



Feedback and Learner Motivation: Analysing Error Correction Techniques in Language Classroom

1. Jinal Purohit, Research Scholar, Indian Institute of Information Technology Vadodara
 2. Dr. Barnali Chetia, Assistant Professor, Indian Institute of Information Technology Vadodara
- Page No. 39-55

Abstract: The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) within the educational arena has transformed the aspect of learning a language and offered innovative ways for interactive, personalized learning. AI-powered chatbots, with their ability to carry out human-like conversations, have emerged as favoured choices to hone communication skills for the learners of the second language. Chatbots enabled with NLP and speech recognition capabilities provide feedback to learners the moment they enter their responses and enable them to practice pronunciation, enhance fluency, and master conversational proficiency. Although the first generations of chatbots were predominantly text-based, developments in voice recognition and text to speech synthesis have enabled more interactive learning with learners being exposed to salient features of language such as stress, intonation, and other suprasegmental aspects. The present study examines the efficacy of AI chatbots in language learning, especially speaking proficiency. It provides a comparative analysis of some of the AI-powered tools like Gemini, Sivi, and ChatGPT with respect to their approaches, methods, and techniques in facilitating spoken language learning and providing feedback. Of particular interest is the way the chatbots conduct conversations in English for General Purposes (EGP) and English for Specific Purposes (ESP). In addition, the research addresses user experience, adaptability, and interaction, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of AI-based language learning such as accuracy, cultural awareness, and ethics. By evaluating the benefits and drawbacks of such AI tools, this study aims to offer pedagogical recommendations to users on how to effectively utilize AI chatbots in language learning.

Keywords: Error correction, Language teaching and learning, Techniques, Second language, Corrective feedback

Introduction

While error correction is an essential component of foreign language education, there are also a lot of questions it brings up. Concerns of error correction include knowing when to correct students and when to avoid it, selecting the most effective kind of corrective feedback, and determining how much error correction is appropriate in a given circumstance. Concerns around timeliness, types of feedback, and the extent of correction required in a specific situation are commonly brought up by error correction in foreign language classrooms. In order to enhance learning, foreign language instruction now incorporates both form-focused and communicative-based methods, placing more emphasis on meaning and expression than just linguistic structure. In order to increase efficiency, teachers use a variety of corrective feedback



strategies, such as explicit correction and recasts, that are customized to the unique needs of each student. Understanding the value of error correction for aspiring teachers is largely influenced by teacher training experiences.

Before discussing error correction in English language teaching, it is important to discuss errors. According to Corder's (1967) theory, errors show how a learner is using their language acquisition strategies rather than being inhibited or interfering with ingrained habits. Trial and error are inevitable since learning occurs in the learner's mind as a result of the cognitive process. Since learning a foreign language is a progressive process that takes time, errors will inevitably arise at every stage of the process. According to interlanguage theory, a learner's mistakes are a common occurrence during the linguistic acquisition process. As a result, making errors when learning a language should be accepted as a normal part of the process. According to Khansir (2010), it's critical that educators understand that mistakes are a normal and necessary component of learning and shouldn't be overly rectified or tolerated. An instructor can choose to correct a language learner's spoken error in the target language (TL) or to overlook it and move on. Students who get their mistakes corrected immediately recognize that they have made a mistake and may even want to have it fixed (Cathcart & Olsen, 1976; Chenoweth, Day, Chun, & Lupescu, 1983). There is, however, no assurance that the students have absorbed the significance of the mistake or its meaning. Additionally, language learners may experience discouragement, frustration, and even a loss of passion for speaking the target language if they are continuously provided with corrective feedback (Chastain, 1975; Vigil & Oller, 1976).

Errors give teachers feedback. They reveal to them what areas of the curriculum they have been following are not well acquired or taught and require additional attention. They also inform them how effective their teaching methods and materials are. In other words, teachers can use the mistakes made by their students to create a plan of action that will help them avoid repeating the same mistakes in the future. While some argue that error correction is counterproductive and even harmful to language learners, there is compelling evidence to support the notion that error correction plays a critical role in enhancing students' language ability. Teachers can use explicit correction, recasts, clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, and repetition as corrective feedback strategies in the classroom (Lyster and Ranta, 1997). However, the instructor must bear in mind that these strategies should be selected not only based on the specific learning environment, but also on the individual variations among the students with respect to intelligence, aptitude, learning style, personality, motivation, attitudes, etc. (Lightbown and Spada, 2001). This is because students will respond differently to various forms of error correction based on these individual differences. Corrective feedback techniques appear to be made even more difficult by this, since the instructor typically has to deal with a large number of students in a class, each of whom has a unique learning style, set of skills, motivation, personality, etc.

This paper aims to explore the reasons for common errors, investigate different error correction techniques, and offer practical insights for educators, helping them create a positive and supportive learning environment.

Origins and Types of Learner Errors:

The origin and types of errors in SLA are crucial as they provide insights into the cognitive processes the learners employ while acquiring a new language. Errors may seem random, but this is far from true - they reflect systematic patterns that indicate how learners construct and



internalize rules of the target language. As emphasized by Corder (1974), the study of errors is part of investigating the process of language learning, that gives a glimpse of a learner's linguistic development and strategies. The analysis of errors benefits language teachers, curriculum designers, and researchers. Teachers can use the results of the error analysis to plan remedial action on problem areas of learners, as Sharma (1980) suggested. Curriculum designers can apply research done through error studies into the preparation of learning materials so that complex structures are gradually introduced after simpler ones to reduce the learners' cognitive load. By contrast, researchers may exploit error analysis to open up the broader contexts of second language acquisition and throw some light upon the development of theories and models of SLA. Understanding errors is useful for the learners themselves. It provides them with an opportunity to look at errors from a neutral perspective, considering them to be a normal part of language learning processes that yields productive fruit. Only through this approach can they be aware of their mistakes and self-refine in their approach to learn the target language.

Factors Contributing to Learner Errors:

There are different types of language errors which can be attributed to different causes. These errors are important for an effective language education, particularly in multilingual situations. There are two major sources of errors in second language learning. The first source is interference from the native language while the second source can be attributed to intralingual and developmental factors. Intralingual and developmental factors include the following:

1. Overgeneralization (Richards, 1971): Learners apply a learned rule too broadly, even to cases where it doesn't apply. Example: Forming the past tense of go as goed instead of went.
2. False concepts hypothesized (Richards, 1971): Learners form incorrect assumptions about language rules due to ambiguity or misleading instruction. Example: Assuming that "-ing" always signifies a present action, leading to "I am knowing him" instead of "I know him."
3. Fossilization (Selinker, 1972): Errors become ingrained and resistant to correction over time, often because they are repeated without feedback or due to lack of motivation to change. Example: A long-term learner consistently says, "He go to school every day" instead of "He goes to school every day," despite corrections.
4. Avoidance (Selinker, 1972): Learners deliberately avoid using structures or words they find difficult or unfamiliar, which may lead to errors in expressing ideas. Example: A learner avoids using passive voice and instead rephrases incorrectly: "Somebody stole my wallet" instead of "My wallet was stolen."
5. Faulty teaching (Corder, 1973): Errors result from incorrect or incomplete explanations by teachers or teaching materials. Example: A teacher inaccurately teaches that all plural nouns in English end in "-s," leading a student to say, "Childs" instead of "Children."
6. Simplification (Richards, 1974): Learners simplify language by omitting complex or unnecessary elements to reduce cognitive load. Example: Saying, "He good man" instead of "He is a good man" by omitting the verb "is."

Errors can be classified on the basis of:

- Linguistic Categories: Morphological Errors, Phonological Errors, Lexical Errors, Spelling and Punctuation Errors



- Surface Structure Taxonomy: Errors can be categorized as omission, addition, misformation, or misordering. (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982)
- Communicative Effect: Global errors affect the overall meaning and communication, while local errors affect only parts of the sentence. (Burt and Kiparsky, 1974)

The Role of Corrective Feedback in Language Learning:

The discussion on Corrective Feedback touches upon a number of issues that involve: whether CF aids L2 acquisition; when CF should be offered, immediate vs. delayed; which errors have to be corrected; who should do the correcting, the instructor or the student; and what type of CF yields the best results.

As a general approach, research stresses the value of feedback, as it repairs inaccuracies, clarifies confusions, and enhances acquisition. That is to say, that it might sometimes vary between types and frequencies based on different learner stages, activity type, or context. Feedback has been seen as a barrier by some, while others see it as a way to improve the learning process. The diverse nature of corrective feedback has been recognized by Chaudron (1977). Feedback, according to Chaudron, is "any reaction of the teacher which clearly transforms, disapprovingly refers to, or demands improvement of the learner's utterance". Both behaviorist and cognitive theories on second language acquisition consider feedback as part of the process in language learning. Feedback is known within both communicative approaches and structural methodologies in the teaching of languages to ensure linguistic accuracy and to encourage student motivation. As Ellis (2013) points out, while remedial criticism is essential, it can hinder the learning ability of students. Hammer (2007) also argues that inappropriate correction—both in terms of the methods used and the focus placed—increases the stress levels of students and derails their learning process. Similarly, Krashen described error correction as a serious error as it leads to the learner trying to avoid using complicated structures in order to reduce mistakes. A view similar to Krashen's was represented by VanPatten (1992), who maintained that "correcting errors in learner output has little to no impact on the developing cognitive structure of most language learners." According to Brown (2007), students who receive negative cognitive feedback are less likely to make verbal responses; conversely, students who receive overly positive feedback are unable to comprehend their mistakes. To reduce the negative impacts associated with correction, teachers should carefully select the best practices, although previous studies have indicated this requirement. In addition, teachers should not overcorrect children because it impacts their psychological problems, such as inferiority, humiliation, inhibition, and anger (Truscott, 1996).

According to behaviorist theories, feedback needs to be reinforced immediately (Skinner, 1954). It is widely accepted that corrections should be made right away in activities that are focused on accuracy. Teachers should not interrupt during communicative activities to correct students' grammar, vocabulary, or pronunciation (Harmer, 2007). Delayed feedback is preferred for more creative and complicated assignments, as it fosters independence and students can reflect on their learning. Delayed feedback is less disruptive when it comes to communication. The nature of feedback—whether direct or indirect—plays a very significant role in determining its effectiveness. Direct feedback gives explicit corrections or the proper wording of an error, which is very helpful to a novice learner or even when learners are not cognizant of the right usage. Indirect feedback challenges learners to identify and correct their



errors independently, and hence it encourages a much deeper engagement with the learning process. Direct feedback provides a clear understanding and minimizes uncertainty, whereas indirect feedback encourages analytical thinking and enhances the long-term memorization of language principles.

Equally important is the source of feedback, which can come from teachers, peers, or the learners themselves. Teacher feedback is often considered the most valid and reliable source, providing structured guidance based on their experience. However, overreliance on teacher feedback might limit channels for developing learner autonomy. Peer feedback promotes the culture of learning through collaboration with different perspectives and helps students achieve that; however, the credibility of the peer review is undermined when the peers are ignorant. Self-review, when augmented by the use of instruments such as rubrics or reflective guidance, enables learners to reflect on their own performances thoughtfully and promotes independence and self-control.

Research tends to generally support the significance of feedback in language learning as it corrects errors, clears up misunderstandings, and reinforces learning. The amount and type of feedback required, however, are different for different levels of learners, types of tasks, and classroom contexts. The timing, type, and source should be very carefully balanced to meet the specific needs and goals of the learners.

Error Correction Techniques and Uptake:

Error correction is one of the most important components of language teaching since different techniques could be used to effectively address learners' mistakes. Upon understanding these techniques and their impact on learner involvement, instructors can strengthen their teaching practices, appropriately tailor their feedback to particular students' needs, and ensure the production of accurate language use.

1. Explicit Correction

Explicit correction involves the teacher directly pointing out the error and providing the correct form. This approach is very direct and may be used quite successfully in drawing attention to specific errors.

For example:

Student: "I goed to the store yesterday."

Teacher: "No, you said 'goed.' We say 'went.'"

2. Recast

Recasting involves the teacher reformulating the student's utterance, implicitly correcting the error. This technique is less direct than explicit correction but can be less disruptive to the flow of conversation.

For instance:

Student: "I like eat pizza."

Teacher: "Oh, you like to eat pizza. That's good."



3. Clarification Request

A clarification request tells the student that his statement was unclear or inaccurate. Such may prompt the student to self-correct or provide more information.

For example:

Student: "I no understand."

Teacher: "I'm sorry, I don't understand. Can you say that again?"

4. Metalinguistic Feedback

Metalinguistic feedback involves providing information about the language, such as grammar rules or vocabulary definitions, to help the students understand and correct their errors. For example:

Student: "I have many homeworks."

Teacher: "Remember, 'homework' is an uncountable noun. We don't say 'many homeworks.'"

5. Elicitation

Elicitation encompasses the teacher posing questions to direct the student toward the accurate form. This method has the potential to foster active engagement and analytical thinking.

For example:

Student: "I go to school yesterday."

Teacher: "Did you go to school yesterday? What's the past tense of 'go'?"

6. Repetition

The process of repetition entails the instructor articulating the student's mistake, frequently employing heightened intonation to emphasize the error. This strategy can prove beneficial in accentuating particular phonetic elements or lexical structures

For example:

Student: "I goed to the store."

Teacher: "Goed? Goed?"

(Lyster & Ranta, 1997) referred to the correction as "repair," but the students' change was referred to as "uptake." Uptake is the learner's response to feedback given by the teacher. It forms a vital aspect of the outcome measure used in determining the effectiveness of error correction. When learners successfully uptake the feedback, they begin to display that they understand corrections and can enact them in their own use of language.



To maximize uptake, educators can employ the following strategies:

- Timing: Provide feedback as soon as possible, when the mistake is fresh in a learner's mind.
- Clarity: Clearly and concisely elucidate the mistake as well as the correct form.
- Positive Reinforcement: Positive reinforcement is a technique that will elicit greater learner involvement and motivation.
- Learner-Centered Approach: Encourage students to participate in correcting errors, to engage them in discussions and decision-making.
- Variety of Techniques: Use a range of error correction methodologies that would cater to different learner needs and preferences.

By understanding the intricacies involved with error correction strategies and uptake, teachers can create learning environments that support language learning and development.

Case studies:

- I. Lyster & Ranta, 1997: The research study by Roy Lyster and Leila Ranta focuses on the use of corrective feedback in learning language. It relies on the context of French immersion classrooms and investigates various types and patterns of corrective feedback in the initiations of teachers, along with the responses, or uptakes, by students, in relation to how those interactions facilitate the learning of the language.

Research Methodology

Participants: Six French immersion classrooms from the Montreal area, four of them at the Grade 4 level and two French immersion Grade 6 classrooms.

Data Collection: From many lessons, 14 subject-matter lessons and 13 French language arts lessons, 18.3 hours of classroom interaction occur in a total of 100 hours of audio recordings.

Analysis Framework: The same analysis framework was applied by the researchers to identify target-like and error correction techniques of the teachers in classroom interaction.

Corrective Feedback Types

The corrective feedback made by the teacher is of the following six types along with the frequency.

Recasts	55%
Elicitation	14%
Clarification Requests	11%



Metalinguistic Feedback	8%
Explicit Correction	7%
Repetition of Error	5%,

Learner Uptake

The effectiveness of different types of feedback in eliciting learner uptake, or the students' responses to the feedback:

Recasts	31% uptake
Elicitation	100% uptake
Clarification Requests	88% uptake
Metalinguistic Feedback	86% uptake
Explicit Correction	50% uptake
Repetition of Error	78% uptake

Student-Generated Repairs

The study looked at the nature of repairs following the feedback:

Elicitations: 43% of the repairs were student-generated.

Overall, repairs were mostly done through recasts, which were 36%, and then the elicitation method was at 23%.

Analysis of Data

Elicitation and metalinguistic feedback were particularly effective in promoting student-generated repairs, suggesting that these methods encourage deeper cognitive engagement with the language. In contrast, recasts and explicit corrections, though frequently used, did not foster the same level of learner engagement. The results show that the type of corrective feedback significantly influences learner uptake and the nature of repairs.

Pedagogical Implications

This brings to the surface the role of the types of feedback that lead to the negotiation of form in language acquisition within meaningful learning experiences. Teachers are urged to undertake feedback practices that elicit self-correction and participation on the



part of the students, in addition to prompting the communicative functions of language that aid in language acquisition.

Conclusion

Indeed, research shows that teachers, time and time again, take into account the process of corrective feedback, which identifies techniques that go beyond the identification of errors, being able to interact with students who eventually become fluent in the language.

- II. Ahlem Ammar, 2008: Ahlem Ammar's research focuses on the process of corrective feedback through prompts and recasts to examine its effects in acquiring English possessive determiners among francophone learners. Three primary schools from the Montreal area participated in a quasi-experimental design, with 64 students divided into three groups: one receiving recasts, the other receiving prompts, and the last with no feedback.

Summary of Research and Results:

1. Participants and Methodology: The sample consisted of 64 ESL students instructed by three different teachers. Several tasks were used to test the effects of feedback, including a computer-based fill-in-the-blank test, an oral picture-description task, and a passage correction task.

2. Types of Feedback:

Recasts: Implicit feedback where the teacher reformulates a student's incorrect utterance.

Prompts: Explicit feedback which elicits pupils' own correction.

3. Findings: Quantitative analysis showed that the effectiveness of different forms of feedback differed significantly. It was found that the students who received a prompt improved considerably in their use of possessive determiners compared with the subjects who received recasts or no feedback at all. According to the research, prompts and other self-fixing strategies type of language learning aids may prove more useful as compared to latent correction strategies such as recasts.

4. Data Analysis: Student performance was analyzed developmentally, which was further divided into a scale introduced by Zobl, 1984, 1985, and further adapted by J. White, 1996, 1998. The result showed a significant improvement in the usage of language among students of the prompt group when compared to the recast and control groups in the delayed oral post-test.

Analysis of the Research:

Strengths: The fact it was a quasi-experiment design provided some control over different methods of feedback within a natural classroom setting. The multiplicity of assessment tasks made the research quite comprehensive in terms of the effect that feedback had on language acquisition.

Limitations: While the sample size was sufficient, it may still limit the extent to which generalizations can be made to larger populations.

The set tasks couldn't really represent language use in a real situation.



Pedagogical Implications: The research strongly indicated that teachers should focus on using promotive strategies in their feedback to give the student more potential and ability for self-correction and language learning. More research is needed into the effects of different feedback types over a longer term and examination of how various learner characteristics influence corrective feedback efficacy.

In other words, Ammar's study contributed some meaningful notions about the role of feedback in second language acquisition and indicated possible benefits that prompts might have over recasts in the development of a learner's language.

- III. Kamilla Bargiel-Matusiewicz: This study aims at examining students' attitudes and preferences towards error correction in terms of language learning, with emphasis on secondary school students in Poland. A teacher should be aware of the facts that how the learners get help from correction techniques or get stuck. It seeks feedback on students' responses to alternative correction techniques, their most loved/less liked sources of feedback and the emotional consequences of correction on their experience of learning.

Participants: 316 secondary school students participated in the research: age range of 13 and 16 years old individuals from Poland, this included only 161 girls and 155 boys. Varied levels of English proficiency were represented by them with most of them under upper elementary to pre-intermediate, having been studying English for 5 years on an average.

Methodology: Data was collected through an anonymous questionnaire designed in Polish language with open-ended and closed-ended questions concerning the opinions of students towards error correction.

Key Findings: This study indicates that the majority of students preferred corrections done by teachers rather than those done by their peers or oneself. Teachers are considered to be important authorities in the learning process of the students. Most think they learn from their mistakes, whereas peer correction commonly gives rise to embarrassment when a student makes a mistake or avoids making any more mistakes. There are mixed feelings among learners in regard to the frequency of corrections: a section of them wants to have more corrections while others are anxious about the public pronunciation. The teacher is prominent in building an environment of great support, a far better approach is one that balances the two methods-the self-correction and the peer-correction to meet the diverse needs of learning in the classroom. Use of various techniques, like pair and group work, can encourage participation from all students, especially shy ones. Also, teachers should be careful about the emotional nature of students regarding correction and provide an adequate explanation of their errors to deepen understanding and enhance their chances of efficient learning.

- IV. Toju Eyengho and Oyeibisi Fawole, 2017: The research paper "Students' Attitude towards Oral Error Correction Techniques Employed by Secondary School Language Teachers in South Western Nigeria" by Toju Eyengho and Oyeibisi Fawole aimed to examine the attitudes and preferences of senior secondary school students in South Western Nigeria towards oral error correction techniques employed by their language teachers. It has been born out of concerns of poor performance by the students in



English language, precisely in oral communication, which can be linked to the types of correction techniques used in teaching.

Research Methodology:

Research Design: A descriptive survey research design used.

Population: The target population for this study was as follows; senior secondary school students in South Western Nigeria public schools.

Sample Size: The sample size for the study was taken from ten public secondary schools randomly and consisted of two hundred students

Instrument: A questionnaire with the title questionnaire on "Students' Preferences on Effective Error Correction Techniques". The questionnaire was divided into two sections; that is, students' attitude towards oral error correction and their preferences towards some error correction methods.

Major Findings:

1. Attitudes Towards Correcting Errors: A remarkable percentage of the students (about 70%) exhibited a positive attitude when inquired whether certain error corrections should be made by the English teachers. The mean value regarding the statement "My oral errors should be corrected by the English teacher" is 3.11, a result pointing toward a positive attitude on this assumption.
2. Preferences Regarding Types of Error Correction: Students liked the pragmatic error correction most (mean score 4.00), followed by phonological error correction (3.96), and grammatical error correction (3.25). The least preferred was the vocabulary error correction (mean score 2.9). Results indicated that students clearly favored active and constructive methods for correcting errors. The techniques to which the highest percentage of responses were given are the ones in which the teacher models the correct pronunciation or structure. Perhaps the result may suggest that the students like to have the opportunity to truly understand and learn from their mistakes. A very large proportion also favored explanation from teachers why their utterances were wrong; this further emphasizes the fact that there should be a rationale embedded in the process of correction. On the other hand, most students rated ignoring oral errors as the least preferred method since they had a strong feeling to have their mistakes corrected and not ignored. This brought out very strongly the need for feedback in the learning process since students had a desire to correct oral skills through direct correction. Overall, the results showed a tendency toward interactive and useful methods, which may improve language learning outcomes and make students much more confident in speaking.
3. Problems and Deficiencies Identified: This study has identified the class size is big; there is a lack of properly trained teachers, and the availability of sufficient teaching aids is another significant problem for proper error correction.

Conclusion: The authors concluded that the error correction methods embraced by the teachers have very little correlation with what the students prefer. They recommended that the mismatch between teachers and students' information of error correction should



be accurately identified in their choice of error correction to increase their efficiency in language teachings. Similarly, it was recommended that the educational administrators exercise some control when enrolling students in a particular institution to foster the teaching and learning atmosphere.

The overall picture that the research draws is that teaching practices need to be changed as per the needs of the students themselves to enhance their communicative skills in English.

- V. Bambang W. Pratolo, 2019: The paper "How Would Our Students Like to Be Corrected?: A Study on Learners' Beliefs about language learning strategy" by Bambang W. Pratolo researches learners' belief about corrective feedback in language learning. This paper examines various aspects of the issue, including how students with varying levels of knowledge interpret CF in English language instruction and what kinds of corrections they can accept. The methodology used in this study was of a qualitative nature.

Objective: The study aimed to understand learners' preferences about CF and to discover whether students with different levels of proficiency would respond differently to CF.

Methods: The research instruments used in this study were semi-structured interview and learning journals. Through these approaches, the researcher is able to elicit comprehensive feelings and experiences from participants about CF. The qualitative approach was used to give an elaborate description of the social context where second language learning takes place.

Participants: The participants were students with varied English proficiency backgrounds in order to have a divergent understanding of CF.

Analysis and Findings:

Identified Themes: Four key themes emanated from the analysis, which include:

- Need/Importance of CF: All participants affirmed that CF was instrumental in enhancing their English language competence.
- Timing of CF: Most of the students want immediate feedback. They said that this will help them in their process of learning. However, they said that as teachers, they would want to provide feedback when students have finished their thoughts
- Methods of CF: CF should be given in a way that the students feel comfortable and appreciated hence, motivated.
- Level of Mistakes: The seriousness of the mistakes should guide the type of feedback given; there is an agreement that feedback is to be tailored in relation to individual learners' needs.

Comfort and Motivation: There is massive emphasis on feedback to be constructive and encouraging in a way that helps reduce anxiety and improves motivation.



Impact of Proficiency Level: There was no significant difference in the students' responses to CF with regard to their English proficiency levels, which suggests that all students believe equally in the value of feedback.

Conclusion: The findings of this research suggest that students may or may not appreciate CF for their learning but prefer it to be delivered thoughtfully. It encourages teachers to consider the emotional impact of feedback on a student and adjust their strategies for offering feedback to help foster a supportive learning environment. The results imply that understanding students' beliefs about CF can contribute much to enhancing teaching practices and improving language learning outcomes.

- VI. Morshada Islam, 2007: The research by Morshada Islam looks into the oral error correction strategies employed by the teachers in elementary-level classes at schools in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The present research tries to find an answer to whether these correction strategies have any effect on students' learning of a second language. More specifically, the task tries to figure out whether the approaches used by the teachers contribute much toward student confidence and language acquisition.

Overview of the Applied Method

The sample size was 145 students and teachers from four schools, so it was quite a diverse sample from different learning contexts. Several tools or instruments utilized in collecting data included classroom observations, student questionnaires, and limited tape recordings. However, due to the problems encountered with tape recordings, the heavy reliance on observational notes might have limited the richness of the data.

Outcomes: Types of Errors and Corrective Measures

Major error types distinguished in the research include grammatical, vocabulary, pronunciation, and discourse errors at all linguistic levels. This kind of classification is very important for showing where exactly the students face difficulties and where more attention and practice, with relevant feedback, are needed. A wide variety of correction methods were used by teachers, but most of them were not aware of the types of feedback they used. Such unawareness might result in inconsistency in the application of correction procedures, which might confuse the learner and cause problems in learning. For example, grammatical errors were very dominant, indicating that teachers should perhaps pay more attention to teaching grammar and give more specific feedback in that line. Moreover, correction strategies used by the teachers included explicit correction, recasts, and peer correction. A wide range of correction strategies is desirable since different students may respond well to different methods. However, if most of these corrections occur unconsciously or with little consideration for efficient methods, then there is considerable room for improvement. The student questionnaires summarized responses to questions about how students perceive error correction and how it affected their learning. Most of the learners said that frequent corrections made them feel uncomfortable or anxious about making mistakes, therefore teachers should learn more supportive ways of correction.

Impact on Student Learning

The student questionnaires revealed that many learners were cooperative and had much to say concerning error correction. However, the presence of teacher intervention in the



course of feedback sessions indicated that this could restrict free communication. The analysis also revealed that ineffective ways of correction may give students negative confidence and freedom to contribute towards language learning. This finding agrees with previous studies which claim the creation of a favorable environment for learning.

Recommendations for Improvement

The study pointed out the professional development activities required in effective error correction strategies. Training teachers to know how to recognize and change the approach of making corrections for all individual student needs can indeed improve the experience in learning. Another point is to allow for a classroom atmosphere where students feel safe to make mistakes and from those mistakes learn. It is important that teachers are trained to give constructive feedback that will encourage the growth of the student and not discourage them.

Limitations and Future Research

Notably, several limitations faced this study: time constraint and reluctance of the school authorities to have classrooms observed and recorded. These might have constrained the depth and scope of data collected and generalizability of findings. In the future, error correction practices could be assessed in a greater number of schools and educational contexts. Longitudinal studies could also provide depth into how different modes of correction affect language acquisition in the long term.

Conclusion

A valuable insight is derived from the research done by Morshada Islam on error correction practices of schools in Dhaka, highlighting their implications for student learning. It shows that effective feedback mechanisms are very important, while further maximizing language learning outcomes relies on teacher training. These strategies, by addressing the identified gaps, would enable educators to create a much more conducive environment for language acquisition, ultimately for the benefit of students in their educational journeys.

Conclusion:

Error is a natural and integral part of learning a second language. This paper focuses on the function of feedback alone in constructing the motivation and perceived confidence of learners. The study focuses on the cause and categories of errors. The paper explored effective SLP strategies on error correction through an analysis of six case studies focusing on different techniques of error correction in English language classrooms and the learner uptake. The case studies reviewed collectively indicate the importance of corrective feedback in second language acquisition. The findings show that although implicit feedback, such as recasts, are one of the most frequent tools used by the teachers, explicit strategies like elicitation and prompts are better at stimulating student participation and self-correction. This approach is further illustrated in the works of Lyster and Ranta (1997), who claimed that no matter which dichotomy is adopted, feedback stimulates greater cognitive involvement, though Ammar (2008) finds significant developmental progression with prompts over recasts. Bargiel-Matusiewicz underscores the significance of teacher-led correction as students prefer the power and control it affords in learning. It calls for immediate and constructive feedback, striking



a balance between correction and motivation. The teachers must, therefore, adopt multiple approaches to minimize anxiety and establish an encouraging learning environment, with an active role from students for successful learning.

From the works of Eyengho and Fawole (2017), and Pratolo (2019), student perceptions of corrective feedback indicated specific emphasis on timely, constructive, and contextualized feedback, ideally balancing correcting and motivating. Therefore, it is recommended that tailor-made feedback based on learning needs and preferences should be used because one-size-fits-all error correction can in fact do more harm than good.

Finally, work by Islam (2007), among many others, emphasizes the building of that role through involving teacher professional development in finding and attempting effective techniques for feedback that ensure a safe learning environment for pupils learning from mistakes. Together, these findings provide a sound basis for developing feedback for language classes as it meaningfully contributes to students' linguistic ability and confidence. Specifically, strategies that encourage student self-correction and cognitive engagement, such as elicitation and prompts, appear effective for both accuracy and learner autonomy. Punitive and over-corrective feedback once again breaks the engagement of learners, and being constructively supportive in correction does encourage the confidence of learners and their active participation.

It was indicated that feedback must cater to individual learners, as well as classroom environments-from a pedagogical point of view. By recognizing how error correction goes beyond correcting linguistic errors and involves building learners' confidence and motivation teachers should seek to balance accuracy with empathy. When narrowed feedback is presented thoughtfully, it feels supportive by creating a gentler learning atmosphere that encourages student engagement as well as risk-taking in participating in language use.

But this study is not without limitation. For example, only six case studies were included in the scope and might not allow the sufficient representation of the different classroom environments and learner profiles, although they provide important insights. The sample size can be increased in more studies to include a wider variety of circumstances, including adult education settings, virtual learning environments, and bilingual classrooms. Moreover, longitudinal study could consider the impact of different types of error correction strategies on language development and learner's confidence at a distance.

Practically speaking, this paper highlights the need for preparation programs of teachers to stress efficient ways of error correction, thereby enabling teachers to use the strategy of giving feedback appropriately and flexibly. It can also be considered to supplement the traditional method by looking into ways to introduce technology in the language classroom, including automated tools for feedback. Further research may focus comparative studies on error correction strategies of the practice across linguistic and cultural contexts. The relation of peer to teacher feedback may also yield important new information concerning cooperative learning procedures. Such research would improve theoretical knowledge, but it would also offer practical methods to enhance language instruction.



A supportive learning environment may, therefore, be achieved when the causes and trends of errors have been identified and thoughtfully utilized methods of compassionate feedback are exercised. The correction of errors in linguistic usage will result in enthusiastic students while it will ensure holistic growth through setting pupils up for increased success in language acquisition.

References

1. Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (4th Ed). Addison Wesley, New York: Longman.
2. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th Ed). Addison Wesley, New York: Longman.
3. Burt, M. & Kiparsky, C. (1972). *A Repair Manual for English*. Newbury House.
4. Chomsky, N. (1959). *A review of BF Skinner's Verbal behavior*. *Language*, 35(1), 26–58.
5. Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Error and strategies in child second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 8, 129-138.
6. Dulay, H., Burt, M. & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. Oxford University Press.
7. El-Dakhs, D. and Mitchell A. (2011). Spelling Error Analysis among EFL High-School Graduates. Retrieved on 3 January 2019 from <http://www.ksaalt.org>
8. Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
9. Ellis, R. (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
10. Hutchinson, T., Waters, A. (1986). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning Centered Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
11. Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
12. Rastegar, M., & Homayoon, H. (2012). *EFL learners' preferences for error correction and its relationship with demotivation and language proficiency in the Iranian context*. *Issues in Language Teaching*, 1(2), 323-341.
13. Richards, L., & Morse, J. M. (2007). *Users guide for qualitative methods* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Rollinson, P. (2005). Using peer feedback in the ESL writing class. *ELT Journal*, 59(1), 23–30.
14. Schulz, R. A. (1996). *Focus on form in the foreign language classroom: Student's and Teacher's views on error correction and the role of grammar*. *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 17-21.
15. Schulz, R. A. (2001). *Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Columbia*. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 56-75.
16. Selinker, L. (1972). *Interlanguage*. *Product Information International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 10, 209-241.



-
17. Suryoputro, G., & Amaliah, A. (2016). *EFL students' responses on oral corrective feedback and uptakes in speaking class*. International Journal of Language and Linguistics, 3(5), 73–80.
 18. Truscott, J. (1996). *The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes*. Language Learning, 46, 327-369.
 19. Widdowson, H. G. (1983). *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford:Oxford University Press.
 20. Correspondent, Ht. "Andhra Pradesh defends decision to change medium of instruction in government schools to English." Hindustan Times, 3 Sept. 2020, www.hindustantimes.com/andhra-pradesh/andhra-pradesh-defends-decision-to-change-medium-of-instruction-in-government-schools-to-english/story-1dDAQxyXHqOtqtTi1XgzfN.html.