Eastern Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literatures (EJLLL)
https:// www.qabasjournals.com/ejlll

Correcting Students' Errors in EFL Speaking Classrooms

Saleh Jebrael Saleh[1] , Shahen Jamal Majeed [2]
[1]*Center of Scientific Research Development, Nawroz University, Kurdistan Region, Duhok, Iraq.*
[2]*College of Education and Languages/ English Department, Lebanese French University, Iraq*

Corresponding Author: Saleh Jebrael Saleh, E-mail: saleh_quchan@yahoo.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received: July 25, 2020
Accepted: August 25, 2020
Volume: 1
Issue: 1
DOI:

KEYWORDS

EFL students, Error correction in speech.

ABSTRACT

This study investigates Correcting Students' Errors in Speech in the Kurdistan region city of Duhok. Two questionnaires, one for the learners and the other for the teachers, were used to elicit the data. 210 EFL students and 30 EFL teachers from both genders (male and female) took part in this research and completed the questionnaires. The findings suggested that the majority of the students and teachers use different methods to correct students' errors. Both groups of the participants, teachers, and students think that clarification is the best corrective feedback method for the correction. The results also indicated that the majority of the teachers and students want students' serious and individual spoken errors to be corrected by the teachers.

1. Introduction

To correct Students' Errors in speech, we need to investigate researchers' and educators' opinions towards methods of error correction and corrective feedback. Shaffer (2008) claims that one of the most common questions that all EFL/ESL teachers have faced is which method teachers should use to correct students' oral correction and how much to correct. Researcher opinions vary widely on this: from no correction to extensive correction, from immediate to delayed correction, and from implicit to explicit correction. Language learners also have their own opinions on how and whether they wish to have their oral errors corrected by their teacher in the classroom setting. These opinions may be at odds with those of the experts, leaving the classroom instructor with more questions about error correction than answers. It is clear that learners have different preferences for particular types of error correction methods. Some learners like to focus on form, while others do not. Error correction methods differ as well. Some teachers like to correct learners' errors by different methods while others do not like them at all (Riazi and Riasti, 2007; Noora, 2006). According to previous research, it is evident that teachers and students share such common views as the importance of error correction and the types of errors that require correcting, there exist considerable differences as to the techniques of error correction (Lee, 2005; Wang, 2010). One of the studies conducted by Chaudron (1977), clarified the effect of corrective feedback on students' oral production. He observed that emphasis and repetition were more effective than other kinds of corrective feedback provided by teachers. Doughty (1998) as cited in Russell & Spada, observed that different kinds of oral corrective

feedback were used by different teachers and found that “clarification” “reacts” and “repetition” was used most (Russell & Spada, 2006). One of the most important studies in this field was conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997). In their study, they specified six different oral corrective feedback methods used by teachers which included; recast, explicit correction, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, repetition, and elicitation. They observed that react was the most extensively used kind of oral corrective feedback by the teachers.

Another study related to oral error correction was conducted by Hyang-Sook Park (2010) in which the results showed that both students and teachers wanted students' errors to be corrected, but students emphasized on correction more than teachers. The students and the teachers had totally different attitudes towards the method, type, and the person who should correct students’ errors, as well as the kind of errors that should be corrected. For this purpose, the following questions were posed:

1. What are the students’ and teachers’ preferences for particular types of error correction methods? Regarding:
    - Students' gender and proficiency level.
    - Teachers' academic degree and years of experience.
2. What types of error correction affect the students’ learning achievement?

    Regarding:

    - Students' gender and proficiency level.
    - Teachers' academic degree and years of experience.

2. Method

This chapter presents the methodology of the study. It clarifies how the process of data collection and analysis was done. This chapter is divided into four parts which included; participants, instrument (teachers’ and students’ questionnaire), procedure of data collection, and data analysis. After obtaining the raw data, the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software (version 16.0) is used to change the data into a numerical interpretable form.

2.1 Sample Size

The sample of the study included 210 secondary school students (105 males and 105 females) aged between 16 to 18years old and 30 EFL teachers (21males and 9 females) from 15 secondary schools selected randomly from five different districts in the Kurdistan region city of Duhok. Most of the teachers who participated in the survey have a bachelor's degree and some of them have master's degrees as shown in table 1.

Table 1: Teachers' highest academic degree.

	Degree	Frequency	Percent
Valid	Bachelor	19	63.3
	Master	11	36.7
	Total	30	100.0

Table 2 illustrates the teachers' years of experience in teaching oral skills.

	Experience	Frequency	Percent
Valid	1 year	3	10.0
	2-5 years	14	46.7
	6-9 years	5	16.7
	more than 10 years	8	26.7
	Total	30	100.0

The majority of the teachers have experience in teaching oral skills between 2-5 years. Some of the teachers have been teaching oral skill classes for more than 10 years as shown in table 2.

Table 3: Number of years students have been studying English.

	Scales	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1 year	1	.5	.5	.5
	2-5 years	6	2.9	2.9	3.3
	6-9 years	84	40.0	40.0	43.3
	more than 10 years	119	56.7	56.7	100.0
	Total	210	100.0	100.0	

All students who participated were adult EFL learners and varied in terms of age and all of them were Kurdish native speakers. The majority of students have been studying English for more than 10 years as shown in table3.

2.2 Data Collection Instruments

The researcher used two questionnaires, adapted from the researcher Fukuda (2004). One for teachers and the other for students in order to investigate Correcting Students' Errors in speech at Kurdistan region. Each questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first part consisted of twenty-two questions to identify Kurdish EFL learners' and teachers' opinions towards Correcting Students' Errors in speech. Response options were classified into three different types of scales, some questions coded to 5-point scales, with 1 representing *strongly agree* and 5 representing *strongly disagree*, some others questions rated each item on a 5-point scale, with 1 representing *always* and 5 representing *never*. The last types of scales were coded to 5-points with 1 representing *very effective* and 5 representing *very ineffective*. The second part of the questionnaire consisted of four demographic questions about students and teachers. This part is designed to collect participants' demographic information, including their genders, native languages, the length of English teaching/learning, and students' proficiency levels.

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

The study started by selecting six secondary coeducational schools from five different districts in Duhok City, Kurdistan region. The students were encouraged by their teachers to participate in the study. The students' questionnaire was translated into Kurdish by the researcher because they cannot read and understand English very well. The questionnaire was given to the students by the researcher during classroom time at six high schools located in Duhok city. The students were informed that they are free to participate or not and their participation would be voluntary and their survey results would be kept anonymous.

After all of this explanation, the researcher distributed the questionnaire. The students were allowed to read and ask questions about the survey. The students were given enough time to answer the questionnaire very carefully.

The questionnaires were collected by teachers after they have finished answering. The researcher gave the questionnaire to EFL teachers in their classrooms, the teacher's office, and by e-mail. After the questionnaire forms have been completed by the teachers, the researcher collected them.

2.4 Data Analysis

To answer the research questions regarding Correcting Students' Errors in speech among the secondary students at the Duhok city, the collected data were analyzed statistically using SPSS in order to answer two research questions: (1) What are the students' preferences for particular types of error correction methods? (2) What types of error correction affect students' learning achievement? For analyzing both teachers' and students' questionnaires the researcher used SPSS Cronbach's alpha, Independent Samples T-Test, and One-Way ANOVA analysis to get answers for thesis questions. the researcher used the Independent-Sample t-test to compare two variables. T-test illustrates whether the means of two groups are statistically significantly different from each other or not. Participants were 105 male students, 105 females EFL students, and 30 EFL teachers from both genders.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Results for the first research question

1. What are the students' and teachers' preferences for particular types of error correction methods?

For responding to the first research question students and teachers were asked to respond to the third section of questions in the questionnaire. The third section was about students' and teachers' preferences for particular types of error correction methods. It consisted of eight methods of error correction including clarification, repetition, implicit feedback, explicit feedback, elicitation, no corrective feedback, metalinguistic, and recast. The Ss and Ts were asked to rate each question into 5 scales "very effective," "effective," "Neutral," "ineffective," and "very ineffective".

Table 4: Students' and teachers' responses towards corrective feedback methods

Methods	Groups	Very effective/effective	Neutral	Ineffective/very ineffective
Clarification	Ss(210)	107	55	48
	Ts(30)	24	2	4
Repetition	Ss(210)	71	76	63
	Ts(30)	20	7	3
Implicit feedback	Ss(210)	91	56	63
	Ts(30)	15	8	7
Explicit feedback	Ss(210)	67	62	81
	Ts(30)	19	7	4
Elicitation	Ss(210)	63	60	87
	Ts(30)	20	7	3
No corrective feedback	Ss(210)	44	27	139
	Ts(30)	5	6	19
Metalinguistic	Ss(210)	107	43	60
	Ts(30)	14	12	4
Recast	Ss(210)	89	48	73
	Ts(30)	13	12	5

Table 10 illustrated students' and teachers' opinions towards their preferences of each of the eight types of corrective feedback methods. Clarification and metalinguistic methods had the highest score among students. Results indicated that teachers saw clarification as the most effective method of corrective feedback. According to both the students and teachers, no corrective feedback was the most ineffective method of corrective feedback and received the lowest score among students and teachers.

a. How do the students' opinions differ in regards to their gender and proficiency level?

Table 5: T-test sample, females and males students' mean and SD on the corrective feedback methods

Methods	Genders	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	T	P	$\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2$	Significance
Clarification	Males	105	3.48	1.186	1.230	0.220	0.210	p>.05
	Females	105	3.27	1.288				
	Males	105	3.05	1.243	0.110	0.910	-0.020	p>.05
Repetition	Females	105	3.07	1.368				
	Males	105	3.10	1.484	0.710	0.480	-0.140	p>.05
Implicit feedback	Females	105	3.24	1.376				
	Males	105	2.94	1.537	0.790	0.430	0.160	p>.05
Explicit feedback	Females	105	2.78	1.407				
	Males	105	2.87	1.448	0.860	0.390	0.170	p>.05
Elicitation	Females	105	2.70	1.415				
	Males	105	3.57	1.440	1.740	0.0840	-0.340	p>.05
No corrective feedback	Females	105	3.91	1.394				
	Males	105	3.16	1.435	2.220	0.0275	-0.430	p<.05
Metalinguistic	Females	105	3.59	1.371				
	Males	105	2.88	1.432	2.360	0.020	-0.460	p<.05
Recast	Females	105	3.34	1.392				

N: Number of participants, $\overline{X}$: Mean, SD: Standard deviation, t: t-test value, p: level of significance at p<0.05 $\overline{X}_2 - \overline{X}_1$ =the difference in mean values

T-test sample shows that female and male students' mean scores towards corrective feedback methods. No corrective feedback method received the highest mean among females (M=3.91) and males (M=3.57) students. The elicitation method scored the lowest mean among males and females students. The explicit feedback method scored the highest SD among female and male students. The results indicate that there are statistically significant differences (P=0.0275) and (P=0.020) between male and female students towards receiving metalinguistic and recast methods of corrective feedback. Female students prefer metalinguistic, recast, no corrective feedback, implicit and repetition methods, while male students are much open to clarification, explicit, and elicitation methods of corrective feedback methods.

Table 6: ANOVA test, Ss' means responses on the corrective feedback methods according to the Ss' level

Methods	Beginning		Intermediate low		Intermediate		Intermediate high		Advanced		P(sig.)
	N of Ss (9)		12		50		67		72		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Clarification	3.67	1.000	3.25	1.215	3.44	1.264	3.45	1.145	3.24	1.348	0.759
Repetition	3.22	1.202	2.67	1.557	3.18	1.320	3.10	1.293	2.97	1.289	0.729
Implicit feedback	3.22	1.394	3.17	1.642	3.24	1.572	3.25	1.396	3.03	1.353	0.900
Explicit feedback	3.00	1.803	2.58	1.443	3.08	1.445	2.78	1.575	2.82	1.367	0.759
Elicitation	3.56	1.590	3.58	1.379	3.00	1.539	2.63	1.335	2.71	1.418	0.288
No corrective feedback	3.67	0.707	4.42	1.165	3.48	1.555	3.79	1.503	3.78	1.345	0.341
Metalinguistic	2.89	1.691	3.50	1.446	3.34	1.319	3.15	1.520	3.65	1.323	0.227
Recast	3.44	1.667	3.00	1.651	2.98	1.363	3.18	1.435	3.11	1.430	0.891

Table 5.1 ANOVA test illustrates the students' level mean and SD towards corrective feedback methods. Low intermediate students received the highest mean (4.42) among students in no corrective feedback method and they prefer no corrective feedback and elicitation methods. The results indicate that there are no statistically significant differences between students' level toward receiving corrective feedback methods. Beginner students are much open to clarification, repetition, and recast while intermediate students prefer explicit feedback. According to high intermediate students implicit is the best method of corrective feedback whereas according to advanced metalinguistic is the best one.

b. How do the teachers' opinions differ in regards to their academic degree and years of experience?

Table 7: T-test sample, teachers' mean and SD towards corrective feedback methods

Method	What is your highest academic degree?	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	T	P	$\overline{X}_1$- $\overline{X}_2$	Significance
Clarification	Bachelor	19	2.11	0.875	0.056	0.955	0.200	p>.05
	Master	11	2.09	1.044				
Repetition	Bachelor	19	2.11	1.100	1.344	0.190	-0.53	p>.05
	Master	11	2.64	0.924				
Implicit feedback	Bachelor	19	3.00	1.000	3.341	0.002	0.270	p<.05
	Master	11	1.73	1.009				
Explicit feedback	Bachelor	19	2.00	0.816	2.290	0.030	-0.91	p<.05
	Master	11	2.91	1.375				
Elicitation	Bachelor	19	2.16	0.834	0.420	0.678	0.160	p>.05
	Master	11	2.00	1.265				
No corrective feedback	Bachelor	19	3.58	1.170	0.773	0.445	-0.330	p>.05
	Master	11	3.91	1.044				
Metalinguistic	Bachelor	19	2.74	0.933	1.47	0.150	0.470	p>.05
	Master	11	2.27	0.647				
Recast	Bachelor	19	2.84	0.958	1.73	0.093	0.660	p>.05
	Master	11	2.18	1.079				

N: Number of participants, $\overline{X}$: Mean, SD: Standard deviation, t: t-test value, p: level of significance at p<0.05 $\overline{X}_2$- $\overline{X}_1$ =the difference in mean values

Table 6.0 T-test sample illustrates teachers' opinions towards corrective feedback methods according to teachers' academic degree. Bachelor and master holders scored the highest mean in no corrective feedback method among all methods. Master teachers received a higher SD than bachelor in explicit feedback. The results indicate that there are statistically significant differences (P=0.002) and (P=0.030) between teachers with BA and MA degrees. Teachers with BA degrees are willing to use clarification, implicit, elicitation, metalinguistic, and recast corrective feedback methods whereas MA teachers prefer repetition, explicit, and no corrective feedback methods for error correction.

Table 8: ANOVA test, Ts with experiences responses to corrective feedback methods

Methods	1 year		2-5 years		6-9 years		More than 10 years		P (sig.)
	N of Ts (3)		14		5		9		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Clarification	2.00	0.000	2.14	1.099	1.80	0.447	2.25	1.035	0.862
Repetition	2.67	0.577	2.14	1.099	1.80	1.447	2.75	1.282	0.369
Implicit feedback	2.33	2.309	2.50	1.092	2.80	1.095	2.50	1.069	0.953
Explicit feedback	2.00	1.000	2.21	1.251	2.20	1.095	2.75	1.035	0.684
Elicitation	1.67	1.155	1.71	0.611	2.60	1.517	2.62	0.916	0.097
No corrective feedback	4.33	0.577	4.00	1.038	2.60	1.140	3.62	1.061	0.068
Metalinguistic	2.33	0.577	2.57	0.938	2.20	0.837	2.88	0.835	0.561
Recast	1.33	0.577	2.86	1.027	3.20	0.837	2.25	0.886	0.038

Table 6.1 shows teachers' opinions that have experience towards corrective feedback methods. Teachers who have more than 10 years of experience scored higher mean than others in all methods except no corrective feedback and recast methods. They want to use all methods except no corrective feedback and recast methods. no corrective feedback method was preferred by those teachers who have one year of experience and the recast method was preferred by those who have experience of between 6-9 years.

The results indicate that students preferred clarification and metalinguistic methods to other methods and according to students those two methods were the most effective methods in the oral error correction process. Most of the teachers thought that clarification is the best method to correct students' errors and it is a very effective one. Most teachers and students thought no corrective feedback was a very ineffective method and they strongly disagree with that method. The finding indicates that it greatly differs from Yoshida (2008) results in which he claimed that teachers prefer the recast method over other types of methods. Also, the results differ from Mackey and Philp (1988) results which indicated that learners prefer the recast method to other types of corrective feedback.

3.2 Results for the second research question

2-What types of error correction affect the students' learning achievement?

For responding to the second research question students and teachers were asked to respond to the second section of questions in the questionnaire. The second section is about students' and teachers' attitudes towards error correction types which affect the students' learning achievement. It consisted of five error types including; serious spoken errors, less serious spoken errors,

frequent spoken errors, infrequent spoken errors, and individual errors. The Ss and Ts were asked to rate each question into 5 scales “always,” “usually,” “sometimes,” “occasionally,” and “never”.

Table 9: Ss’ and Ts’ responses on the error correction types that should be corrected

Table 7: illustrates students’ and teachers’ attitudes towards types of error correction. Serious spoken errors and individual error types have the highest scores among students. Most of the students want their serious and individual spoken errors to be corrected by their teachers more than other types always or usually. The majority of the teachers want students’ serious and frequent spoken errors should be corrected always or usually. Minority of the
students and teachers want students’ infrequent spoken errors should be treated by the teachers always or usually.

Types of errors	Groups	Always	Usually	Sometimes	Occasionally	Never
Serious errors	Ss(210)	124	39	21	11	15
	Ts(30)	11	12	5	1	1
Less serious errors	Ss(210)	39	47	68	36	20
	Ts(30)	2	8	11	8	1
Frequent errors	Ss(210)	65	42	53	32	18
	Ts(30)	7	12	4	5	2
Infrequent errors	Ss(210)	21	51	67	51	20
	Ts(30)	1	7	11	10	1
Individual errors	Ss(210)	96	28	29	30	27
	Ts(30)	3	10	11	6	0

a. **How do the students' opinions differ in regards to their gender and proficiency level?**

Table 10: T-test sample, students' mean and SD on the error correction types according to students' gender

Types of errors	Genders	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	T	P	$\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2$	Significance
Serious errors	males	105	1.74	1.074	1.000	0.320	-0.170	p>.05
	females	105	1.91	1.374				
Less serious errors	males	105	2.94	1.277	2.10	0.036	0.350	p<.05
	females	105	2.59	1.124				
Frequent errors	males	105	2.62	1.274	1.28	0.200	0.230	p>.05
	females	105	2.39	1.326				
Infrequent errors	males	105	3.16	1.153	2.20	0.029	0.340	p<.05
	females	105	2.82	1.081				
Individual errors	males	105	2.38	1.490	2.290	0.720	0.060	p>.05
	females	105	2.32	1.490				

N: Number of participants, $\overline{X}$: Mean, SD: Standard deviation, t: t-test value, p: level of significance at p<0.05 $\overline{X}_2 - \overline{X}_1$ =the difference in mean values

Table 8.0 explains the mean scores and SD of female and male students on the error correction types. The results indicate that there are statistically significant differences (P=0.036) and (P0.029) between female and male students. Male students want to correct their less serious and infrequent spoken errors more than female students. Infrequent spoken errors type received the highest mean among males (M=3.16) and females (M2.82) students. Serious spoken errors scored the lowest mean among students. Individual spoken errors scored the highest SD among females and males students. Female students are much open to all types of errors except to serious spoken errors. However male students emphasized on a serious spoken error to be corrected.

Table 11: ANOVA test, the mean and SD on the types of errors according to students' level

Types of errors	Beginning		Intermediate low		Intermediate		Intermediate high		Advanced		P(sig.)
	N of Ss (9)		12		50		67		72		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Serious	2.87	1.563	3.44	1.667	2.78	1.202	3.33	1.118	2.56	1.509	0.17

Less serious	2.50	1.567	3.08	1.311	3.08	1.240	2.75	1.485	2.17	1.030	0.20
Frequent	1.92	1.226	3.10	1.093	2.40	1.262	3.30	0.953	2.42	1.553	0.382
Infrequent	1.60	1.060	2.49	1.173	2.36	1.276	2.87	1.217	2.22	1.380	0.161
Individual	1.75	1.219	2.65	1.189	2.58	1.371	2.89	1.069	2.43	1.617	0.887

Table 8.1 ANOVA test shows students' mean and SD on the types of errors according to students' level. Low intermediate students scored the highest mean (3.44) among students in serious spoken errors type. Beginner students received the lowest mean (1.60) among students in infrequent spoken errors type. Low intermediate students scored the highest SD (1.667) among students in serious spoken errors type. The results indicate that low intermediate students want their teachers to correct their serious and less serious spoken errors whereas high intermediate students are willing the teachers to correct their frequent, infrequent, and individual errors.

b. **How do the teachers' opinions differ in regards to their academic degree and years of experience?**

Table 12: T-test teachers' mean and SD towards types of errors according to teachers' academic degree

Types of errors	Academic degree	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	T	P	$\overline{X}_{1}-\overline{X}_{2}$	Significance
Serious errors	Bachelor	19	1.95	.911	0.190	0.90	-0.050	p>.05
	Master	11	2.00	1.183				
Less serious errors	Bachelor	19	2.84	.958	0.670	0.51	-0.250	p>.05
	Master	11	3.09	1.044				
Frequent errors	Bachelor	19	2.53	1.219	0.554	0.583	0.260	p>.05
	Master	11	2.27	1.272				
Infrequent errors	Bachelor	19	3.05	.911	0.366	0.720	-0.130	p>.05
	Master	11	3.18	.982				
Individual errors	Bachelor	19	2.74	.933	0.540	0.595	0.190	p>.05
	Master	11	2.55	.934				

N: Number of participants, $\overline{X}$: Mean, SD: Standard deviation, t: t-test value, p: level of significance at p<0.05 $\overline{X}_{2}-\overline{X}_{1}$ =the difference in mean values

Table 9.0 T-test sample illustrates teachers' opinions towards error correction types in regard to teachers' academic degrees. Bachelor and master teachers received the highest means in infrequent spoken errors among all types of errors. The results indicate that teachers with BA degrees want to correct frequent and individual spoken errors more than with MA degrees. However, teachers with MA degrees want to correct serious, less serious, and infrequent students spoken errors.

Table 13: ANOVA test, teachers' mean and SD towards the types of errors according to teachers' experience

Types of errors	1 year		2-5 years		6-9 years		More than 10 years		P(sig.)
	N of Ts (3)		14		5		8		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Serious	2.00	1.000	2.07	0.829	1.40	0.548	2.12	1.458	0.602
Less serious	3.00	1.000	3.14	1.099	2.60	1.140	2.75	0.707	0.701
Frequent	2.67	1.155	2.14	0.864	2.00	1.225	3.12	1.642	0.259
Infrequent	3.00	0.000	3.29	1.069	3.00	1.000	2.88	0.835	0.787
Individual	3.00	1.000	2.64	0.894	2.40	1.035	2.75	1.035	0.845

Table 9.1 shows teachers with experience opinions towards types of errors. Teachers who have experience 2-5 years scored the highest mean (3.29) in infrequent spoken errors among all types. It refers that those teachers who have 2-5 years of experience want to correct infrequent and less serious spoken errors more than other teachers while teachers who have more than 10 years of experience want to correct serious and frequent spoken errors.

The results indicate that students prefer serious and individual spoken error types to be corrected by their teachers more than other types. The teachers want to correct their students' serious and frequent spoken error types more than other types. Most teachers and students thought that infrequent spoken errors should not be corrected at all times only occasionally.

4. Conclusion

The main aim of this thesis is to investigate Kurdish EFL Learners' and teachers' opinions towards Correcting Students' Errors in Speech in the Kurdistan region. In order to collect most of the significant information on Correcting Students' Errors in Speech, two questionnaires are distributed one for students and the other for teachers. The students who participated in the survey were from both genders (females and males) and they have a different level of speaking and listening but most of them are from advanced levels. The teachers who participated in the survey also were from both genders and their academics degrees were bachelor and master but bachelors are the majority. Most of them have been teaching English for 2-5 years. The findings show that students prefer clarification and metalinguistic methods to the other types of correction methods. Also, teachers agreed on the clarification method and they thought that this method is the best type of corrective feedback. The finding is different from

Azara and Molavib (2012) study, in which students and teachers prefer the explanation of errors and, repetition methods to correct students' oral errors than other methods. Second, the majority of the students want their serious and individual spoken errors to be treated by their teachers. According to the majority of the teachers, serious and frequent spoken error types that affect students' learning achievements process should be always treated or usually by them to overcome it. The finding is partially similar to Hyang-Sook Parks (2010) study, in which she indicated that students and teachers focused on serious and frequent spoken error types more than other types, especially on individual spoken errors.

References

Chaudron, C. (1977). A descriptive model of discourse in the correctional treatment of learners‟ errors. *Language Learning*, 27, 29-46.

Doughty, C., & Varela, E. (1998). Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 114-138). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fukuda, Y. (2004). *Treatment of spoken errors in Japanese high school oral communication classes.* Master's thesis, California State University, San Francisco.

Hyang-Sook Park (2010). *Teachers' and learners' preferences for error correction* master thesis California state university, Sacramento.

Lee, I. (2005). *Error correction in the L2 writing classroom*: What do students think? TESL Canada Journal, 22 (2).

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

Mackey, A., & Philp, J. (1998). Conversational interaction and second language development: Recasts, responses, and red herrings? *The Modern Language Journal, 82*, 338-356.

Noora, A. Iranian Non-English Majors' Language Learning preferences: The Role of Language Institutes. 2006.Developing Teachers.com.http://www.asian-efljournal.com/site_map. Php

Riazi, A. & Riasati, M. (2007). "*Language Learning Style Preferences: A Students Case Study of Shiraz EFL Institutes*." Asian EFJ Journal. 2007.linkinghub. elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1877042810020355

Russel, J., Spada, N. (2006). *The effectiveness of corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar.* In Norris & Ortega (2006) (Ed.) Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching. Hawai: John Benjamins.

Shaffer. D. (2008). *Error Correction: Student Preferences and Research Findings*. Retrieved May 18, 2009. From http:// www.linfref.com/cpp/casp/7/paper 1285. pdf.

Wang, P. (2010). Dealing with English Majors' Written Errors in Chinese Universities. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 1*, No. 3, pp. 194-210

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