

## Editorial

# Teachers of English and their Perceptions towards ESL Errors

**Prof. Laxmi Bahadur Maharjan, PhD**

Editor in Chief  
Mangal Research Journal  
Email: [laxmi.maharjan@tucded.edu.np](mailto:laxmi.maharjan@tucded.edu.np)

### Abstract

This study entitled 'Teachers of English and their Perceptions towards ESL Errors' aimed at evaluating and determining gravity of grammatical errors in terms of acceptability and intelligibility judgments. Quantitative research methodology was utilized in this study. The data was gathered with the aid of a questionnaire prepared on the basis of the result of error analysis conducted earlier. The questionnaires were mailed to English teachers of different private and public schools, colleges and universities of Nepal and worldwide. Two hundred twenty (220) useable surveys were collected altogether for the study: 100 surveys from Nepali English teachers, 100 surveys from native English speaking teachers, 20 each from Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and America, and likewise, 20 surveys from non-Nepali English teachers. Received responses were analyzed and explained descriptively. The findings of the study showed that the native English teachers evaluated the errors far more leniently than Nepali and non-Nepali English teachers. There is no any significant difference in evaluation of errors found in between Nepali and non-NepaliEnglish teachers, but compared to native English teachers, they were found statistically and significantly different in their judgments of errors in acceptability and intelligibility both. On the other hand, while comparing judgments of learners' errors in between the native English teachers; it was revealed that there were not any significant differences found there. It is recommended that the native English speaking teachers' perception of errors be rightly explored and accordingly evaluation scales be developed and the teachersbe made aware of such universal rating scales of grammatical errors while evaluating learners' errors.

**Keywords:** acceptability, intelligibility, judgment, Nepali English teachers, perception,

### Introduction

The study of errors is always very meaningful. Dealing with student errors is a central feature of instructional quality. Teachers' reactions to a student's error and classmates' errors can be crucial to the success of a lesson (Kotzebue et al. 2021).

Error treatment in teaching to adult English language learners has recently gained major focus. Hussain et al. (2020, p. 290) state two major schools of thought: one who considers errors to be the indication of the learners' incompetence and the other who considers errors to be an important sign of learning. Considering the above, teachers should keep in notice of both these errors seriously. Burt (1974, p. 53) states that it becomes necessary for teachers to be prepared to handle the variety of errors that inevitably occur in student speech and writing.

Error review is a very sensitive area. Since responding to student errors is the teacher's most enduring and difficult task, great care should be taken while one judges student errors. Therefore, Heidorn (2018) rightly expresses the concern that once this topic is tackled the wrong way, it is a great effort to rebuild trust.

With regards to the present study, several studies have earlier been carried out on evaluation and determination of gravity of ESL errors. Related to this, Vann et al. (1984, p. 428) has focused on measuring native speaker reaction by determining which errors interfere with comprehension or are irritating or unacceptable to the receiver. More information is found in Davies' (1985, p. 65) work when he says in the evaluation of learners' errors, more use should be made of the criterion of intelligibility. Hughes and Lascaratou (1982) are found to earlier clarify that non-native speakers of English do not seem to make use of the criterion of intelligibility, and suggest that this criterion ought to be given more weight. Going a step ahead, Chastain, (1980, p. 210) wrote, 'depending upon native speaker linguistic tolerance, insight, interest, and patience, student language errors will be viewed as comprehensible and acceptable'. Furthermore, Chastain (1980) continued, native speakers can obviously understand much non-native speech, ...they can often comprehend utterances that are linguistically quite corrupted phonetically, semantically, and grammatically (p. 210).

Native English and Nepali and non-Nepali teachers of English may differ considerably in their evaluations of learners' errors. In this regard, Sheorey (1986) writes, 'The difficulty in judging students' errors is that the teacher needs guidelines for determining their seriousness but these do not presently exist'. Sheorey (1986) continues, 'In the absence of any explicit guidelines for determining the seriousness or gravity of given errors, one can speculate that individual teachers of ESL, regardless of their native language, tend to evaluate errors or error types differently (p. 306). James (1977) seems to support this view when he says that ESL teachers probably do refer consistently to criteria of degree

of erroneousness when they mark, even though they do not explicitly formulate these criteria (p. 116). Perhaps there are consistent differences also between the way nationals (non-native speakers) and native-speaker teachers mark written exercises (p. 116).

There are subsequent researches into understanding the errors of language learners which are classified into different categories. First, there was theoretical work in reaction to Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH); this attempts to predict the errors in L2 that learners of various L1 backgrounds will make. The second main area of research is based on what happens in the classroom, what teachers and learners actually do in the classroom when language errors occur (Chaudron, 1988, Allwright & Bailey, 1991). The third body of work consists of error gravity studies (e.g. James, 1977, Hughes & Lascaratou, 1982, Sheorey, 1986, McCretton & Rider, 1993, Delamere, 1996), where various language errors are ranked according to the perception of the seriousness of errors. There has been some work in the error gravity studies on how non-native speaker teachers of English judge errors for their seriousness. However, no study has been published that examines whether non-native speaker teachers of English can correctly identify what is or is not erroneous, or explain why something is erroneous.

Keeping the above concepts in mind, the present study focuses on evaluating the students' errors. Overall, errors are typically described with regard to the target language system. This paper deals with errors from different teachers' points of views: Nepali English teachers, non-Nepali English teachers, and native English speaking teachers. Several of them were involved to make judgments about the relative comprehensibility and intelligibility of student errors, and at the same time determine the relative importance of error types. This study was carried out with a prime purpose of evaluating and determining gravity of the grammatical errors in terms of acceptability and intelligibility judgments by teachers of English.

## Methods

### Design and Population

This research is a fact finding mission; so it a survey research. Quantitative methodological approach was applied. Of course, this research concerned with people's views or perceptions of an issue, and there were interpretations and findings, more testing applied and generalizations drawn; the study started with the collection of numerical data on a subject followed by a statistical analysis elsewhere: statistical package, SPSS, was used for numerical analysis, so it is a quantitative study.

In this study, error evaluation has been applied. At this phase, the researcher collected different teachers' assessment of errors from home and abroad. Along with perceptions made by native English speaking teachers, the assessment of the errors as perceived by Nepali teachers of English and non-Nepali teachers of English was recorded. This

research was based on the population of 100 (=20 x 5) native English speaking teachers, 100 Nepali English teachers and 20 (1 X 20) non-Nepali English teachers, for evaluation of errors.

### **Data Gathering Tools**

A questionnaire consisting of 100 erroneous sentences which were collected from the works of higher secondary school level students was prepared on the basis of the highest frequency of errors. The Likert scale was used where the teachers rated each of the sentences on a 5-point rating scale with 1 being intolerable in all academic situations and 5 being tolerable in all academic situations (also see Vann, et al. 1984, p. 430).

### **Sampling Procedures**

The researcher randomly selected 100 Nepali English teachers with at least a year's experience in teaching. The selected sample of teacher represented all the ecological belts - the Terai, the Hill and the Mountain in Nepal, and all the development regions in the corresponding ratio as far as possible. So far as native English speaking teachers and non-Nepali English teachers are concerned, the researcher contacted them globally through email correspondences. Questionnaires were mailed to 300 Principals, Assistant Principals, and English teachers of different private and public schools, colleges and universities worldwide. The mailed directions gave participants the option of completing the survey either on paper to submit through postage or on on-line at a website designed for this purpose. Two months later, follow-up enquiries were made to the recipients. The surveys were anonymous, thus it was not possible to contact non respondents to see whether they differed in any systematic way from those who responded. The researcher then selected 100 most valid responses received from native English speaking teachers from English speaking countries like the USA (20), New Zealand (20), Canada (20), Australia (20) and Britain (20). Similarly, non - Nepali English teachers (20) who participated in the research were from the countries other than native English speaking countries and Nepal. Non - Nepali English teachers were from Argentina, Belgium, Bhutan, China, Greece, Hungary, Iran, Israel, Italy, Malta, Mexico, South Africa, India, Pakistan, Afganistan, Thailand, Bangladesh, Austria, Kirjikistan and the Philippines working elsewhere. All these teachers' perceptions were collected through email correspondences. In selecting these teacher like native English speaking teachers and non - Nepali English teachers, the researcher selected only those surveys which were complete in themselves.

## Results and Discussion

This section concerns with description of results derived from the perceptions made by different stakeholders of this research project followed by discussions.

### Country wise Error Perception by Native English Teachers

Native English speaking teachers' perception of English language errors has been analysed country wise in this section here. Accordingly, comparison of the error perception of the five groups of native English speaking teachers namely British, American, New Zealander, Canadian, and Australian are dealt with under this heading.

As regards the acceptability judgment of British and Australian native English speaking teachers who participated in this study, it is revealed that British teachers deducted 6670 points out of 10000 which comprised 66.70%, 3.91% points less than their Australian counterparts (7061 points - 70.61%) (table 1). This data showed that Australian teachers were more severe than British teachers by 3.91% points. Likewise, New Zealander native English speaking teachers deducted 7143 points in acceptability judgment; this proves that New Zealander teachers are also more serious than British teachers by 473 scores (i.e. 4.73%), but they (New Zealander native English teachers) were found to show their severity by only 82 scores (0.04% mean scores) from Australian teachers the difference of which is very nominal than the two teachers - New Zealanders and Britishers – who were alike.

In acceptability judgment below, Canadian teachers deducted 6278 points out of 10000, which comprised 62.78%. The study showed that Canadian teachers have evaluated the errors 3.92% less from British teachers, 7.83% less from Australian teachers and 8.65% less from New Zealander teachers. This reveals that Canadian teachers are lenient than all the three teachers, Britishers, New Zealanders and Australians. Looking at American teachers, they have scored 7218 points, the most severe than all the four teachers, namely Britishers by 5.48%, Canadians by 9.4%, New Zealanders by 0.74%, and Australians by 1.57%. In acceptability judgment, overall it is revealed that American teachers are the most severe judges (72.81%) whereas Canadian teachers are the least severe (62.78%).

**Table 1***Error Perception of Native English Teachers*

Native English Teachers	Criteria for Judgment							
	Acceptability				Intelligibility			
	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean	Total	Deducted Scores	%	Mean
Britisher (20)	10000	6670	66.70	3.34	10000	5237	52.37	2.62
Australian (20)	10000	7061	70.61	3.53	10000	5548	55.48	2.77
New Zealander (20)	10000	7143	71.43	3.57	10000	5403	54.03	2.70
Canadian (20)	10000	6278	62.78	3.14	10000	4747	47.47	2.37
American (20)	10000	7218	72.18	3.61	10000	5362	53.62	2.68

In intelligibility judgment, British teachers scored 5237 (52.37%) points which is ahead of their Canadian teachers by 4.9%, but their counterparts, Australian teachers, New Zealander teachers, and American teachers, are still ahead of them by 3.11%, 1.66% and 1.25%, respectively. This reveals that among the five native English speaking teachers, in intelligibility judgment, Canadian teachers (47.47%) are least severe whereas Australian teachers (55.48%) are most severe.

Overall, Canadian teachers are least severe than their fellow teachers namely Britisher, Australian, New Zealander and American in both acceptability and intelligibility judgments. Regarding the most severe judges, whereas American teachers (3.61%) were most severe in acceptability judgment, Australian teachers (2.77%) were most severe in intelligibility judgment.

Finally, to compare acceptability judgment with that of intelligibility judgment, it is revealed that the degree of seriousness towards grammatically deviant sentences in terms of acceptability is higher than that of intelligibility for both British and Australian teachers. This finding is in line with Nushi et al.'s finding that there was a strong positive correlation between acceptability and intelligibility ratings of the errors by the advanced EFL learners, meaning that the more acceptable the errors, the more intelligible they were (2021, p. 48). However, the judges are different in these two studies; whereas in the present study the judges are teachers of English, in Nushi et al.'s study, the raters are EFL learners.

### **Significance of Mean Scores of Native English Teachers**

Five groups of native English teachers' perception of ESL errors were under study here. An attempt has been made to compare British native teachers with other sub-group native speakers while evaluating learners' errors in terms of acceptability and intelligibility judgment point of views. Accordingly, different native English teachers' mean scores in acceptability and intelligibility judgments are compared separately and analysis made in the following sub-headings.

### I. Significance of British and Australian Teachers' Mean Scores

Here is a comparative study between mean scores of British and Australian native teachers; T-test is applied to find out the significance of mean scores of these two sub- groups of native teachers.

**Table 2**

*Mean difference between British and Australian Teachers*

Native English Teachers		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	Sig. F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper	
Acceptability judgment	British	Equal variances assumed	2.759	.105	20	333.50	63.48	-19.55	.414	-.825	-67.51	28.41
	Australian	Equal variances not assumed			20	353.05	84.84					
Intelligibility judgment	British	Equal variances assumed	.083	.775	20	261.85	73.71	-15.55	.523	-.645	-64.31	33.21
	Australian	Equal variances not assumed			20	277.40	78.57					

$P < 0.05$  in t-test

As shown in table 2 above, there were 20 British and 20 Australian teachers and the mean scores 333.50 and 353.05 in acceptability judgment and 261.85 and 277.40 in intelligibility judgment respectively. The mean differences between these two groups were 19.55 in acceptability judgment and 15.55 in intelligibility judgments. Likewise, in output, the Sig. (2-tailed) values .414 and .523 in both judgments were above the required cut off of .05. This proves a statistically insignificant difference in the mean acceptability scores and intelligibility scores for British and Australian teachers.

## II. Significance of British and New Zealander teachers' mean scores

Analysis of mean scores of British and New Zealander native teachers in both acceptability and intelligibility judgments has been made to find out the significance of mean scores of these two sub-groups of native teachers here.

**Table 3**

*Mean Difference between British and New Zealander Teachers*

	Native English Teachers	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances F	Sig.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										Lower	Upper	
Acceptability judgment	British	Equal variances assumed	.052	.821	20	333.50	63.48	-23.65	.259	-1.147	-65.39	18.09
	New Zealander	Equal variances not assumed			20	357.15	66.87					
Intelligibility judgment	British	Equal variances assumed	1.724	.197	20	261.85	73.71	-8.30	.687	-.406	-49.70	33.10
	New Zealander	Equal variances not assumed			20	270.15	54.14					

$P < 0.05$  in t-test

Sig. (2-tailed) values .259 and .687 are above the required cut off of .05 in acceptability and intelligibility judgments both. Table 3 above proves that British had statistically non-significant lower mean scores (333.50, 261.85) than their New Zealander counterparts (357.15, 270.15) on both acceptability and intelligibility judgments.



### III. Significance of British and Canadian Teachers' Mean Scores

Here is a study between British and Canadian native teachers' mean scores in both acceptability and intelligibility judgments; the significance of mean scores of these two sub-groups of native teachers is dealt with.

**Table 4**

*Mean Difference between British and Canadian Teachers*

Native English Teachers	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	Sig.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
									F	Lower	Upper
Acceptability judgment	British	3.253	.079	20	333.50	63.48	19.60	.396	.858	-26.61	65.81
	Canadian			20	313.90	79.96					
Intelligibility judgment	British	.099	.755	20	261.85	73.71	24.50	.798	.258	-42.80	55.30
	Canadian			20	237.35	67.92					

$P < 0.05$  in t-test

Table 4 reveals that British had higher mean scores on acceptability (333.50, 261.85) than Canadian evaluators (313.90, 237.35). The t – ratios were .858 and .258 at  $p = .396$  and .798 both above 0.05. It is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean acceptability scores for British and Canadian teachers.

#### IV. Significance of Britisher and American teachers' Mean Scores

Britisher and American teachers' mean scores in acceptability and intelligibility judgments has been studied here.

**Table 5**

*Mean Difference between American and British Teachers*

Native English Teachers		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	Sig.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
										F	Lower	Upper
		Equal variances assumed	.990	.326	20	360.90	73.76					
Acceptability judgment	British	Equal variances assumed										
	American	Equal variances not assumed			20	333.50	63.48	27.40	.216	1.259	-16.65	71.45
Intelligibility judgment	British	Equal variances assumed	.006	.939	20	268.10	79.43	6.25	.281	1.093	-20.87	69.87
	American	Equal variances not assumed			20	261.85	73.71					

$P < 0.05$  in t-test

Table 5 reveals that the t - ratios 1.932 at  $p = .216$  in acceptability and 1.093 at  $p = .281$  in intelligibility state that American teachers had statistically non-significant mean scores than British teachers in both acceptability and intelligibility judgments.

Different sub-groups of native English speaking teachers have, of course, judged the learners' errors differently. While applying T-test on the mean scores on the deducted scores of these teachers, it becomes obvious that none of the teachers' judgments of errors have found to be significantly different than the other teachers' judgments of errors. In between the native English speaking teachers' judgment of learners' errors, there were found neither statistical nor significant differences there. Overall, the native sub-groups of English teachers' patterns of evaluating errors are almost identical.

#### Error Perception by Native, Nepali and Non-Nepali English Teachers

One hundred (100) Nepali English teachers, 100 native English speaking teachers, and 20 non-Nepali English teachers participated in this study. Here is a sub-groups wise analysis

of evaluation of learners' errors by native, Nepali and non-Nepali teachers of English individually with one another described under subsequent sub-headings below.

### I. Comparison of Error Perception by Native and Nepali English Teachers

A comparative study of perception of errors by native English speaking teachers and Nepali English teachers have been carried out in this research. In acceptability judgment, table 22 below shows that native English teachers deducted 34370 points out of 50000 which comprises 68.74%. Similarly, Nepali English teachers deducted 38173 points out of 50000 which makes 76.35%. Data shows that Nepali English teachers have found to mark the errors by 7.61% more seriously. This supports what James (1977) and Hughes and Lascaratou (1982) say 'non-native speakers were more severe in their evaluation than the native speakers' (cited in Davies, 1983, p. 304).

**Table 6**

*Error Perception of Native English and Nepali English Teachers*

Native English and Nepali	Criteria for Judgment							
	Acceptability				Intelligibility			
English Teachers	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean
Native (100)	50000	34370	68.74	3.44	50000	26296	52.59	2.63
Nepali (100)	50000	38173	76.35	3.82	50000	33346	66.69	3.33
<b>Difference</b>			<b>-7.61</b>				<b>-14.1</b>	

In intelligibility judgment, native English teachers deducted 26296 points which comprises 52.59%. Likewise, Nepali English teachers deducted 33346 points to comprise 66.69%. The data in intelligibility judgment shows that Nepali English teachers are more serious in comparison to native English teachers. Overall, this, (except non-Nepali English teachers), confirms the findings of James (1977), Hughes and Lascaratou (1982), Sheorey (1986), Awasthi (1995) (as cited in Maharjan, 2010, p. 75) who concluded that native speakers (teachers as well as non-teachers) appear to be more tolerant of errors made by ESL students than non-native speakers are.

The finding in the current study is like most findings the authors arrived at which are stated above. However, it will be appropriate to mention Arcya (2020) when she says 'The first and most important finding is that NES teachers, overall, tend to assess their students' performances with higher grades on the speaking rubric than NNES teachers do (p. 33).

Moreover, in regard to the difference in marking of grammatical errors between acceptability and intelligibility judgments, the impairment of acceptability (68.74%,76.35%) is remarkably greater than that of intelligibility (52.59%,66.69%)(see table 6 above).

### Significance of Native English and Nepali English Teachers' Mean Scores

Comparative study between native English teachers' and Nepali English teachers' findings showed that Nepali English teachers were more serious regarding the judgments of foreign language errors. As shown in table 7 below, native and Nepali English teachers' acceptability mean scores were 343.70 and 381.73 respectively. The mean difference between these two groups was -38.03. The t - ratio was -3.942 at  $p = .000$ , which was below 0.01. Similarly, the lower limit and the upper limit of these sub-groups of teachers were -57.05 and -19.00, both negative. Hence, it is concluded that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean acceptability score of native English teachers and Nepali English teachers ( $t = -3.942$ ,  $p = .000$ ). In other words, Nepali English teachers had a statistically significantly higher mean score on acceptability (381.73) than their native counterparts (343.70).

**Table 7**

*Significance of Mean difference between Native English and Nepali English Teachers*

Native English and Nepali Teachers	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	Sig.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean difference	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	95% confidence interval of the difference		
									Lower	Upper	
Acceptability judgment	Equal variances assumed	10.317	.002	100	343.70	74.82					
	Equal variances not assumed			100	381.73	60.88	-38.03	.000	-3.942	-57.05	-19.00
Intelligibility judgment	Equal variances assumed	1.120	.291	100	262.97	71.25	-70.92	.000	-7.407	-89.80	-52.03
	Equal variances not assumed			100	333.89	63.95					

$P < 0.05$  in t-test

In intelligibility judgment by native English teachers and Nepali English teachers also, the study reveals that there is a statistically significant difference between the mean intelligibility scores of native English teachers and Nepali English teachers ( $t = -7.407$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Between two teachers, Nepali English teachers were found to evaluate the grammatical errors more seriously. This finding associates with Arcya's (2020) finding

when she writes in her study finding that native English teachers rate students higher than their non-native colleagues. This is apparently due not only to differences in training but also the differences in the processes of acquisition (p. 29).

## II. Comparison of Error Perception by Nepali and Non-Nepali English Teachers

In acceptability judgment, Nepali English teachers deducted 38173 points which is 76.35%. Similarly, non-Nepali English teachers deducted 7351 points which comprised 73.51% (table 8). Nepali English teachers are by 2.84% ahead in comparison to non-Nepali teachers. This data, however, shows that the scoring points of both sub-groups of teachers are almost the same, although Nepali English teachers (76.35%) showed the severity of acceptability as higher than those of their non-Nepali counterparts (73.51%).

**Table 8**

*Error Perception of Nepali English and Non-Nepali English Teachers*

Nepali and non-Nepali Teachers	Criteria for Judgment							
	Acceptability				Intelligibility			
	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean
Nepali (100)	50000	38173	76.35	3.82	50000	33346	66.69	3.33
Non-Nepali (20)	10000	7351	73.51	3.68	10000	6281	62.61	3.14
Differences			<b>2.85</b>				<b>3.88</b>	

In intelligibility judgment above, Nepali teachers deducted 33346 points out of 50000 which is 66.69%. Similarly, non-Nepali teachers deducted 6281 points which comprised 62.81%. As in acceptability judgment, Nepali teachers (66.69%) again scored 3.88% more points as compared to non-Nepali English teachers (62.61%). This proves that both Nepali English and non-Nepali English teachers are found to judge the errors more harshly than native English teachers.

This finding confirms Hyland and Anan's (2006) study when they resulted that non-native English speaking teachers are generally more severe in grading errors and rely more on rule infringement rather than intelligibility in judging seriousness.

### Significance of Nepali and Non-Nepali English Teachers' Mean Scores

In acceptability judgment, the study reveals that Nepali English teachers and their non-Nepali counterparts showed somehow similar judgments regarding perception of English language errors. Therefore, it is proved that there is no any statistically significant difference between the mean acceptability score for these two sub-groups of teachers ( $t = 1.417, p = .158$ ).

Table 9

*Mean Difference between Nepali and Non-Nepali English Teachers*

Nepali and Non-Nepali Teachers			Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	Sig.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			F								Lower	Upper
Acceptability judgment	Nepali	Equal variances assumed	1.399	.238	100	381.73	60.88					
		Equal variances not assumed			20	367.55	73.40	14.18	.158	1.417	-5.57	33.93
Intelligibility judgment	Nepali	Equal variances assumed	1.015	.315	100	333.89	63.95	16.76	.117	1.574	-4.25	37.78
		Equal variances not assumed			80	317.12	78.96					

$P < 0.05$  in t-test

Likewise, according to data in table 9 above, the Sig. (2-tailed) value .117 proves that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean intelligibility scores for the Nepali English and non-Nepali English teachers. In other words, Nepali English teachers had a statistically non-significantly higher mean score on intelligibility (333.89) than their non-Nepali counterparts (317.12). These two sub-groups of teachers judged the students' errors whatever the criterion they applied while evaluating the errors, the results indicated as different only statistically insignificantly.

### III. Comparison of Error Perception by Native and Non-Nepali English Teachers

In acceptability judgment, native English teachers deducted 34370 points which comprised 68.74%. Similarly, non-Nepali English teachers deducted 7351 points which comprised 73.51%. Data shows that non-Nepali English teachers have found to mark the errors by 4.77% more seriously (table 10).

**Table 10***Error Perception by Native English and Non-Nepali English Teachers*

Native and  non-Nepali Teachers	Criteria for Judgment							
	Acceptability				Intelligibility			
	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean
Native	50000	34370	68.74	3.44	50000	26296	52.59	2.63
non-Nepali	10000	7351	73.51	3.68	10000	6281	62.61	3.14
<b>Differences</b>			<b>4.77</b>				<b>10.02</b>	

In intelligibility judgment, native English teachers deducted 26296 points out of 50000 and this comprised 52.59%. Likewise, non-Nepali teachers deducted 6281 points out of 10000 which comprised 62.81% points. This data shows that non-Nepali English teachers have been irritated by the grammatically deviant sentences by 10.02%. All in all, data in intelligibility judgment showed that non-Nepali English teachers are much more serious compared to native English teachers. Conversely, native English teachers leniently judged the errors than their fellow non-Nepali English teachers.

More precisely, this finding is in line with those earlier studies that reported NNS faculty being less tolerant of errors than their NS colleagues (e.g. Hughes & Lascaratou, 1982; Hyland & Anan, 2006, as cited in Endley, 2016). It should be borne in mind, however, that some other studies report precisely the opposite finding, with NS faculty being less tolerant (e.g. Birdsong and Kassen, 1988; Kobayashi, 1992, as cited in Endley, 2016).

**Significance of Native English and Non-Nepali English Teachers' Mean Scores**

As shown in table 11 below, the participant teachers were native English teachers and non-Nepali English teachers whose mean scores were 343.70 and 367.55, respectively. The mean difference between these two groups was -23.85. The t - ratio was -2.143 at  $p = .033$ , which was below 0.05. Its lower limit was -45.81, and the upper limit also -1.88, both negative. Thus, it is concluded that there is a statistically significant difference between mean acceptability score for native English teachers and non-Nepali English teachers ( $t = -2.143$ ,  $p = .033$ ). In other words, native English teachers had a statistically significant lower mean score on acceptability (343.70) than non-Nepali English teachers (367.55).

Table 11

*Mean Difference between Native English and Non-Nepali English Teachers*

			Levene's						95%			
Native and Non-Nepali Teachers		Test for Equality of Variances	Sig. F	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean Difference	Sig. (2-tailed) t	Confidence Interval of the Difference			
									Lower	Upper		
Acceptability judgment	Native	Equal variances assumed	2.247	.136	100	343.70	74.82					
	Non-Nepali	Equal variances not assumed			20	367.55	73.40	-23.85	.033	-2.143	-45.81	-1.88
Intelligibility judgment	Native	Equal variances assumed	.017	.897	100	262.97	71.25	-54.15	.000	-4.828	-76.28	-32.02
	Non-Nepali	Equal variances not assumed			20	317.12	78.96					

$P < 0.05$  in t-test

In intelligibility judgment, table above showed that mean difference between these two groups was still greater i.e. -54.15. The t - ratio was -4.828 at  $p = .000$ , which was below 0.01. The lower and the upper limit were once again both negative i.e. -76.28 and -32.02. Therefore, it is concluded that there is a statistically significant difference between mean intelligibility score for native English teachers and non-Nepali English Teachers ( $t = -4.828$ ,  $p = .000$ ).

Above all has prepared us to think that there must be a range of criteria of evaluating learners' errors which native English teachers, Nepali English teachers and non-Nepali English teachers have utilized while scoring English language errors. Many researches have been carried out since Nickel, and Gorosch (1973) have given their viewpoints as regards evaluation of errors. Gorosch (1973) has stated that teachers and non-teachers are considerably different while assessing learners' errors. Nickel (1973) writes that native speakers use their wide-ranging norms of English to prove that they are more lenient. Davies (1983) writes 'native speakers' low scores here could reflect their greater readiness to think of contexts... ' Highlighting evaluation of errors, Kim (2007, p. 221) writes, NS teachers relied more on intelligibility in evaluating error seriousness, while NNS teachers assigned higher scores to the writing sample and they tended to evaluate errors based on the rule violation criterion.



Considering all stated above, the current study helps that the significance of judgments of errors should communicate various evaluation criteria to further research out in the determination and establishment of error gravity of English language errors.

### Conclusion

Errors are the pride of teachers and language learners. They provide insights of learners' transitional knowledge about second language learning strategies. Moreover, it is equally important to analyse and explain the evaluation of these errors by teachers from different points of views. This study makes a brief record of different error evaluation projects accomplished since James (1977) to Nushi et al. (2021) and attempts to update the strategies being adopted until now. Of course, James (1977) cites Nickel's (1970) observation that native speakers are probably more tolerant of learners' errors than teachers of the same nationality as the students, and explains why students prefer to be assessed by English assistants rather than by their compatriots.

Within this period of 44 years (1977-2021), a lot of researches have been conducted with outstanding results which have been used in citation works and in references by thousands of students, teachers, authors, researchers, educationists, experts, and many more.

Earlier in 1977, James carried out a research entitled 'Judgments of Error Gravities' with the purpose of explaining what is involved in marking written work in EFL. James (1977) discusses the consistent use of the criteria of degree of seriousness when they mark, even though they do not explicitly formulate these criteria. Likewise, Nushi et al. (2021) investigate the gravity of the lexical errors made by Iranian advanced EFL learners from the perspective of their peer advanced EFL learners. Nushi et al. (2021) further discusses the correlation of acceptability and intelligibility ratings of the errors by the advanced EFL learners, meaning that the more acceptable the errors, the more intelligible they were.

Many research studies have been conducted since Nickel (1970) and James (1977) which have been focused above. Likewise, the present research has been carried out which attempts to reveal the evaluation patterns of ESL errors by British, Canadian, New Zealander, Australian and American native English teachers, and carry out a brief comparative study of perceptions between/among these teachers. Other purpose was to reveal the differences reacted by native, Nepali and non-Nepali teachers on the same grammatically erroneous sentences produced by Nepali learners of English, and significances of mean scores of these different teachers of English.

To conclude, the above study attempted to explain the judgments of errors by native English teachers, Nepali English teachers and non-Nepali English teachers on the basis of the deducted scores in both acceptability and intelligibility points of views.

Native English speaking teachers' perception of English language errors has been analysed country wise in this study. It is proved that the different groups of native Englishspeaking teachers have, of course, judged the learners' errors differently. In their patterns of judgments also, it is revealed that native teachers have tried to show their mostleniency over the ESL errors, while other sub-groups tried to express their irritation over some errors though. However, while applying T-test on the mean scores on the deducted scores of the native English teachers, it becomes obvious that none of the teachers' judgments of errors have found to be significantly different than the other teacher sub- groups' judgments of errors.

Similarly, there were observations noticed in sub-groups of native, Nepali and non-Nepali English teachers in regard to perception of errors committed by Nepali language learners. As regards the significance of native English teachers', Nepali English teachers' and non – Nepali English teachers' mean scores, it is revealed that there is a statistically significant differences between mean acceptability scores and mean intelligibility scores for native English teachers and Nepali and non-Nepali English teachers, but not in between the native English sub-groups of teachers themselves.

On the basis of different observations and findings above, it can be recommended that the approaches used by native English speaking teachers to evaluate learners' errors should be explored and a universal rating scale be developed so as to use it while evaluating ESL errors. If we can practice our own error evaluation procedures in line with those of native English speaking teachers, this will be a historical step in judgment of error gravity of English language errors.

### References

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.
- Arcaya, M. (2020). Differences between native English-speaking teachers and their non-native counterparts when evaluating pronunciation. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 22(1), 29-41. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v22n1.78800>.
- Awasthi, J. R. (1995). *A linguistic analysis of errors committed by Nepali Learners of English*. An Unpublished Thesis of Ph. D. in applied Linguistics. Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies. School of Humanities. University of Hyderabad.
- Burt, M. K. (1974). Error Analysis in the Adult EFL Classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9 (1), 53-63. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3586012>

- Chastian, K. (1980). Native Speaker Reaction to Instructor-Identified Student Second-Language Errors. *The Modern Language Journal*, 64(2), 210-215.
- Chaudron C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Davies, E. E. (1983). Error evaluation: the importance of viewpoint. *ELT Journal*, 37(4), 304-311. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/37.4.304>
- Davies, E. E. (1985). Communication as a Criterion for Error Evaluation. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 23(1), 65-69.
- Delamere, T. (1996). The Importance of interlanguage errors with respect to stereotyping by native speakers in their judgments of second language learners' performance'. *System* 24(3), 279–297. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(96\)00022-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(96)00022-X)
- Endley, M. J. (2016). Perceptions of Error Gravity among Native Speaking and Non- native Speaking Faculty at UAEU. In Elsheikh, A., Riddlebarger, J., Abu-Rmaileh, S., & AlAlami, S. (Eds.). *Proceedings of the 21st TESOL Arabia Conference: Theory, Practice, Innovation. Teaching and Learning in the Digital World*. Dubai: TESOL Arabia Publications
- Heidorn, M. (2018). Error Handling Part 1: Error Detection, Management and Culture. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1980.tb05187.x>
- Hughes, A. & Lascaratou, C. (1982). 'Competing Criteria for Error Gravity'. *ELT Journal*, 36(3), 175–182. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/36.3.175>
- Hussain, M. S., Albeshar, K. B., & Farid, A. (2020). Teachers' Error Treatment Practices and Perceptions in Teaching English to Adult EFL Learners in Saudi Arabia: A Gender-Based Qualitative Study. *Global Regional Review*, 5(1), 290-299. doi:10.31703/grr.2020(V-I).32
- Hyland, K. & Anan, E. (2006). Teachers' perceptions of error: The effects of firstlanguage and experience. *System*, 34(4), 509-519. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.09.001>
- James, C. (1977). Judgements of Error Gravities. *ELT Journal*, 31(2), 116–124. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/XXXI.2.116>
- Kim, K. J. (2007). Error perceptions of native and nonnative English-speaking writing teachers. *English Teaching*, 62(4), 221-239.

- Kotzebue, L. V., Fortsch, C., Fortsch, S. & Neuhus, B. J. (2021). Dealing with Student Errors in Whole-Class Discussions of Biology Lessons at German Secondary Schools. *Int J of Sci and Math Educ* 20, 459–480. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-021-1017>
- Maharjan, L. B. (2010). Learners' Errors and their Evaluation. *Journal of Nelta*, 14(1), 71–81. DOI: [10.3126/nelta.v14i1.3093](https://doi.org/10.3126/nelta.v14i1.3093)
- McCretton, E. & Rider, N. (1993). Error Gravity and Error Hierarchies. *IRAL*, 31(3), 177–188. <https://doi.org/10.1515/iral.1993.31.3.177>
- Nushi, M., Jafari, R. & Tayyebi, M. (2021). Iranian Advanced EFL Learners' Perceptions of the Gravity of Their Peers' Written Lexical Errors: The Case of Intelligibility and Acceptability. *Interdisciplinary Studies in English Language Teaching (ISELT)*, 1(1), 40-56. [10.22080/iselt.2021.20667.1005](https://doi.org/10.22080/iselt.2021.20667.1005)
- Santos, T. (1987). Markedness theory and error evaluation: An experimental study. *Applied Linguistics*, 8(3), 207–218.
- Sheorey, R. (1986). Error perceptions of native speaking and non-native speaking teachers of ESL. *ELT Journal*, 40(4), 306-312. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/40.4.306>
- Vann, R. J., Meyer, D. E., & Frederick, L. O. (1984). Error gravity: A study of faculty opinion of ESL errors. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(3), 427–440.
- (Present article is based on the author's PhD dissertation entitled 'A study on teachers' perceptions towards the English language errors' accomplished in 2009. Some of the data posted in this article has already been published in the author's article published in Journal of NELTA, Vol. 14, No 1&2, 2009.)