

Editorial

Perceived Gender wise Judgement of NETs on English Language Errors

Prof. Laxmi Bahadur Maharjan, PhD

Editor in Chief
Mangal Research Journal
Email: laxmi.maharjan@tucded.edu.np

Abstract

The purpose of this study entitled 'Perceived Gender wise Judgement of English Language Errors' was to evaluate and determine the gravity of English language errors in terms of acceptability and intelligibility by the native English speaking teachers. Quantitative research methodology was utilized in this study. An error evaluation questionnaire consisting of 100 questions which were collected from the works of the higher secondary school level students was prepared with a Likert scale survey. The questionnaire was mailed to the teachers of colleges and universities of the native English speaking countries and 100 useable surveys were received electronically for a response rate of 50%, which is a good response rate for a mail survey. Received responses were analyzed using an SPSS programme and explained descriptively. The result of the study revealed that country wise native English speaking teachers judge the ESL errors alike in acceptability judgement whereas in intelligibility judgement, female teachers are found to judge the errors slightly ahead by 3.49%. Overall, both these sub-groups of teachers have perceived the errors almost similar. Moreover, the results reveal that out of the five country English speaking teachers, Australian male teachers have shown their most severity in evaluation of errors and the New Zealander teachers employed lenient patterns in their evaluation patterns. Likewise, the most severe male teachers are the Australian teachers (77.55%/58.78%) and the most severe female teachers are the New Zealander (70.96%) and American (70.12%/56.13%) teachers whereas the most lenient male teachers are the Canadian teachers (56.62%/44.10%) and the most lenient female teachers are the Australian (65.98%) and Canadian (50.84%) teachers. It is recommended that the native English speaking teachers' evaluation of the learner errors should direct to formulate a common error evaluation pattern which can be utilized in the classrooms so that the teachers of English become aware of such universal rating scales of the ESL errors.

Keywords: Native English speaking teachers, gender wise, acceptability and intelligibility, severity, leniency

Introduction

Evaluating errors requires insights drawn from previously determined values and principles in the English language teaching system. While evaluating ESL errors, teachers have found to show a considerable difference in their patterns of evaluations. The

evaluation of errors from different viewpoints by native English speaking teachers is always considered a norm and it reflects 'a function of their own experience and their knowledge of their pupils' experience' (Davies, 1983).

Native speakers' gender-wise perception of ESL errors study is a focus of study at this time. There is a considerable interest found to have developed in the study of error perceptions by both genders of native English teachers. In an association sense, Ahmad and Radzuan (2015) say that there were no differences of perceptions across teaching experience and across genders. There is an association of rating of ESL errors by the male native English speaking teachers of English and the female English teachers in terms of acceptability and intelligibility views at this point here. Talking about perceptual viewpoints of errors, Kim (2000) writes that native English teachers identified significantly more errors and they relied more on intelligibility in evaluating error seriousness.

Many studies prove that native English speaking teachers leniently evaluate ESL errors in comparison to their non-native counterpart teachers of English. Sheorey (1986) has compared the error perceptions of native and non-native ESL teachers from the United States and India. Analysis of the responses has indicated that native teachers were more tolerant of errors than non-native teachers and that..., generally the perceptions of the two groups were not alike. Sheorey (1986) concludes with a discussion of how the results of the study can be used in marking student papers. Roa and Li (2017) in line with Sheorey write that NES teachers are generally more tolerant of student errors and rely more on intelligibility rather than rule infringement.

Research avails that there is association with gender related differences while evaluating errors committed by the students. Hudson's (1992) study explores the gender differences in speaking styles and their relation to evaluation styles where he arrived at the implication that speech instructors must be aware of their own speaking and evaluation style to avoid any biased instructing. Hanan et al. (2015), in a similar vein, write that the significance of teacher gender seems even more crucial in an environment based on gender segregation. Likewise, as regards the female teachers' participation in their instruction, Mahdi and Al-Dera (2013) write with a complaint note that the female teachers less use ICT than male teachers.

Focusing more on gender perception of the ESL errors, Mengel et al. (2017) write that gender bias exists if women and men receive different evaluations that cannot be explained by objective differences in teaching quality. In another perspective, Hussain et al. (2020) say that no significant difference in the male and female teachers is found in their perception of the students' errors, reasons and ways to correct students' errors and their perceptions of the backwash effect of the error correction. Similarly in line with a

gender difference, Wardana (2023) writes that both genders had positive perceptions, with males displaying a more favorable perspective on teacher feedback than females.

There are perceptions that native speakers of English make better English language teachers (Kiczkowiak, 2014). However, research has not found that all of them make similar evaluation of the ESL errors. In case of evaluation of native speaker judgement of foreign – accented British and American English, there appeared to be a tendency for older and female judges to be slightly more tolerant of the potential errors presented in the experiment (Doel, 2006, pp. 106). Doel (2006, p. 1) further writes that a majority of Dutch students of English appear to believe that English native speakers from Britain and Ireland are the most severe judges of their Dutch-accented pronunciation of English; only a small minority consider North Americans to be less lenient.

Methods

This study concerned with gender wise evaluation of native English speaking teachers aimed at evaluating and determining gravity of ESL errors in terms of acceptability and intelligibility judgments. The native English speaking teachers considered as population of the study represented twenty teachers (20) each from the Australia, Canada, Britain, New Zealand and America. All these teachers' judgements of errors were collected through email correspondences.

A set of questionnaire that contained 100 erroneous sentences collected from the works of the higher secondary school level students was prepared on the basis of the highest frequency of errors. The researcher distributed the questionnaire through email to native English speaking teachers. Questionnaires were mailed to 200 Principals, Assistant Principals, and the English teachers of different private and public schools, colleges and universities worldwide with a cover letter in it. 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.

The teachers of English as evaluators had to rate each of the sentence on a rating scale of 1-5. In other words, 1 had no error at all and 5 had the worst error. However, the 100 useable surveys were received electronically for a response rate of 50%, which is a good response rate for a mail survey. Received responses were analyzed using an SPSS programme and explained descriptively.

Results and Discussion

Gender wise error perception by native English speaking teachers

This section concerns with analysis of evaluation of ESL errors by gender wise native English and their sub-groups of teachers namely Australian, Canadian, British, New Zealander and American. Forty four (44) male teachers and 56 female teachers participated in this study.

Male and female native English speaking teachers

Native English speaking male teachers deducted 30344 scores out of 44000 which comprised 68.96% whereas their female counterparts deducted 38356 scores out of 56000 with 68.56%. Irrespective of the total scores out of which the actual scores have been deducted it is revealed that the native male teachers deducted scores more by 0.4% than their female counterparts in the acceptability judgement. This difference indicates the pattern of severity of the two groups of judges which is almost alike (see table 1).

Table 1

Error perception by native male and female teachers

Native English Teachers	Criteria for Judgement							
	Acceptability				Intelligibility			
	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean	Total	Deducted Scores	%	Mean
Male	44000	30344	68.96	3.45	44000	22282	50.64	2.53
Female	56000	38356	68.56	3.43	56000	30312	54.13	2.71
Differences			0.4%				3.49%	

In the intelligibility judgment, the male teacher judges scored 22282 points out of 44000, and the female teachers 30312 points out of 56000. In the intelligibility judgement, female native teacher judges showed their severity by 3.49% in their ESL error evaluation. In other words, the female teachers are harsher (54.13%) than their male counterparts (50.64%) in the intelligibility judgment.

It is revealed that the country wise native English speaking teachers judged the ESL errors alike in the acceptability judgement whereas the female teachers are slightly ahead by 3.49%. Overall, it is found that both these sub-groups of teachers evaluated the errors almost similar.

Significance of native male and female teachers' mean scores

The male and female teachers who participated in this research were 44 and 56 respectively. As shown in table 2 below, their mean scores were 344.81 and 342.82, respectively. This meant that the male teachers (344.81) had a statistically non-significantly higher mean on acceptability than the female teachers (342.82). The mean

difference between these two groups was 1.99. Similarly, the t - ratio was .132 at $p = .895$, which was above 0.05. Hence, since the Sig. (2-tailed) value is .895 and above the required cut off of .05, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference between the mean acceptability score for the male teachers and the female teachers ($t = .132, p = .895$).

Table 2

Mean difference between native male and female teachers (Acceptability and Intelligibility)

	Native	N	M	SD	M Diff	t	Sig (2-tailed)
English Teachers							
Acceptability	Male	44	344.81	74.58	1.99	.895	.132
judgment	Female	56	342.82	75.67			
Intelligibility	Male	44	253.20	64.13	-17.43	.226	-1.21
judgment	Female	56	270.64	76.07			

In the intelligibility judgment, the table above indicates that the mean difference between these two groups was 17.43. The t - ratio was -1.21 at $p = .226$, which was above 0.05. The Sig. (2-tailed) value is .226 which is above the required cut off of .05. Therefore, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean intelligibility scores for the male and female native teachers. Moreover, it is revealed that female teachers are ahead by 17.43%, but there was no statistically significant difference found.

Overall, it is found that both the sub-groups of native English teachers evaluated the errors almost similar. The female teachers are ahead (1.99/17.43) in their evaluation pattern of the errors but this difference is not sufficient enough to prove statistically significant.

NETs and their sub-groups of teachers' evaluation of errors

Twenty (20) native English speaking sub-groups of teachers each from Australia, Canada, Britain, New Zealand and America participated in this research.

Australian NETs and their judgement of errors

Eight (8) male and 12 female English speaking teachers from Australia participated in this research. It is revealed that the Australian male teachers (77.55%) evaluated the errors greater than their female teachers (65.98%) in the acceptability judgement. Similarly, in the intelligibility judgement, the male teachers (58.78%) are ahead of their female counterparts (53.28%) (see table 3 below).

Table 3*Judgement of errors by sub-groups of native English teachers*

Native English Teachers		Criteria for Judgement							
		Acceptability				Intelligibility			
		Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean	Total Scores	Deducted Scores	%	Mean
Australian	Male	4000	3102	77.55	3.88	4000	2351	58.78	2.94
	Female	6000	3959	65.98	3.30	6000	3197	53.28	2.66
Canadian	Male	5000	2831	56.62	2.83	5000	2205	44.10	2.21
	Female	5000	3447	68.94	3.45	5000	2542	50.84	2.54
British	Male	4500	2988	66.40	3.32	4500	2149	47.76	2.39
	Female	5500	3682	66.95	3.35	5500	3088	56.15	2.81
New Zealander	Male	4500	3240	72.00	3.60	4500	2442	54.27	2.71
	Female	5500	3903	70.96	3.55	5500	2961	53.84	2.69
American	Male	4000	3011	75.25	3.76	4000	1994	49.85	2.49
	Female	6000	4207	70.12	3.51	6000	3368	56.13	2.81

The data in the above table reveals that Australian male teachers have found to evaluate the errors seriously. They are by 11.57% more serious than their female counterparts in the acceptability judgement. Equally serious they are in the intelligibility judgement by 5.50% . This finding shows that Australian male teachers are harsher and the females more lenient.

Moreover, Australian male teachers (77.55%) are ahead in the evaluation of errors in both the acceptability and intelligibility judgements than their Australian female teachers (58.78%).

Canadian NETs and their evaluation of errors

Ten (10) Canadian male and 10 female teachers participated in this research. The table 3 above shows that Canadian male teachers had in the acceptability judgement and the intelligibility judgement the mean scores 56.62% and 44.10%, respectively. Similarly, Canadian females, in the acceptability judgement, scored 68.94% which is by 12.32% more than their male counterparts, and in the intelligibility judgement, the female teachers have marked the errors by 6.74% more than their male counterparts (Female 50.84% / Male 44.10%)

In overall, Canadian female teachers are harsher in both acceptability (68.94% / 56.62%) and intelligibility judgements (50.84% / 44.10%).

British NETs and their evaluation of errors

Nine (9) male and 11 female British teachers took part in this research. The British male teachers scored 66.40% and the female teachers 66.95%. This data, in the acceptability

judgement, shows that the British male (66.40%) and the female teachers (66.95%) had a similar pattern of judgement towards the ESL errors (see table 3).

In the intelligibility judgement, the British male teachers deducted 2149 points out of 4500 which comprised 47.76% and the female teachers 3088 points out of 5500 which is 56.15%. Unlike in the acceptability judgement, here in the intelligibility judgement, the British female teachers had by 8.39% made a more severe evaluation than the British male teachers towards the grammatically deviant sentences produced by the ESL learners of English.

The data in table 3 above shows that in respect to the acceptability judgement, the two groups of teachers are alike in their evaluation, but as regards to the intelligibility judgements, they tend to differ slightly: the British male teachers are lenient to some extent.

It is revealed that male and female teachers differ in evaluation of errors in the intelligibility judgement; male teachers have found to evaluate the errors leniently by 8.39%.

New Zealander NETs and their evaluation errors

In the acceptability judgement, the New Zealander male teachers deducted 3240 points out of 4500 which comprised 72%. Similarly, the female teachers deducted 3903 points out of 5500 with 70.96%. The data (see table 3 above) show that the New Zealander male and female teachers did not mark the errors remarkably different (72% /70.96%).

In the intelligibility judgement also, there is no any indication of difference in the perception of errors between the New Zealander male and female teachers. The difference between the two teachers is only 0.43% which is quite negligible. In the acceptability judgement, this difference is 1.04%. Thus, it is obvious that the above is an explicit example to show that the New Zealander male and female teachers have marked the grammatically deviant sentences almost alike from both the acceptability and the intelligibility judgement views. Taqi et al.'s (2015) revelation that the statistics have revealed that both genders (and sometimes female more than male teachers) are good language teachers helps to rightly support the explicit example of evaluation at this point.

It is revealed that New Zealand male and female teachers showed an explicit model of evaluation of ESL errors, alike in the evaluation of errors (Male 72.00%, Female 70.96%).

American NETs and their evaluation of errors

American male teachers' scores, in the acceptability judgement, comprised 75.25% and the female teachers 70.12%. The indication of 5.13% difference in evaluation of errors

between the American male teachers and female teachers prove that the American male teachers are found more severe than their female counterparts (see table 3).

In the intelligibility judgement, however, the American female teachers are found to mark the errors strictly by 6.28% more. The table 3 above reveals that the American male teachers' deduction of 1994 points out of 4000, which comprises 49.85% is less severe while compared to their female counterparts who scored 56.13% points out of the total 6000 scores.

It is revealed that American male teachers are found to evaluate the errors more severe by 5.13% in the acceptability judgement, but they are found less severe in the intelligibility judgement. Doel's (2006) study mildly supports when he writes that Americans are less lenient. ... only a small minority consider North Americans less lenient.

Overall, from the obtained scores of these native sub-groups of teachers, it is revealed that Australian male teachers are ahead in the evaluation of errors in both the acceptability and intelligibility judgements than their Australian female teachers. Canadian female teachers are stricter in both acceptability (68.94% / 56.62%) and intelligibility judgement (50.84% / 44.10%). British male and female teachers differ in evaluation of errors in the intelligibility judgement where male teachers have found to evaluate the errors leniently by 8.39%. American male teachers are found to evaluate the errors more severe by 5.13% in the acceptability judgement, but they are found less severe in the intelligibility judgement. Unlike Australian, Canadian, British, and New Zealand teachers, the New Zealander male and female teachers showed an explicit model of evaluation of ESL errors, alike in the evaluation of errors (Male 72.00%, Female 70.96%).

Significance of mean scores by NETs and their sub-groups of teachers

This section deals with significance of mean scores between acceptability and intelligibility judgement by native English speaking sub-groups of teachers, their p value and sig. 2 tailed summations.

The findings as regards significance of mean scores by NETs and their sub-groups of teachers are given below.

Table 4

Significance of mean difference between sub-groups of NETs (Acceptability and Intelligibility)

Native English Teachers		N	M	SD	M Diff.	t	Sig.																																																																																																								
Acceptability judgement	Australian Male	8	387.75	87.45	57.83	1.547	.139																																																																																																								
	Australian Female	12	329.91	78.14				Intelligibility judgement	Australian Male	8	293.87	65.27	27.45	.757	.459	Australian Female	12	266.41	87.30	Acceptability judgement	Canadian Male	10	283.10	54.72	-61.60	-1.825	.088	Canadian Female	10	344.70	91.63	Intelligibility judgement	Canadian Male	10	220.50	58.58	-33.70	-1.117	.279	Canadian Female	10	254.20	75.35	Acceptability judgement	British Male	9	332.00	59.92	-2.72	-.093	.927	British Female	11	334.72	69.15	Intelligibility judgement	British Male	9	238.77	55.88	-41.94	-1.288	.214	British Female	11	280.72	83.39	Acceptability judgement	New Zealander Male	9	360.00	58.42	5.18	.179	.869	New Zealander Female	11	354.82	75.85	Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18	Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401
Intelligibility judgement	Australian Male	8	293.87	65.27	27.45	.757	.459																																																																																																								
	Australian Female	12	266.41	87.30				Acceptability judgement	Canadian Male	10	283.10	54.72	-61.60	-1.825	.088	Canadian Female	10	344.70	91.63	Intelligibility judgement	Canadian Male	10	220.50	58.58	-33.70	-1.117	.279	Canadian Female	10	254.20	75.35	Acceptability judgement	British Male	9	332.00	59.92	-2.72	-.093	.927	British Female	11	334.72	69.15	Intelligibility judgement	British Male	9	238.77	55.88	-41.94	-1.288	.214	British Female	11	280.72	83.39	Acceptability judgement	New Zealander Male	9	360.00	58.42	5.18	.179	.869	New Zealander Female	11	354.82	75.85	Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18	Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24								
Acceptability judgement	Canadian Male	10	283.10	54.72	-61.60	-1.825	.088																																																																																																								
	Canadian Female	10	344.70	91.63				Intelligibility judgement	Canadian Male	10	220.50	58.58	-33.70	-1.117	.279	Canadian Female	10	254.20	75.35	Acceptability judgement	British Male	9	332.00	59.92	-2.72	-.093	.927	British Female	11	334.72	69.15	Intelligibility judgement	British Male	9	238.77	55.88	-41.94	-1.288	.214	British Female	11	280.72	83.39	Acceptability judgement	New Zealander Male	9	360.00	58.42	5.18	.179	.869	New Zealander Female	11	354.82	75.85	Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18	Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																				
Intelligibility judgement	Canadian Male	10	220.50	58.58	-33.70	-1.117	.279																																																																																																								
	Canadian Female	10	254.20	75.35				Acceptability judgement	British Male	9	332.00	59.92	-2.72	-.093	.927	British Female	11	334.72	69.15	Intelligibility judgement	British Male	9	238.77	55.88	-41.94	-1.288	.214	British Female	11	280.72	83.39	Acceptability judgement	New Zealander Male	9	360.00	58.42	5.18	.179	.869	New Zealander Female	11	354.82	75.85	Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18	Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																																
Acceptability judgement	British Male	9	332.00	59.92	-2.72	-.093	.927																																																																																																								
	British Female	11	334.72	69.15				Intelligibility judgement	British Male	9	238.77	55.88	-41.94	-1.288	.214	British Female	11	280.72	83.39	Acceptability judgement	New Zealander Male	9	360.00	58.42	5.18	.179	.869	New Zealander Female	11	354.82	75.85	Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18	Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																																												
Intelligibility judgement	British Male	9	238.77	55.88	-41.94	-1.288	.214																																																																																																								
	British Female	11	280.72	83.39				Acceptability judgement	New Zealander Male	9	360.00	58.42	5.18	.179	.869	New Zealander Female	11	354.82	75.85	Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18	Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																																																								
Acceptability judgement	New Zealander Male	9	360.00	58.42	5.18	.179	.869																																																																																																								
	New Zealander Female	11	354.82	75.85				Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18	Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																																																																				
Intelligibility judgement	New Zealander Male	9	271.33	42.55	2.15	0.86	9.32																																																																																																								
	New Zealander Female	11	269.18	64.18				Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459	American Female	12	350.58	74.98	Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																																																																																
Acceptability judgement	American Male	8	376.37	73.99	25.79	.757	.459																																																																																																								
	American Female	12	350.58	74.98				Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																																																																																												
Intelligibility judgement	American Male	8	249.25	82.65	31.41	-.861	.401																																																																																																								
	American Female	12	280.66	78.24																																																																																																											

Australian native English speaking teachers

The Australian male and female teachers had mean scores of 387.75 and 329.91, respectively. The mean difference between these two groups was 57.83. The t - ratio was 1.547 at $p = .139$, which was above 0.05. The results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference ($p = .139$). Therefore, since this value is above the required cut off of .05, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean acceptability scores for the male and female Australian teachers.

The table 4 above indicates that the mean difference between the Australian male and female teachers was 27.46. In other words, the Australian male teachers had a statistically non-significantly higher mean score on intelligibility (293.87) than their female counterparts (266.41). Similarly, the t - ratio was .757 at $p = .459$, which was above 0.05. However, the Sig. (2-tailed) value is .459 which is above the required cut off of .05. It is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean intelligibility scores for the Australian male and female teachers.

Canadian native English speaking teachers

There were 10 male and 10 female participants who took part in this research. The mean scores obtained by the Canadian male and the female teachers were 283.10 and 344.70, respectively. The mean difference between these two sub groups was 61.60. This means that the Canadian male teachers had a statistically non-significantly lower mean score on acceptability (283.10) than their female counterparts (344.70). Similarly, the t - ratio was -1.825 at $p = .088$, which was above 0.05. Hence, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference between the mean acceptability score for the Canadian male and the female teachers ($t = -1.825$, $p = .088$). In other words, although there is a difference found in seriousness of the errors between the two teachers, this difference is not sufficient enough to claim any significant difference as such.

In the intelligibility judgement by the Canadian male and the female teachers, it is revealed that the mean difference between these two sub-groups was 33.70. The t - ratio was -1.117 at $p = .279$, which was above 0.05. The Sig. (2-tailed) value is .279 which is above the required cut off of .05. Hence it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean intelligibility scores for the Canadian male and female teachers.

British native English speaking teachers

The t -test performed on the mean scores of the British male and the female teachers' evaluation of errors showed that the British male teachers had a statistically non-significantly lower mean score on acceptability (332.00) than the female teachers (334.72). The t - ratio was -.093 at $p = .927$. The results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference ($p = .927$). In other words, there is not a statistically significant difference between the mean acceptability scores for the British male and female teachers.

Likewise, the t -test performed on the mean intelligibility score of the British male teachers and the female teachers indicate that the British male teachers had a statistically non-significantly lower mean score on intelligibility (238.77) than their female counterparts (280.72). Once again, the British male and female teachers had a huge difference in their mean scores towards the errors, but statistically it is not found to be so. However, the Sig. (2-tailed) value in the table is .214. As this value is above the required cut off of .05, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean intelligibility scores for the British male and female teachers.

New Zealander native English speaking teachers

As shown in table 4 above, there were 9 New Zealander male and 11 female teachers whose mean scores were 36.00 and 35.48, respectively in the acceptability judgement.



The mean difference between these two sub-groups was 5.18. The t - ratio was .173 at $p = .869$, which was above 0.05. These results indicate that the mean of New Zealander male teachers is not statistically significantly different from the mean of New Zealander female teachers. It is revealed that no statistically significant difference is found ($p=.869$) in the acceptability judgement between them because this value is above the required cut off of .05.

Likewise, the mean intelligibility score of the New Zealander male and female teachers ($t = 0.86$, $p = .932$) indicate that the male teachers had a statistically non-significantly higher mean score on intelligibility (271.33) than the New Zealander female teachers (269.18). The data reveals that the New Zealander male and the female teachers had statistically similar judgements towards the errors. However, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference between the mean intelligibility score for the New Zealander male and the female teachers ($t = 0.86$, $p = .932$).

American English speaking teachers

The table 4 above indicates that the American male and female teachers' mean scores were 376.37 and 350.58, respectively with a difference of 25.79 in the acceptability judgement. This shows that American male teachers had a statistically non-significantly higher mean score on acceptability (376.37) than their female counterparts (350.58). The t - ratio was .757 at $p = .459$, which was eventually above 0.05. The results indicate that there is no statistically significant difference ($p = .459$). As the Sig. (2-tailed) value is .459, and this value is above the required cut off of .05, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean acceptability scores for the American male and female teachers.

In the intelligibility judgement, the above table indicates a mean difference of these two sub-groups of teachers by 31.41. The t - ratio is .861 at $p = .401$, which is eventually above 0.05. However, the Sig. (2-tailed) value is .401 which is above the required cut off of .05. Therefore, it is concluded that there is not a statistically significant difference in the mean intelligibility scores for the American male and the female teachers.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This study aimed to study the evaluation and determination of the gravity of English language errors in terms of acceptability and intelligibility view points by the native English speaking teachers. Since the major stakeholders of this study were the native English speaking 100 male and female teachers, it would be essential to infer 44 male teachers and 56 female teachers from five sub-groups of native English speaking countries namely Australia, Canada, Britain, New Zealand and America at this juncture. The major concern of this study is not how these native teachers evaluate the ESL errors,

but the determination of seriousness of the errors by these teachers country wise and gender wise is crucial here.

It is indeed difficult to categorize any of the native English speaking teachers as stricter in ESL error evaluation due to the factors such as their teaching styles and assessment practices, educational approaches and subjective judgements. However, it is expected to develop a perception and perspective pattern of errors by the native speakers of English which can be used as a consistent evaluation criterion in the assessment system of the errors. There is no statistically significant differences revealed in the perceptions of male and female native English speaking teachers but there exists differences of seriousness in their evaluation systems. Therefore, it becomes immensely needed to suggest how the teachers develop criteria and evaluate errors as acceptable and intelligible. It is equally crucial to know and apply the proper statistical methods and tools to rightly evaluate ESL errors. The author is a NNET professor but he is never ever sure of what criteria a native English speaking teacher applies while he evaluates an un-native like piece of language nor is he aware of the criteria employed by a particular native English speaker to establish him as a severe teacher or a lenient teacher. Whatever the result is withdrawn, the native English speaking teacher must have employed a high level intuition which helps him to put ahead of the others in the overall evaluation process. This insightful, perceptive, and ability to make quick decisions based on limited information is a gut feeling which every English language teacher should know to sincerely apply in the evaluation of the errors.

This study should provide the insight which the native male teachers and the female teachers have utilized to differentiate him/her as a teacher of one geographical region from the other. Likewise, the gender differences have also reflected the severity of ESL errors. Mohd Noh and Mohd Matore (2022) have stated that the differences in teachers' rating severity have based on their rating experience, training experience, and teaching experience. This insight and practice should have helped to mark as a native English speaking teacher, and in turn, a native male teacher and a native female teacher and a teacher from one country and from the other country.

Severity is the result arrived at because of personal evaluation schemes that a teacher evaluator develops while judging the errors. Severity can be seen and felt only after a researcher analyses the data achieved. What evaluation scheme a native English teacher applies is a highly personal asset and intelligence. However, in such judgemental pattern, a country's reflection can be understood. Therefore, it is suggested that teachers evaluate the ESL errors very carefully so that it can contribute in judgemental pattern of ESL errors in common.

Evaluation schemes have to be developed. Written errors are much influenced by the factors such as nationality, gender and the others. Therefore, when evaluating learner

errors, observation should be made to see in which situation and variability the examinee was in.

On the basis of the native English judgement criteria, universal evaluation scales have to be developed and teachers should be made aware of such procedures and their significance in ELT world. In connection with this, Maharjan (2022) recommends that the native English speaking teachers' perception of errors should be rightly explored and accordingly evaluation scales be developed and the teachers be made aware of the universal rating scales of grammatical errors while evaluating learners' errors.

Further research can be carried out to explore the specific factors which contribute to gender bias in native English teachers' evaluation including the influence of cultural expectations, personal beliefs and training. Likewise, research can be carried out to develop neutral criteria for error identification and remediation could further ensure fair evaluation for all students regardless of their perceived gender.

(The 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 'Learners' Errors and their Evaluation' published in Journal of NELTA, Vol. 14, No 1&2, 2009.)

References

- Ahmad, I., Raha, N. & Radzuan, R. (2015). EFL Teacher Perceptions of Error Correction in Grammar Teaching: A Case Study. *International Journal of Language Education and Applied Linguistics*, 3, 37-50. <https://doi.org/10.15282/ijleal.v3.474>
- 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>
- Doel, R. van den. (2006). How friendly are the natives?: An evaluation of native-speaker judgements of foreign-accented British and American English. <https://dspace.library.uu.nl/bitstream/handle/1874/13381/Doel-13-completetext.pdf>
- Hudson, J. B. (1992). *Gender differences in evaluation styles* (Publication No.2310). [Masters thesis, Eastern Illinois University]. The Keep.
- 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. [https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2020\(V-I\).32](https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2020(V-I).32).

- Kiczkowiak, M. (2014, July 18). *Native English-speaking teachers: always the right choice?* British Council. <https://www.britishcouncil.org/voices-magazine/native-english-speaking-teachers-always-right-choice>
- Kim, K. J. (2007). Error Perceptions of Native and Nonnative English-speaking Writing Teachers. *English Teaching*, 62(4), 221-239. http://journal.kate.or.kr/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/kate_62_4_10.pdf
- Maharjan, L. (2022). Teachers of English and their Perceptions towards ESL Errors. *Mangal Research Journal*, 2, 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.3126/mrj.v3i1>.
- Mengel, F., Sauermann, J. & Zölitz, U. (2017). Gender Bias in Teaching Evaluations. <https://docs.iza.org/dp11000.pdf>
- Mohd Noh, M. F. & Mohd Matore, M. E. E. (2022). Rater severity differences in English language as a second language speaking assessment based on rating experience, training experience, and teaching experience through many-faceted Rasch measurement analysis. *Frontiers Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.941084>
- Rao, Z. & Li, X. (2017). Native and Non-native Teachers' Perceptions of Error Gravity: The Effects of Cultural and Educational Factors. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 26(1-2), 51-59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-017-0326-5>
- 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>
- Taqi, H. A., Al-Darwish, S. H., Akbar, R. S. & Al-Gharabali, N. A. (2015). Choosing an English teacher: The influence of gender on the students' choice of language teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 8(12), 182-190. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v8n12p182>
- Wardana, I. K. (2023). Exploring EFL students' perceptions and perspectives among different genders on native English teachers' feedback. *Journal on English as a Foreign Language*, 13(2), 628-656. <https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v13i2.6474>