Students at University Level. *City University Research Journal Of Literature And Linguistics*, *5*(1), 134-148.

Ali, M., Ali, S. S., & Nasir, M. S. (2021). Focusing on English Learners' Concerns: Investigating De-Motivational Sources of ESL Learners in Classroom Setting of a Public-Sector University of Pakistan. *Psychology and Education Journal*, *58*(1), 5782-5794.

Alobo, J.O. (2015). Error Identification, Analysis and Correction in Second Language (L2) teaching and Learning. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 2(9), 632-636.

Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers think is right and why?. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *13*(2), 95-127.

Ananda, D. R., Febriyanti, E. R., Yamin, M., & Muin, F.(2017). Students preferences toward oral corrective feedback in speaking class at English department of Lambung Mangkurat university academic year 2015/2016. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 7(3), 176–186

Bell, J., & Waters, S. (2018). *E book: Doing Your Research Project: A Guide For First-Time Researchers*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Bitchener, J., &Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *19*(4), 207–217.

Brookhart, S. M. (2008). Feedback that fits. *Engaging the whole child: Reflections on best practices in learning, teaching, and leadership*, *65*(4), 54-59.

Chaudron, C. (1977). A Descriptive Model of Discourse in the Corrective Treatment of Learners' Errors. *Language Learning*, 27 (1), 29-46

Clariana, R. B. (1999). Differential Memory Effects for Immediate and Delayed Feedback: A Delta Rule Explanation of Feedback Timing Effects*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research Se Improvement (OEM) Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).*1-12

Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learner's Errors. *1RAL*, *5*(4), 161-170.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Mixed methods research. Thousand Oaks, CA*.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). Choosing a mixed methods design. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*, *2*, 53-106.

Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Gutmann, M. L., & Hanson, W. E. (2003). Advanced mixed methods research designs. *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*, 209-240.

Dorrnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational Strategies in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (2008). Learner beliefs & language learning. *Asian EFL Journal*, *10*(4), 7-25.

Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback & Teacher Development. *L2 Journal, 1*(1), 3-18.

Ellis, R. *(1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., 2017. Oral corrective feedback in L2 classrooms: what we know so far. In:Nassaji, H., Kartchava, E. (Eds.), *Corrective Feedback in Second Language Teachingand Learning*. Routledge, 3–18.

Ellis, R., Loewen, S. & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and Explicit Corrective Feedback and the Acquisition of L2 Grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 339–368.

Gul, N., Ali, M., & Sabih-Ul-Hassan, S. (2022). An Investigation Into The Challenges Faced By The Secondary Level Students In Speaking English In District Kohat KPK Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Research*, *4*(2), 1018-1027.

Gul, N., Khatoon, S., & Hassan, S. S. (2022). An Investigation into the Role of Language in Regional Connectivity in Afghanistan and Pakistan. *University of Chitral Journal of Linguistics & Literature*, *6*(I), 341-348.

Gul, N., Sabih-Ul-Hassan, S., & Imran, S. (2022). An Exploration of the Factors Responsible For English Language Oral Fluency Problems Faced By the Undergraduate Level Students in District Kohat. *Journal of Education and Social Studies*, *3*(2), 95-109.

Gumbaridze, J. (2013). Error correction in EFL speaking classrooms. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *70*, 1660-1663.

Ha, X.V., Murray, J.C., (2021). The impact of a professional development program on EFL teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback. System 96, 102405.

Ha, X.V., Nguyen, L.T., (2021). Targets and sources of oral corrective feedback in English as a foreign language classrooms: are students' and teachers' beliefs aligned? *Front. Psychol.* 12, 697160.

Ha,X.V., Murray, J.C.,& Riazi, A.M. (2021).High school EFL students' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: The role of gender, motivation and extraversion, *SSLLT* 11 (2). 2021. 235-264

Hamidun, N., Hashim, S., & Othman, N. F. (2012).Enhancing students' motivation by providing feedback on writing: The case of international students from Thailand. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 2(6), 591–594.

Izadpanah, J., Sadighi, F., &Akbarpour, L. (2022). Comparing Explicit Oral and Written Corrective Feedback to Boost Learners' Grammar. *Journal of Language and Translation*, *12*(1), 49-61.

James, F. (1998). *Minuit: Function minimization and error analysis reference manual* (No. CERNLIB-D506). CERN. 1-46

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of mixed methods research*, *1*(2), 112-133.

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2020). The Revision and transfer effects of direct and indirect comprehensive corrective feedback on ESL students' writing. *Language Teaching Research* , *24*(4), pp. 519–539.

Kencana, A.T.A (2020). Students' Preferences and Teachers' Beliefs toward written corrective feedback. *Journal of English Language Teaching,* 9(1). 85-95.

Li, S. (2014). Oral Corrective Feedback.*ELT Journal*, 68, 196-198.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of second language acquisition*.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 19*(1), 37-66.

Lyster, R., Saito, K., Sato, M., (2013). Oral corrective feedback in second language classrooms. *Lang. Teach. 46* (1), 1–40

Mackey, A., Gass, S., & McDonough, K. (2000). How do learners perceive interactional feedback? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*(4), 71-97.

Nassaji, H. (2015). The interactional feedback dimension in instructed second language learning: *Linking theory, research, and practice*. Bloomsbury.

Nemati, M., Alavi, S. M., & Mohebbi, H. (2019). Assessing the effect of focused direct and focused indirect written corrective feedback on explicit and implicit knowledge of language learners. *Language Testing in Asia*, *9*, 1-18.

Nusrat, A., Ashraf, F., & Narcy-Combes, M. F. (2019). Effect of Direct and Indirect Teacher Feedback on Accuracy of English Writing: A Quasi-Experimental Study among Pakistani Undergraduate Students. 3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature, 25(4), 84-98.

Papangkorn, P. (2015). SSRUIC Students' Attitude and Preference toward Error Corrections. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 197, 1841 – 1846.

Pawlak, M. (2014). Errors Correction in the Foreign Language Classroom, Reconsidering the Issue: Springer.

Rassaei, E., Moeinzadeh, A., &Youhannaee, M. (2012). Effects of recasts and metalinguistic corrective feedback on the acquisition of implicit and explicit L2 knowledge. *Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2*(1), 58-74.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. London: Longman.

Roothooft, H. (2014). The relationship between adult EFL teachers' oral feedback practices and their beliefs. *System, 46,* 65e79.

Roothooft, H., Breeze, R., (2016). A comparison of EFL teachers' and students' attitudes to oral corrective feedback. *Lang. Aware*. 25 (4), 318–335.

Rummel, S., &Bitchener, J. (2015). The effectiveness of written corrective feedback and the impact LAO learners' beliefs have on uptake. Australian Review of Applied Linguistics 38(1):64-82.

Saeli, H, & Cheng, A. (2019) Student writers' affective engagement with grammar centred written corrective feedback: The impact of (mis)aligned practices and perceptions. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* : 22, (2), 109-132.

Salajegheh, S., KhomeijaniFarahani, A. A., & Shahabi, H. (2022). The Role of Explicit Corrective Feedback Timing in Second Language Structure Accuracy. *Journal of Language, Culture, and Translation*, 4(2), 1-21.

Shamim,F.(2008).Trends, Issues and Challenges in English Language Education inPakistan'*AsiaPacificJournalofEducation*.28, 235-249.

Smith, H. (2010). *Correct me if I'm wrong: Investigating the preferences in error correction among adult English language learners* (Unpublished master's thesis). The University of Central Florida, Orlando.

Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *COLT--communicative orientation of language teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research.

Tesnum, O., (2019). Oral Corrective Feedback and Its Impact on Learners' Speaking Skills: Tunisian EFL Students as a Case Study. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*. 7, (3), 138-149.

Ustacı, H. Y., & Ok-.Selami, (2014). Preferences of ELT Learners in the Correction of Oral and Pronunciation Errors. *Higher Education Studies*, 4(2), 29-41.

Yoshida, R. (2008). Teachers' choice and learners' preference of corrective feedback types. Language Awareness, 17(1), 78–93.

Zarei, M., Ahour, T.,& Seifoori, Z. (2020). Impacts of Implicit, Explicit & Emergent Feedback Strategies on EFL Learners' Motivation, Attitude and Perception, *Cogent Education*, 7, 1, 1727130,