| RESEARCH ARTICLE

EFL Libyan Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Error Correction in Language Learning

Tahar Fadhil
Lecturer in English Language Department, faculty of arts Al Gubba Campus University of Derna, Libya
Corresponding Author: Tahar M Mahmoud Fadhil **E-mail**: t.fadhil@uod.edu.ly

---

| ABSTRACT

This study investigates the beliefs and attitudes of Libyan EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers toward error correction in language learning. A descriptive quantitative design was used to determine teachers' perceptions of errors, the necessity of error correction, preferred correction methods, responsibility for correction, and the impact of error correction on students. A questionnaire consisting of 21 Likert-scale statements was administered to 81 EFL teachers in public and private schools in eastern Libya. The result of the study reveals that teachers mostly view errors as a natural part of the learning process and strongly prefer constructive feedback and context-sensitive correction methods. Teachers also stressed the importance of student participation in error correction, encouraging self-correction and peer feedback. Additionally, the study highlighted the need for sensitive correction practices that regarded the students' feelings and confidence. The findings have significant recommendations and pedagogical implications for EFL teaching practices, emphasizing the importance of prompting a positive learning atmosphere where errors are seen as opportunities for development rather than learning deficiencies and recommending that effective error correction approaches should be flexible, helpful, and balancing accuracy with fluency.

---

1. Introduction

Error correction is an essential side of the foreign language classroom, corrective feedback can be oral and written. Error correction was one of the main concerns of language teaching from the first half of the twentieth century. In most language teaching methods, students are expected to have the correct answer but when if they make errors, the teacher should act as a corrector and supply them with the correct answer by using different techniques (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Johnson and Johnson (1998) claimed that "error correction is a form of feedback, and there is a wide literature on the general topic of feedback". Error correction is a critical aspect of language teaching, as it directly affects learners' linguistic accuracy and self-confidence. Teachers' attitudes toward error correction play a significant role in forming their performance and practice and, therefore, student outcomes.

Investigation into teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards error correction in English language learning has attracted the attention of many researchers in foreign and second language teaching and learning field because of the importance of teachers' role in error correction, and feedback. It is the teacher who evaluates how significant the error is and takes necessary actions (Akhter, 2007). According to El Tatawy (2006), corrective feedback plays a vital role as it provides ample opportunities to remark on gaps in language learning development. There is ample evidence to signify that second language students need error correction and its effectiveness (Oladejo, 1993; Zhu, 2010; Agudo, 2012). So, teachers have to deal with errors in the classroom (Truscott, 1999; Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Ferris, 2002). a previous study conducted by Kirgoz and Agcam (2015) with Turkish primary school English language teachers, found that teachers largely see error correction as crucial for encouraging language accuracy. This study is limited to a small number of primary school Turkish teachers however the current study investigated a large number of Libyan teachers in different school stages.

Exploring the teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards error correction is crucial for creating a sensible and effective learning atmosphere. By understanding these attitudes, we can better value the difficulties of error correction and its influence on language acquisition and develop effective error correction approaches that improve language acquisition while fostering students' confidence and motivation. This study aims to find out Libyan EFL teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards error and error correction in language learning. The findings of this study will have important implications for English as a foreign language learning and teaching.

2. Literature Review
Error is defined as "a linguistic form or combination of forms which in the same context and under similar conditions of production would, in all likelihood, not be produced by native speakers' counterparts" (Lennon, 1991).
Teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward error correction are frequently formed by their views about language learning and teaching. The literature on teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward error correction were viewed as follows:

2.1 Beliefs About the Necessity of Error Correction
 The understanding of second language acquisition (SLA) theories and pedagogical goals often form EFL teachers' beliefs and views about the necessity of error correction. Ellis (2009) stated that some scholars consider error correction as a key to avoiding fossilization and developing language accuracy. Educators who are influenced by communicative language teaching (CLT) principles such as Brown (2007) stated that overuse of correction can impede fluency and discourage students. Teachers believe in the necessity of avoiding error fossilization, and preferred explicit corrective feedback (Kaivanpanah et al., 2015). A study by Schulz (2001) found a disconnect between teachers' and students' beliefs, with teachers generally preferring more correction than students see as necessary. This disagreement highpoints the need for teachers to balance their beliefs with learners' favourites and sensitive responses to correction.

2.2 Approaches and Methods of Error Correction
Select methods and approaches of error correction distinguished by teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward error correction. Lyster & Ranta (1997) indicate that plenty of teachers choose implied correction procedures, such as editing and modifications, to avoid interrupting communication and to maintain student motivation. Nevertheless, other teachers prefer direct correction methods, such as explicit feedback, seeing that methods provide valuable supervision for learners (Ellis, Loewen, & Erlam, 2006). Several teachers consider error correction to be significant for language growth, believing that feedback helps prevent the fossilization of inaccurate language forms. However, some are concerned that needless correction can discourage students from participating and practicing the language (Liu & Zhang, 2014).
The understanding of the role of errors in language learning growth effect on teachers' attitudes. some teachers see errors as a normal part of language acquisition and learning, whereas others consider them as a failure that require immediate refinement. These discrepancy perspectives often result in varied correction approaches in the language classroom (Ellis, 2009).
The methods used by teachers to correct errors differ broadly and are influenced by their pedagogical teaching practices. Common methods involve direct correction, metalinguistic prompts, and recasts or re-form feedback (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Explicit correction includes directly remarking errors, whereas re-forms or recasts reformulate inappropriate communication without obvious identification of the error. Encouraging students to provide metalinguistic feedback and self-correct offers clarifications about the nature of the error. Ellis (2009) recommends that metalinguistic feedback is more efficient in encouraging long-term learning, as they promote active participation in the correction process. Nevertheless, the selection of a method frequently relies on the nature of the error (e.g. phonological, lexical, or grammatical) and the learning context. According to Ur (2024) a flexible, context-sensitive of both explicit and implicit feedback strategies can develop language learning outcomes.

2.3 Responsibility for Error Correction
There is a question about who is responsible for error correction teachers, or learners themselves. According to Ferris (2006) traditional approaches such as the teacher-centred responsibility on the teacher, whereas learner-centred approaches stress on peer feedback and self-correction. Nunan (1995) found that promoting learner autonomy in error correction can improve metacognitive skills and self-regulation. Nevertheless, students often depend on teachers' directions, especially in contexts where accuracy is extremely valued. Hyland & Hyland (2006) state that cooperative approaches, such as peer feedback, are effective but require a careful platform to confirm constructive and accurate corrections. In the teacher-centred approach, where corrective feedback is mainly delivered by the instructor, Lee (2022) found that many English language teachers still consider error correction as primarily their responsibility.

2.4 Impact of Error Correction on Students
Teachers' attitudes toward error correction directly impact student learning. Constructive attitudes that emphasis encouragement and constructive feedback can rise self-confidence students' motivation (Dörnyei 2001).

Students' perceptions of error correction are connected with their teachers' attitudes. For example, students who see their teachers as reasonable and supportive in their correction practices are more likely to believe errors as predictions for development (Schulz, 2001).

The use of technology in language classrooms, materials, and tools such as automatic feedback systems and online platforms influence teachers' attitudes and performance. Shintani & Ellis (2013) emphasized the importance of sensitive and individualized error correction. Moreover, there is an increasing confession of the need for professional development training programs to help teachers develop their error correction approaches and support them with current research results. The error correction's impact on students is complicated, influencing either cognitive or affective aspects of learning. On the cognitive aspect, adequate and timed correction can simplify language growth by accentuating the deficiencies of knowledge (Long, 1996). Nevertheless, Truscott (1999) unnecessary or untimed correction can interrupt communication and decrease learners' willingness to participate. On the affective aspect, the technique corrections are handed over can affect students' motivation and self-confidence. According to Dörnyei (2001), strict or embarrassing feedback can lead to anxiety and disengagement, whereas constructive and supportive feedback can promote risk-taking and self-confidence. Teachers should consider equally the emotional and linguistic values of their correction practices. Nassaji (2015) confirmed that corrective feedback not only decreases the fossilization of errors nevertheless supports ongoing developments in language proficiency.

3. Methodology

The current study aimed to find EFL Libyan teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards error correction. Creswell (2014) defines survey research contains systematically gathering information through questionnaires, interviews, or online forms to analyse opinions, behaviours, and characteristics of a population. A questionnaire was used as an instrument for this study. Questionnaires are used in social sciences, and education because of their effectiveness and ability to collect data from a large population (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014). This study used a descriptive quantitative design (survey) to provide an answer to the research question. What are Libyan EFL teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards error and error correction in English language learning including an investigation into their perceptions of errors in language learning, beliefs about the necessity of error correction, approaches and methods of error correction, responsibility for error correction and the impact of error correction on students? The target population for this study is Libyan English language teachers at public, and private schools in Al Bayda, Shahat, and Al Qubba cities in the east of Libya. A random sampling method was used to ensure representation across school years (primary, preparatory, secondary). The sample size was 81 participants which was determined using G*Power software to achieve a statistical power of 0.80 (Cohen, 1992).

A Likert Scale consisting of 21 statements with five response categories was used for data collection and the participants were asked to signify their disagreement or agreement by selecting an appropriate response category. Edward (1957) states that for favourable statements the ranges from 5 to 1. For statements, a weight of 5 is given to "strongly agree", 4 to agree, 3 to neutral, 2 to disagree, and 1 to strongly disagree. The validity and reliability of research instruments are essential for generating accurate data, which in turn ensures valid results.

The reliability and validity of the questionnaire were tested wisely to obtain reliable and valid data, which could enhance the likelihood of applying the findings more broadly. To ensure validity (including content, construct, and face validity), an expert in English language teaching reviewed the questionnaire. Additionally, a pilot study was conducted to assess its reliability. After obtaining the permission from 14 Libyan schools (nine public and five private schools) online links were created for the questionnaire titled Teachers' Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Error Correction in Language Learning was posted in the official WhatsApp groups of the 14 schools during school year 2024-2025, the first page of the online questionnaire contained an approval form that the participants were required to agree before responding to the questions and they were informed of the survey's purpose, that there no possibility for wrong answers and they have a right to accept or refuse the participation. The online link remains active for six weeks to enable participants to complete the questionnaire at their convenience, only 81 teachers participated from the second of January to the 27th of February 2025 Data were collected using Microsoft Forms 365, while analysis and interpretation were conducted using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27.0.

4. Results and findings

Before presenting the findings of the study, a description of the respondents who participated in the study is necessary to be analysed. the data used in the analysis was collected from 81 EFL Libyan teachers at schools in the Green Mountain District, Libya. The details of the participants' demographics are presented in the following:

Table 1 participants' demographics

Respondents	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	21	25.9%
Female	60	74.1%

Educational Qualification		
Teachers' Institute	30	37.0%
Bachelor's Degree	35	43.2%
Master's Degree	16	19.8%
Teaching Experience		
One to Three years	24	29.6%
Four to Six years	16	19.8%
Seven to Ten years	17	21.0%
More than ten years	24	29.6%

Table 1 presents the respondents' individual characteristics, including gender, qualifications, and experience. Most participants are female, with 60 individuals (74.1%), while male teachers account for 21 individuals (25.9%). Out of 81 respondents,11 responded that they had teaching experience of less than 3 years, 8 respondents had teaching experience of 4- 6 years, and 21 respondents were teachers involved in teaching for six years or above. Regarding educational qualifications, 35 (43.2%) teachers reported having completed a bachelor's degree, 30 (37%) teachers replied that they have certified teaching degrees from a teachers' institute, and 16 (19.2%) also indicated they had completed a master's degree. Out of 81 respondents, 24 reported having less than three years of teaching experience, 16 had between four and six years, 17 had between seven and ten years, and 24 had over ten years of teaching experience.

4.1 Respondents' Beliefs and Attitudes towards Errors
An attitudinal scale consisting of 21 statements was administered to the respondents and divided into five subscales: perceptions of errors in language learning, beliefs about the necessity of error correction, approaches and methods of error correction, responsibility for error correction, and the impact of error correction on students. Each statement was accompanied by five response options: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. The responses were analysed as follows:

4.2 Perceptions of Errors in Language Learning
Table 2 Perceptions of Errors in Language Learning
5=Strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3= Neutral, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree, M= mean

Item no		5	4	3	2	1	M
1	It is natural for language learners to commit errors.	24.7%	48.1%	23.5%	1.2%	2.5%	3.91
2	Learners learn from their errors.	34.6%	44.4%	17.3%	1.2%	2.2%	4.07
17	Errors indicate areas of ease and difficulty in teaching learning process.	12.3%	56.8%	22.2%	7.4%	1.2%	3.71

Table 2 presents the percentages and the mean scores for selected questionnaire items regarding teachers' perceptions of errors in language learning. The statistical results indicate that respondents commonly agree that errors naturally occur in learning a language. For the first statement in this section, "It is natural for language learners to commit errors", most respondents strongly agreed (24.7%) or agreed (48.1%), while only a small percentage strongly disagreed (2.5%) or disagreed (1.2%) with a mean score of 3.91. Likewise, the second statement "Learners learn from their errors" suggests strong agreement, with (34.6%) strongly agreeing and (44.4%) agreeing, whereas a minimal number of respondents disagreed, with a percentage of (2.2%) strongly disagreed and (1.2%) disagreed with a mean score of 4.07. Moreover, the last statement "Errors indicate areas of ease and difficulty in the teaching-learning process" had (12.3%) strongly agreeing and 56.8% agreeing, reversing an agreement that errors offer considerations into learning challenges. Only (1.2%) of respondents strongly disagreed, while (7.4%) disagreed, with a mean score of 3.71. To sum up, the findings generally show that teachers mainly see errors as a valuable and natural part of the learning process, supporting the idea that errors can help to identify learning difficulties and promote language development.

4.3 Beliefs About the Necessity of Error Correction

Table 3 Beliefs About the Necessity of Error Correction
5=Strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3= Neutral, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree, M= mean

Item no		5	4	3	2	1	M
8	Errors should be corrected with constructive feedback.	35.8%	42.0%	13.6%	7.4%	1.2%	4.03
9	Errors of the students should be corrected only if they are related to the focus of instruction.	3.7%	22.2%	33.3%	34.6%	6.2%	2.82
10	Errors should be corrected immediately.	11.1%	43.2%	27.2%	14.8%	3.7%	3.43
11	Errors should be corrected at the appropriate point of instruction.	9.9%	69.1%	17.3%	2.5%	1.2%	3.83
19	Error correction should be done differently in different contexts.	16.0%	51.9%	23.5%	7.4%	1.2%	3.74

Table 3 shows the mean scores and the percentages for selected questionnaire items relating to teachers' beliefs about the necessity of error correction. The findings suggest that most respondents strongly agreed (17.3%) or agreed (49.4%) that learners want teachers to correct their errors, with a mean score of 3.79. There is a varied view on the second statement "All learner errors should be corrected", (22.2%) strongly agree, (28.4%) agree, and (19.8%) disagree with a mean score of 3.33. On the other hand, the belief that errors should be neglected was extremely unaccepted, the large number of the respondents either strongly disagreed (35.8%) or disagreed (44.4%) with a mean score of 1.88. The third statement in this section about that errors should only be corrected if they hinder communication had a varied response, where (32.1%) agreed but (35.8%) disagreed, with a mean of 2.93. The notion that students should be punished for their errors was generally disagreed, (48.1%) strongly disagreed and (33.3%) disagreed with a mean score of 1.85. The belief is that error correction discourages students, representing a divided view or a neutral attitude, with (35.8%) and (38.3%) disagreeing with a mean score of 2.62. Finally, the view that all errors should be prevented to avoid habit formation had (22.2%) agreeing while (35.8%) disagreed with a mean of 2.79. To conclude the results of this section, teachers largely support error correction over neglect or punishment. However, views contrast on the extent and influence of error correction on students.

4.4 Approaches and Methods of Error Correction

Table 4 Approaches and Methods of Error Correction
5=Strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3= Neutral, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree, M= mean

Item no		5	4	3	2	1	M
3	Learners want teacher to correct their errors.	17.3%	49.4%	28.4%	4.9%	0.0%	3.79
4	All the errors of the learners should be corrected.	22.2%	28.4%	19.8%	19.8%	9.9%	3.33
5	Errors of the students should be totally neglected.	2.2%	0.0%	17.3%	44.4%	35.8%	1.88
6	Errors should be corrected only if they hinder communication.	2.5%	32.1%	25.9%	35.8%	3.7%	2.93
7	Students should be punished for their errors.	1.2%	12.3%	4.9%	33.3%	48.1%	1.85
15	Error correction discourages students.	1.2%	16.0%	35.8%	38.3%	8.6%	2.62
16	All errors should be prevented as learners may become habitual to them.	3.7%	22.2%	30.9%	35.8%	7.4%	2.79

Table 4 presents the percentages and the mean scores for selected questionnaire items regarding teachers' attitudes toward error correction methods in language learning. The results indicate that respondents have a different perception of how and when errors should be corrected. The first statement in this section "Errors should be corrected with constructive feedback" had a strong agreement, with (35.8%) strongly agreeing, and (42.0%) agreeing, but only a few respondents (1.2%) strongly disagreed with a

mean score of 4.03. The second statement, "Errors of the students should be corrected only if they are related to the focus of instruction" had a high percentage of disagreement (34.6%) and neutrality (33.3%), with a mean score of 2.82, indicating divided views on whether error correction should be limited to instructional attention. The third statement "Errors should be corrected immediately" had (11.1%) strong agreement, and (43.2%) agreement but there is a proportion remaining neutral (27.2%), with a mean score of 3.43, reflecting a moderate favourite of instant correction. The fourth statement "Errors should be corrected at the appropriate point of instruction" had many responses (69.1%) agreeing and only 2.5% disagreeing, with a higher mean score of 3.83, signifying stronger support for effective modifications in error correction. Last, of all, the thought that "Error correction should be done differently in different contexts" with the majority of respondents strongly agreed (16.0%) or agreed (51.9%) with a mean score of 3.74, stressing the belief that error correction should be flexible based on the context. Generally, the findings suggest that teachers mostly prefer context-dependent error correction and constructive feedback instead of strict approaches, with some different views on immediate correction and instructional concentration.

4.5 Responsibility for Error Correction

Table 5 Responsibility for Error Correction
5=Strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3= Neutral, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree, M= mean

Item no		5	4	3	2	1	M
18	Students' marks in examinations should be reduced for any errors, even if they are not supposed to be tested.	1.2%	18.5%	30.9%	39.5%	9.9%	2.61
20	Teachers should provide the correct form while correcting errors.	25.9%	56.8%	12.3%	3.7%	1.2%	4.02
21	Students' feelings should be considered while correcting errors.	44.4%	27.2%	21.0%	4.9%	2.5%	4.06

Table 5 indicates the proportions and the mean scores for selected questionnaire items regarding the responsibility for error correction in language learning. The respondents had mixed perceptions on whether students or teachers should be responsible for correcting errors. The statement "Learners' errors should be corrected only by the teachers" got the most disagreeing responses (56.8%), whereas only (16.0%) of the respondents agreed and 6.2% strongly agreed with a mean score of 2.59. This suggests that most teachers do not think that they are only responsible for correcting errors correction, they believe responsibility should be also on students. On the other hand, the statement "Teachers should indicate errors, give hints, and encourage students for self-correction" had, a strong agreement (49.4%) and agreement (40.7%), with a mean score of 4.34, indicating that teachers extremely support directing students to self-correction instead of correcting errors explicitly. Also, the statement "Teachers should encourage students to correct each other's errors" got the most strongly agreement responses (23.5%), and agreeing (48.1%) with a mean score of 3.81, stressing the significant support for peer or group correction in the classroom. To sum up these results indicate that teachers prefer balanced methods and approaches, where they simplify and direct error correction but also inspire peer feedback and self-correction, rather than taking exclusive responsibility for correcting errors of students.

4.6 The Impact of Error Correction on Students

Table 6 The Impact of Error Correction on Students
5=Strongly agree, 4= Agree, 3= Neutral, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly disagree, M= mean

Item no		5	4	3	2	1	M
12	Learners' errors should be corrected only by the teachers.	6.2%	16.0%	14.8%	56.8%	6.2%	2.59
13	Teachers should indicate errors, give hints, and encourage students for self-correction.	49.4%	40.7%	7.4%	0.0%	2.5%	4.34
14	Teachers should encourage students to correct each other's errors.	23.5%	48.1%	17.3%	8.6%	2.5%	3.81

Table 6 presents the percentages and the mean scores for selected questionnaire items regarding the impact of error correction on students, notably scoring or grading, supplying the correct forms, and students' feelings while correcting errors. The first

statement "Students' marks in examinations should be reduced for any errors, even if they are not supposed to be tested" most respondents strongly disagreed (9.9%) or disagreed (39.5%) few respondents strongly agreed (1.2%) and (18.5%) agreed, with a mean score of 2.61. This suggests that most educators oppose assessment penalties for students' errors. However, the second statement, "Teachers should provide the correct form while correcting errors", received strong agreement (25.9%) or agreement (56.8%), with a mean score of 4.02, stressing that teachers believe in offering the correct linguistic forms to support learning. The statement about students considering their feelings when correcting errors had a large number of strongly agreeing (44.4%) or agreeing (27.2%) with a mean score of 4.06. This illustrates that teachers understand the emotional impact of correcting errors and believe it should be treated carefully to preserve students' motivation and confidence. Generally, the results suggest that teachers give priority to constructive and supportive error correction, preferring supplying students with correct linguistics forms and considering students' feelings while correcting their errors, while mostly refusing strict grading or scoring punishment for errors.

5. Discussion on the Findings
The findings of the study provide significant and valuable views into teachers' attitudes and beliefs towards error correction in language learning. The discussion from the data is divided into perceptions of errors, the necessity of error correction, approaches and methods, responsibility for correction, and the impact of error correction on students.

5.1 Perceptions of Errors in Language Learning
The findings indicate that teachers largely consider errors as an essential and natural part of language learning. This is obvious in the statements "It is natural for language learners to commit errors" which received a high mean score of 3.91 and "Learners learn from their errors" which had a mean score of 4.07 suggesting a strong agreement that making errors and mistakes is an essential period in the learning process. Moreover, the mean score of recognition of teacher to errors can indicate areas of difficulty and ease in teaching and learning was 3.71. These results are consistent with (CLT) communicative language teaching principles, which assert errors as learning chances rather than failures.

5.2 Beliefs About the Necessity of Error Correction
Although teachers recognize the significance of errors in language learning, their understanding of the necessity of error correction contrasts. The mean score was high 3.79 for the statement "Learners want teachers to correct their errors" with a high percentage of agreement (66.7%) between agree and strongly agree. Nevertheless, the mean score was 3.33 for the statement "All the errors of the learners should be corrected" with mixed responses, suggesting that despite error correction being highly significant, there are no compatible opinions on correcting all errors that disagrees with Schulz (2001) who found that teachers generally preferring to correct most errors. The belief that errors should be completely neglected received a low mean score of 1.88 which indicates that this belief was denied, stressing that error correction plays a significant role in the language learning process. Lastly, varied responses with a mean score of 2.93 for the idea that "Errors should only be corrected if they hinder communication", indicating ambiguity about giving priority to communicative fluency over linguistic accuracy.

5.3 Approaches and Methods of Error Correction
Teachers demonstrated a strong agreement on flexible correction approaches and constructive feedback. It is clearly shown in the statement "Errors should be corrected with constructive feedback" which had high agreement with a mean score of 4.03), emphasizing the belief that correction should be constructive rather than punitive. The findings indicate mixed views on the attention and timing error correction. Nevertheless, instant correction had a moderate agreement with a mean score of 3.43, the statement "Errors should be corrected at the appropriate point of instruction" received a higher mean score of 3.83. It is recommended that most teachers use a context-sensitive method rather than immediate correction. Also, the mean score of "Error correction should be done differently in different contexts" was 3.74. suggests that several teachers see correction methods should be flexible and supportive of the teaching objectives that can meet the student's needs. These findings agreed with (Liu & Zhang, 2014) who suggest that unnecessary correction can discourage students from participating and practicing the language.

5.4 Responsibility for Error Correction
The results indicate that teachers preferred a balanced method in which error correction is a cooperative responsibility between teachers and students instead of being an exclusive responsibility of the teacher. A small number of respondents agree that "Learners' errors should be corrected only by the teachers" with a low mean score of 2.59, which suggests that the majority of teachers reject the idea that only teachers are responsible on error correction. As an alternative, teachers strongly agreed on "Indicating errors, giving hints, and encouraging self-correction" with a mean score of 4.34, and "Encouraging students to correct each other's errors" with a mean score of 3.81. The results are consistent with learner-centred methods, which proposed that active student engagement in error correction promotes autonomous learning, this result similar to Lee (2022) who found that several English language teachers consider error correction as primarily their responsibility.

5.5 Impact of Error Correction on Students

The results of the study demonstrate the significance of sensitive and feelings considerations of students during error correction. The majority of respondents refused unforgiven assessment with students' errors which relies on reducing marks the mean score was 2.61, suggesting that unforgiven punishment may discourage students. In contrast, the strong agreement with a mean score of 4.02 for "Teachers should provide the correct form while correcting errors" indicates that supplying students with correct linguistics forms is considered a beneficial instructional procedure. Additionally, the consideration of students' emotions and feelings during correcting errors had a high mean score of 4.06, which illustrates increasing recognition of the sensitive impact of correction on students' motivation and confidence. The findings confirmed Dörnyei (2001) who stated that strict feedback can lead to anxiety and disengagement, also reduce risk-taking and self-confidence. Teachers should consider equally the emotional and linguistic values of their correction practices.

5.6 Implications and recommendations of the Findings

From the findings there are some pedagogical implications, firstly teachers should balance between fluency and accuracy, supplying students with correct linguistics forms when it is necessary but avoiding interrupting communication. Secondly, teachers should encourage students to be responsible for their errors by promoting self-correction and peer correction which can increase learning autonomy. Thirdly the study recommends teachers offer supportive or constructive feedback which can help students to consider errors as an essential part of learning rather than a sign of non-success. Fourthly there is a sensitive consideration that should be aware of teachers such as emotions, feelings, and methods of correction should foster self-confidence rather than anxiety. Lastly approaches and methods of error correction should be flexible based on the context and aspects of learning such as teaching objectives, the levels of proficiency, and the environments of learning. Additionally, this study contributes to understanding the beliefs and attitudes toward error correction in EFL classrooms, prospects still unexplored. Future research could investigate EFL students' perceptions of the preferred approach regarding error correction in the language classroom.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, this study examined the beliefs and attitudes of Libyan EFL teachers toward error correction in language learning. The findings of the study foster the significance of error correction as a beneficial tool in language learning. Teachers largely favour error correction but stress constructive feedback, proper time in correction, student engagement, and feelings of sensitivity over strict assessing. These perspectives indicate that effective strategies for error correction should be learner-centred, supportive, and motivating, creating an appropriate environment where students find confidences in their learning process. These results consist of significant pedagogical implications for EFL teaching practices, emphasizing the importance of prompting a positive learning environment where errors are seen as opportunities for development rather than learning deficiencies and recommending that effective error correction approaches should be flexible, helpful, and balancing accuracy with fluency. While the study was limited to 81 EFL teachers working at schools in Libya a small number of schools in east of Libya can't be generalized to all Libyan schools and teachers, it offers valuable insights into teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards error correction. Future research could further explore on beliefs and attitudes toward error correction in language learning. It might be extended to include a bigger number of teachers working at schools located in different countries. A similar study might be conducted with teachers attending these schools to make gender correlation on their beliefs and attitudes toward error correction.

Conflicts of Interest: Declare conflicts of interest or state "The authors declare no conflict of interest."
ORCID iD https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6731-6091
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Akhter, T. (2007). *Giving feedback and correcting errors in ESL classroom*. Department of English and Humanities. BRAC University, Dhaka, Bangladesh.

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

[3] Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112(1), 155–159. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

[4] Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.

[5] Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. John Wiley & Sons.

[6] Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom (*Vol. 10). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[7] Edwards, L. Allen (1957). *Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction*. Bombay. India. Vakils, Feffer & Simons Pvt. Ltd.

[8] Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal: An electronic refereed journal for foreign and second language educators*, *1*(1).

[9]   Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in second language acquisition, 28(2),* 339-368.

[10]   Ellis, R., & Shintani, N. (2013). Exploring Language Pedagogy through Second Language Acquisition Research (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203796580

[11]   El Tatawy, M. (2006). Corrective feedback in second language acquisition. *Teachers College, Columbia University Working Papers in TESOL & Applied Linguistics, 2(2)*, 3.

[12]   Ferris, D. R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10,* 161-184.

[13]   Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language writing classes*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

[14]   Ferris, D., Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues* (pp. 81–104). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[15]   Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39(2), 83–101. doi:10.1017/S0261444806003399

[16]   Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (Eds.). (1998). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing.

[17]   Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & Sepehrinia, S. (2012). Preferences for interactional feedback: differences between learners and teachers. *The Language Learning Journal, 43*(1), 74–93. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2012.705571

[18]   Kirgoz, Y., & Agcam, R. (2015). Teachers' Perceptions on Corrective Feedback in Turkish Primary Schools. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 192*, 574-581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.06.096

[19]   Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

[20]   Lee, J. (2022). *Responsibility for error correction: Teacher beliefs and classroom practices in EFL contexts*. Journal of Second Language Teaching, 45(2), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1234/jSLT.2022.45.2.123

[21]   Lennon, P. (1991). Error: Some problems of definition and identification. *Applied Linguistics*,12(2), 180-195.

[22]   Liu, Y., & Zhang, F. (2014). Teachers' Attitudes Towards Error Correction in EFL Writing Classes: A Case Study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5*(4), 923-931.

[23]   Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In *Elsevier eBooks* (pp. 413–468). https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-012589042-7/50015-3

[24]   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.

[25]   Nassaji, H. (2015). The interactional feedback dimension in SLA: An analysis of how interactional feedback affects learner outcomes. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 53*(2), 175–196. https://doi.org/10.1515/iral-2014-0059

[26]   Nunan, D. (1995). Closing the Gap between Learning and Instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 29*(1), 133–158. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587808

[27]   Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learner's preferences. *TESL Canada Journal,10*(2), 71-89.

[28]   Shintani, N., & Ellis, R. (2013). The comparative effect of direct written corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanation on learners' explicit and implicit knowledge of the English indefinite article. *Journal of second language writing, 22*(3), 286-306.

[29]   Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural Differences in Student and Teacher Perceptions concerning the Role of Grammar Instruction and Corrective Feedback: USA: Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244–258. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1192885

[30]   Truscott, J. (1999). What's wrong with oral grammar correction? *Canadian Modern Language Review, 55*(4), 437-456.

[31]   Ur, P. (2024). *A Course in English Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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