



CORRECTING WRITING ERRORS: GREEK PRIMARY SCHOOL TEACHERS' ATTITUDES AND THEIR TEACHING PRACTICES

Vasiliki Marmouta¹ⁱ,
Georgios D. Kapsalis²,
Alexandra Galani²

¹Primary School Teacher,
Greece

²Department of Primary Education,
University of Ioannina,
Greece

Abstract:

In modern theories of student assessment, errors are seen as a “learning tool”, since they are considered an integral part of the learning process, which creates opportunities for fruitful discussions, reflection and a critical dialogue not only between teachers and students but also amongst students themselves. In this paper, we focus on writing errors, aiming to explore how Greek primary school teachers view these errors and how they correct them. The analysis of the data, which were collected through the distribution of a questionnaire and classroom observations, led to the following results. First and foremost, the majority of the teachers evaluated the correction of their students’ errors as a process of great necessity and importance. Moreover, most participants responded that they prefer to correct some errors only –and in no case all of them, so that their students are not discouraged– but they do not focus on specific types of errors. Despite the fact that they prefer their students to correct their own work, the observation data analysis revealed that error correction is performed by the teachers. Regarding the ways errors are corrected, it was found that explicit correction techniques are mainly used. Finally, the teachers choose either to provide general feedback on the students’ work or to personalise the feedback and analyse the errors each student made.

Keywords: writing errors, primary school teachers, attitudes, teaching practices

1. Introduction

A student’s success is determined primarily by their performance in the use of written language and secondarily by that in oral language. The importance attributed to written language is evident from the fact that a student’s progress is measured almost exclusively

ⁱ Correspondence: email vasilikhmarmouta@gmail.com

by their performance in written assessment, which accompanies them from their enrollment in Primary Education all the way up to their admission into Higher Education (Papadopoulou, 2005). It is therefore expected that writing errors are identified and corrected more frequently and with greater strictness than oral mistakes. In the former case, we also observe difficulties and errors which are related to the text form and its content. Writing errors have been –and still are– at the center of research studies, as their identification and analysis contribute to an understanding of the ways students compose their texts. Moreover, these errors are considered indicators of the students' linguistic competence, and they should be examined, as they often influence students' attitudes towards writing (Karakoli, 2016). In this paper, we focus on writing errors, aiming to explore how Greek primary school teachers view these errors and how they correct them.ⁱⁱ

2. Literature Review

A concept which is closely linked to the way teachers view and treat student errors is the perceived error climate or error culture (Tulis, 2013; Steuer *et al.*, 2013). In a positive error culture, teachers' attitudes towards student errors are likewise positive. In such a learning environment, every kind of deviation is considered not only acceptable but also desirable, as it provides opportunities and stimuli for reflection and discussion (Tulis, 2013; Firwana, 2010). On the other hand, in a negative error culture, teachers' attitudes and beliefs towards errors are expected to be equally negative (Tulis, 2013). In this case, errors are treated both by teachers and students as indicators of ineffectiveness and insufficient skills or abilities and, at the same time, as obstacles to the learning process and they should be, therefore, avoided and ignored, since error correction is a particularly negative process for both students and teachers (Tulis, 2013; Firwana, 2010; Leighton *et al.*, 2015).

Undoubtedly, teachers' attitudes and beliefs about student errors guide their behaviour and practices in line with which they eventually manage those errors (Tulis, 2013). More specifically, the corrective practices teachers adopt are mostly related to errors identified in students' written work. According to the literature, there are various error correction techniques which can be classified into categories on the basis of specific criteria, as discussed in what follows (Ellis, 2009; Zarkogianni, 2016; Iseni, 2011; Valero *et al.*, 2008; Tafani, 2009).

A. Correction Techniques Based on the Degree of Focus Paid on Specific Types of Writing Errors

According to this criterion, we can distinguish two types of correction techniques: comprehensive correction and selective correction. Comprehensive correction is

ⁱⁱ See Marmouta *et al.* (2025) for an investigation of the attitudes and the teaching practices of Greek primary school teachers towards students' oral errors. The same methodological approach is employed in the present paper.

provided by teachers who correct all errors they identify in their students' written work. This is the most traditional method adopted for error correction, which has been, nevertheless, strongly criticised. First of all, comprehensive correction tends to discourage students, especially when many errors have been made and their work is highly marked with corrections. As a result, students may be confused as to which errors they need to focus on. At the same time, this process can also be particularly time-consuming and exhausting for teachers who need to correct every single error, regardless of whether it is essential or not. Additionally, given time pressure, teachers' work often turns out to be ineffective (Zarkogianni, 2016; Valero *et al.*, 2008; Tafani, 2009; Ellis, 2009; Lee, 2003).

Selective correction, on the other hand, does not involve correcting all errors but rather focuses on specific types of errors, depending on the level (grammar, vocabulary, etc.) that teachers choose to focus on each time. It is a practical approach with clear advantages over comprehensive correction. Students can concentrate on specific types of errors, comprehend them and manage them in a more effective way (Zarkogianni, 2016; Valero *et al.*, 2008; Tafani, 2009; Ellis, 2009; Lee, 2003).

B. Correction Techniques Based on the Way the Error Is Marked and Corrected

According to this criterion, correction may be direct (teachers explicitly correct the students' errors by providing the correct answer) or indirect (teachers do not explicitly correct the errors, but instead they guide their students –through hints and suggestions– so that they correct them themselves) (Zarkogianni, 2016). In case teachers decide to correct the errors directly, they may correct them in the following ways: by deleting the unnecessary word or phrase, by inserting the word or phrase that has been omitted or by providing the correct one (Bitchener & Knoch, 2009; Bitchener, 2008). Direct correction is mainly associated with the traditional learning model and the teacher-centered process, as correction is considered a teacher's exclusive right and obligation (Ampati & Katsarou, 2015).

On the other hand, in indirect correction, teachers do not explicitly correct the error but instead they guide their students through specific practices; students first identify the errors, then move on to understanding them and finally correct them. Teachers use symbols and indications to draw their students' attention to their errors –they do not mark them explicitly (Bitchener, 2008). Using correction codes for indirect error marking is a method with multiple benefits for the learning process. First of all, using symbols helps teachers during the correction process. At the same time, indirect correction is often seen as more effective than direct correction because it encourages students to take initiative and practice self-correction (Ferdouse, 2013; Kubota, 2001; Makino, 1993). Thus, the use of this technique makes the correction process less intimidating for students (compared to a paper full of red marks) (Harmer, 2007), while it also strengthens their self-confidence during the learning process (Riddell, 2011).

C. Correction Techniques Based on the Degree of Student Participation in Error Correction

Depending on the role students assume during the correction of their work, different corrective practices may emerge. When correcting students' work, teachers identify the errors and choose whether to intervene directly or indirectly, either by correcting the errors themselves or by giving hints that guide students towards self-correction. Consequently, teachers essentially coordinate the correction process, as they guide their students through the process of recognising, processing and correcting their errors (Zarkogianni, 2016).

As the level of teacher assistance decreases, student participation in the correction process gradually increases. When the responsibility for correcting errors shifts from teachers to students, it may take the form of group correction –where students are divided into groups, and each group corrects the work of another– or peer correction –where students work in pairs, and each pair corrects the other pair's work (Zarkogianni, 2016).

Both group and peer correction serve as preparatory stages in the correction process, during which students become more autonomous and gradually take full responsibility for correcting their own errors. The technique of self-correction is considered an essential part of the learning process, since students are ultimately led to self-assessment through the cultivation of critical thinking and reflection (Rapti, 2002; Tafani, 2009). Self-correction becomes effective once both teachers and students are familiar with the error-correction process: teachers need to practise providing opportunities for student participation and correction, while students need to become accustomed to applying this technique themselves (Valero *et al.*, 2008).

Despite the evident advantages of both peer and self-correction for the learning process, these techniques do not appear to be universally accepted. Their principal drawback is that they are time-consuming, as students are required to focus on the identification, analysis and correction of these mistakes. Moreover, students frequently struggle to recognise their errors, particularly when these arise from knowledge gaps or weaknesses. Finally, with regard to peer correction, it is argued that students –due to a lack of confidence in their peers' abilities or competence– often feel exposed and ultimately turn to the teacher for error correction (Ganji, 2009; Diab, 2010; Mahmoud, 2010).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design - Research Objectives

The study investigates three key areas: how Greek primary teachers perceive students' writing mistakes, how they handle and address such errors in their classrooms and how these beliefs align with the instructional choices they make.ⁱⁱⁱ In order to address the afore-

ⁱⁱⁱ See Marmouta et al. (2025), as previously mentioned.

mentioned research questions, quantitative data were collected through an attitudinal questionnaire (Athanasiou, 2007) and structured class observations. The combination of these two data collection methods (see also Marmouta *et al.*, 2025) allows us to determine whether the teachers' attitudes are consistent with the corrective practices they adopt in class when they correct their students' work.

3.2 Research Tools - The Sample

For the design of the questionnaire, weighted instruments which appear in prior research (Dinas *et al.*, 2006; Firwana, 2010; Leighton *et al.*, 2015; Salteh & Sadeghi, 2015; Zarkogianni, 2016) were incorporated, and the tool was further refined through additional adjustments (Creswell, 2026). Participants were invited to respond to 6 Likert scale close-ended questions. For the class observations, we used a predefined coding scheme (Robson, 2010) to record the teaching techniques teachers adopt to correct any errors in their students' written work. The observation protocol was based on the teaching practices discussed in section 2. The questionnaire was completed by 516 (N=516) teachers, selected through random sampling. The sample size resulted from a previous pilot study. Finally, in the observations, 40 Greek primary school teachers, who taught in Grades four, five and six, were selected through convenience sampling.

3.3 Data Collection - Statistical Analysis

Quantitative data were gathered between September and December 2020. At first, hard-copy questionnaires were delivered to primary schools across the Prefectures of Ioannina, Thesprotia, Arta, Preveza, and Etoloakarnania in Greece. For schools that could not be visited, the questionnaire was distributed electronically via email. Classroom observations followed later, taking place from March to June 2021. These observations were conducted through non-participant methods, with the researcher solely watching and documenting events without interacting with the classroom environment or activities (Verma & Mallick, 2004; Athanasiou, 2007; Creswell, 2016; Mills *et al.*, 2017). Questionnaire responses and observation notes were first extracted and organised in Microsoft Excel 2019, then coded and statistically processed using SPSS version 26.0.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Data Results: Questionnaires

The questionnaire data reveal that the correction of students' writing errors is considered very necessary (52,47%) by the teachers. As far as the number of errors they correct, 63,34% of the participants show a preference for addressing certain kinds of mistakes over others, thus favouring selective correction (while only 36,66% claimed that they correct all the errors they identify in their students' work). The results to these questions are presented in detail in Table 1.

Table 1: Teachers' perspectives on how writing mistakes should be corrected

How necessary is the correction of the students' writing errors?					
	Not at all	A little	Moderately	Very	Extremely
(%)	2 (0,39%)	7 (1,38%)	32 (6,31%)	266 (52,47%)	200 (39,45%)
Do you correct all the errors you identify in your students' work or do you prefer to focus on certain types of mistakes according to the lesson's aims and objectives?					
	All errors		Specific errors		
(%)	180 (36,66%)		311 (63,34%)		

Table 2 presents the findings concerning teachers' self-reported levels of correction across various categories of writing errors. Overall, most teachers indicate that they address all error types with similarly high levels of attention: phonological errors (40,86%), stress errors (40,35%), spelling errors (43,50%), morphological errors (45,91%), syntactic errors (49,22%), lexical-semantic errors (49,51%), expressive errors (50,00%), errors in the use of punctuation marks (43,39%), errors in the alternation of lowercase and uppercase letters (44,03%) and, finally, content errors (47,17%).

Table 2: Types of writing errors teachers correct

To what extent do you provide correction for each of the writing errors shown below?					
Errors	Not at all (%)	To a small extent (%)	To a moderate extent (%)	To a large extent (%)	To an absolute extent (%)
Phonological	13 (2,55%)	52 (10,22%)	138 (27,11%)	208 (40,86%)	98 (19,25%)
Stress	4 (0,78%)	40 (7,80%)	111 (21,64%)	207 (40,35%)	151 (29,43%)
Spelling	1 (0,19%)	14 (2,72%)	71 (13,79%)	224 (43,5%)	205 (39,81%)
Punctuation marks	3 (0,58%)	18 (3,50%)	126 (24,51%)	223 (43,39%)	144 (28,02%)
Lower/Uppercase letters	1 (0,20%)	15 (2,94%)	52 (10,18%)	225 (44,03%)	218 (42,66%)
Morphological	1 (0,19%)	8 (1,56%)	67 (13,04%)	236 (45,91%)	202 (39,3%)
Syntactic	1 (0,19%)	13 (2,53%)	75 (14,59%)	253 (49,22%)	172 (33,46%)
Lexical-Semantic	2 (0,39%)	15 (2,92%)	111 (21,64%)	254 (49,51%)	131 (25,54%)
Expressive	1 (0,19%)	15 (2,92%)	107 (20,82%)	257 (50%)	134 (26,07%)
Content	2 (0,39%)	23 (4,48%)	118 (23%)	242 (47,17%)	128 (24,95%)

The extent to which students participate in error correction was also investigated (Table 3). Findings show that teachers largely opt to handle the correction of students' errors themselves (36,19%) or to allow the students to correct them. In such instances, teachers often encourage students to take responsibility for correcting their own writing (54,47%) or first allow students to correct their work and then check it themselves (49,03%). Peer and group correction appear to be used to a much lesser extent, since only 3,70% of the teachers encourage students to review and correct a peer's work collaboratively in pairs and 2,92% in groups.

Table 3: Teachers' attitudes towards the participation of students in error correction

How often do your students also participate in the correction of their writing errors?					
Correction technique	Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Sometimes (%)	Often (%)	Always (%)
Only the teacher	27 (5,25%)	68 (13,23%)	179 (34,82%)	186 (36,19%)	54 (10,51%)
Only the student	7 (1,36%)	36 (7,00%)	154 (29,96%)	280 (54,47%)	37 (7,20%)
First the student, then the teacher	8 (1,56%)	49 (9,53%)	139 (27,04%)	252 (49,03%)	66 (12,84%)
The students in pairs	50 (9,73%)	102 (19,84%)	190 (36,96%)	153 (29,77%)	19 (3,70%)
The students in groups	89 (17,35%)	144 (28,07%)	154 (30,02%)	111 (21,64%)	15 (2,92%)

The frequency with which teachers use different forms of explicit and implicit correction in students' writing errors is shown in Table 4. According to the findings, most teachers often: a) correct the error within the word itself (37,06%), b) write the correct form next to or above the incorrect one (39,49%), c) underline the error and write the correct form beside it (40,71%) and d) underline the error and write the correct form beside it along with comments (36,17%). Less frequently ("Sometimes") teachers tend to: a) cross out the error and write the correct form next to it (25,69%), b) underline the error (28,77%), c) underline the error and indicate the correct form with an arrow (33,07%) and d) underline the error and add a correction instruction beside it (35,49%). Most respondents reported that they never apply the following practices when correcting their students' work: a) deleting the error (53,83%), b) underlining the error and indicating its type (e.g., S=spelling, E=expression) (34,25%), c) underlining the entire sentence containing the error (51,96%), d) providing no correction and only general comments at the end of the text (47,36%) and e) providing no correction with only the initials at the end of the text (79,10%). Finally, regardless of the specific errors marked in the text, the majority of the participants stated that they always include general comments on the overall quality of the written work (35,94%).

Table 4: Teachers' perspectives on explicit and implicit correction

How often do you apply the correction techniques listed below?					
Practices	Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Sometimes (%)	Often (%)	Never (%)
I correct the error within the word.	44 (8,63%)	77 (15,10%)	150 (29,41%)	189 (37,06%)	50 (9,80%)
I write the correct form next to/above the incorrect one.	15 (2,95%)	55 (10,81%)	171 (33,60%)	201 (39,49%)	67 (13,16%)
I cross out the error.	274 (53,83%)	141 (27,70%)	64 (12,57%)	29 (5,70%)	1 (0,20%)
I cross out the error and write the correct form beside it.	116 (22,75%)	112 (21,96%)	131 (25,69%)	115 (22,55%)	36 (7,06%)
I underline the error.	112 (21,92%)	94 (18,40%)	147 (28,77%)	136 (26,61%)	22 (4,31%)
I underline the error and write the correct form beside it.	27 (5,34%)	62 (12,25%)	164 (32,41%)	206 (40,71%)	47 (9,29%)
I underline the error and write the correct form beside it along with comments.	34 (6,72%)	85 (16,80%)	162 (32,02%)	183 (36,17%)	42 (8,30%)

I underline the error, and I indicate the correct form with an arrow.	79 (15,55%)	130 (25,59%)	168 (33,07%)	110 (21,65%)	21 (4,13%)
I underline the error and add a correction instruction beside it.	60 (11,76%)	90 (17,65%)	181 (35,49%)	154 (30,20%)	25 (4,90%)
I underline the error and indicate the type of error.	175 (34,25%)	133 (26,03%)	106 (20,74%)	78 (15,26%)	19 (3,72%)
I underline the entire sentence containing the error.	265 (51,96%)	120 (23,53%)	85 (16,67%)	34 (6,67%)	6 (1,18%)
I write general comments about the text at the end.	17 (3,32%)	47 (9,18%)	98 (19,14%)	166 (32,42%)	184 (35,94%)
I don't correct errors. I only write general comments.	242 (47,36%)	163 (31,90%)	72 (14,09%)	29 (5,68%)	5 (0,98%)
I don't correct errors. I only write my initials at the end.	405 (79,10%)	61 (11,91%)	34 (6,64%)	10 (1,95%)	2 (0,39%)

Finally, after correcting their students' written work, the participants employ various practices when returning the work to them (Table 5). More specifically and according to their questionnaire responses, 47,55% of the participants stated that they never return papers without providing additional comments and an analysis of the errors students have made. Moreover, the majority of the teachers a) make general comments on the overall quality of the written work (38,39%), b) highlight errors that appear frequently across students' papers (49,71%), c) comment on selected papers and analyse random errors (32,75%) and d) analyse each student's errors individually and point out the weaknesses in their written work (37,74%).

Table 5: Teachers' attitudes towards the practices they employ when returning students' corrected work

Once you correct your students' work, how often do you employ the following practices when you return the work to them?					
Practices	Never (%)	Rarely (%)	Sometimes (%)	Often (%)	Never (%)
Return the work with no additional comments and an analysis of the errors.	243 (47,55%)	160 (31,31%)	78 (15,26%)	26 (5,09%)	4 (0,78%)
General remarks on the overall quality of the written work.	34 (6,69%)	67 (13,19%)	154 (30,31%)	195 (38,39%)	58 (11,42%)
Highlight common errors found across students' work.	16 (3,12%)	37 (7,21%)	122 (23,78%)	255 (49,71%)	83 (16,18%)
Comments on selected papers and analysis of random errors.	49 (9,55%)	103 (20,08%)	172 (33,53%)	168 (32,75%)	21 (4,09%)
Individual analysis of each student's work with emphasis on the weaknesses.	34 (6,61%)	54 (10,51%)	133 (25,88%)	194 (37,74%)	99 (19,26%)

4.2 Data Results: Observations

During the observations, a total of 3,421 errors were recorded and classified into the following categories, as shown in Table 6. The most frequently observed errors were related to the use of punctuation marks (24,6%). Stress-related errors (21,8%) and spelling errors (20,6%) were also common, though to a slightly lesser extent. Content errors accounted for 12,5%, while all other types of errors (phonological, morphological,

syntactic, lexical, expressive errors and errors in the alternation of lowercase and uppercase letters) appeared at rates up to 6%.

Table 6: Frequency of students' writing errors across error types

Errors	Frequency	%
Phonological	202	5,9%
Stress	745	21,8%
Spelling	705	20,6%
Morphological	51	1,5%
Syntactic	134	3,9%
Lexical-Semantic	133	3,9%
Expressive	75	2,2%
Content	429	12,5%
Punctuation marks	840	24,6%
Lower/Uppercase letters	107	3,1%
Total	3.421	100,0%

Out of the total 3.421 errors which were recorded during the observations, 1.122 were corrected by the teachers, a number corresponding to 32,8% of the total errors made (see Table 7).

Table 7: Frequency of students' writing errors across teachers' corrections

	Errors corrected	
	Frequency	%
No	2299	67,2%
Yes	1122	32,8%
Total	3421	100,0

The percentage of the errors that were corrected according to their type is presented in Table 8. The exact percentages are listed by category; according to the Pearson Chi-Square test, the proportion of the corrected errors was not constant but depended on the type of error observed ($p < 0.001$). More specifically, spelling errors (77,2%) were most frequently corrected by teachers, while errors related to the alternation of lowercase and uppercase letters were also corrected at a similarly high rate (66,4%). Content errors were corrected at a rate of 36,6%, followed by syntactic errors (35,1%) and lexical errors (32,3%). The remaining types of errors (phonological, stress, morphological, expressive and punctuation) were corrected less frequently, at rates below 25%. When these findings are considered alongside those in Table 7, it becomes clear that, among the errors most commonly made by students, spelling errors are corrected most often by teachers.

Table 8: Distribution of students' writing errors according to their correction frequency

Errors	Corrected: No		Corrected: Yes	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Phonological	160	79,2%	42	20,8%
Stress	662	88,9%	83	11,1%
Spelling	161	22,8%	544	77,2%
Morphological	42	82,4%	9	17,6%
Syntactic	87	64,9%	47	35,1%
Lexical-Semantic	90	67,7%	43	32,3%
Expressive	57	76,0%	18	24,0%
Content	272	63,4%	157	36,6%
Punctuation marks	732	87,1%	108	12,9%
Lower/Uppercase letters	36	33,6%	71	66,4%

The techniques teachers use to correct their students' writings –based on the observational data– are presented in Table 9. It should be noted that, in several cases, more than one technique was recorded; therefore, the number of techniques reported (1.383) exceeds the number of errors (1.122). This is reflected in the “percent of cases” column in Table 9, where the total percentage of the recorded techniques amounts to a total of 123,4% of all errors. Overall, the most frequently used technique for correcting students' writing errors was internal substitution (i.e., correcting the error within the word), which was applied in 42,7% of all errors, followed by addition, at a considerably lower rate (23%), though. Moreover, teachers also used external substitution (correcting the error outside the word) at a rate of 18,9%, underlining at a rate of 15,2% and deletion at 10,9%. The technique of commenting appeared less frequently (6,9%), while the remaining techniques (underlining the entire sentence containing the error, omission, indication, instruction) were applied only minimally, with their combined percentage not exceeding 3%.

Table 9: Distribution of techniques for the correction of students' writing errors

Technique	Responses		% of Cases
	N	%	
Underlining the error	170	12,3%	15,2%
Underlining the sentence containing the error	6	0,4%	0,5%
Internal substitution	479	34,6%	42,7%
External substitution	212	15,3%	18,9%
Addition	258	18,7%	23,0%
Deletion	122	8,8%	10,9%
Omission	25	1,8%	2,2%
Comments	77	5,6%	6,9%
Indication	31	2,2%	2,8%
Instruction	3	0,2%	0,3%
Total	1383	100,0%	123,4%

Finally, we examined those cases in which teachers provided some sort of overall feedback to their students regarding their writings (Table 10).

Table 10: Distribution of practices when providing overall feedback regarding the students' written work

Practices	Responses		% of Cases
	N	%	
General comments	13	28,9%	59,1%
Characterisation (e.g., "Excellent")	14	31,1%	63,6%
Add a symbol at the end of the paper	6	13,3%	27,3%
Add the teacher's initials at the end of the paper	12	26,7%	54,5%
Total	45	100,0%	204,5%

The findings indicate that teachers employ several practices when they provide overall feedback. They wrote a general comment/characterisation (e.g., "Excellent", "Well done") at the end of the paper based on the overall quality of the student's work (63,3%). They also provided general comments on the paper (59,1%). At a similarly high level, instead of writing comments, teachers simply added their initials at the end of the paper (54,5%). A smaller percentage (27,3%) marked the students' papers with a symbol to indicate that the work had been checked. Finally, it is worth noting that, in many cases, teachers used combinations of the feedback practices, resulting in more than one practice being recorded for the same paper (this is reflected in the "% of Cases" column in Table 10): the total percentage of techniques applied amounts to 204,5% of all papers for which feedback was provided.

5. Conclusion

The questionnaire results reveal that most participants view the correction of writing errors as both essential and beneficial. This finding is consistent with previous research in both international and Greek literature (Ellis, 2009; Zarkogianni, 2016).

Regarding the types of writing errors, the participants reported that they tend to address various categories of errors at roughly equal rates. The observational data largely confirm this tendency, highlighting the importance teachers attribute to form-related and content-related errors. However, less emphasis appears to be placed on correcting spelling errors and errors involving the alternation of lowercase and uppercase letters.

As for the number of errors corrected, the majority of the teachers clearly favoured selective correction both at a theoretical and practical level, as only a portion of the errors identified in the students' work was corrected. This preference for selective correction does not fully align with previous studies, where teachers were divided between comprehensive and selective correction, making it difficult to establish a position on how many errors should be corrected (Dinas *et al.*, 2006; Amrhein & Nassaji, 2010; Diab, 2010). Most teachers stated that they heavily rely on self-correction (correction by the students) and teacher correction, while peer correction (correction by a classmate) is less frequently preferred. Nevertheless, the observational data indicate that the teacher is the primary agent responsible for correcting the students' work.

As for the correction techniques based on the way the error is marked and corrected (direct/indirect) and the teachers' practices in class, the participants reported that they mainly prefer explicit techniques of correction and feedback (e.g., providing the correct form, adding or crossing out the missing letter or word, underlining the error, etc.). This preference is further supported by the observational findings. It is also confirmed in previous studies (Goulas, 2010; Zarkogianni, 2016; Salteh & Sadeghi, 2015), where teachers stated that they prefer and apply direct feedback on writing errors. However, other studies report a preference for indirect correction (i.e., marking the error through hints and indications) as shown in Amrhein & Nassaji (2010), Salteh & Sadeghi (2015) and Diab (2010).

Moreover, as far as the overall feedback provided to the students is concerned, most teachers reported that they consistently write general comments on the overall quality of the text, regardless of the specific errors marked. The observational data largely confirm this finding, as teachers provided comments to a substantial portion of the students' papers. They also frequently wrote comments (e.g., "Excellent," "Well done") or added their initials at the end of the paper.

When teachers return the marked papers to the students, the majority of the participants stated that they either provide a general comment addressing the class's work and analyse the most common errors, or they individualise their feedback by commenting on each student's paper and highlighting the most significant errors identified.

The questionnaire data were juxtaposed with the observational evidence to explore how teachers' beliefs about students' writing errors align with the ways they actually correct them in class. The analysis revealed a marked consistency regarding a) the categories of writing errors they choose to correct, b) the explicit and implicit correction strategies they apply, and c) the forms of feedback they provide.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Authors

Dr. Vasiliki Marmouta received her PhD from the Department of Primary Education at the University of Ioannina. She is a primary school teacher. Her main research interests focus on the teaching of the subject of language, on errors in the use of the Greek language and on the production and evaluation of students' oral and written language.

Prof. Georgios D. Kapsalis is an Emeritus Professor in the Department of Primary Education at the University of Ioannina (Greece) and former Rector of the University. His main research interests are in language, children's literature and culture.

Dr. Alexandra Galani is a Senior Teaching Fellow in Greek as a foreign language in the Department of Primary Education at the University of Ioannina (Greece). Her main research interests are in morphology and its interfaces as well as in foreign language teaching and learning.

References

- Ampati, A. & Katsarou, Ch. (2015). Production of oral and written language. In D. Papadopoulou, E. Agathopoulou & K. Pouliou (Eds.), *Support of the function of reception classes: issues of language teaching*. Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. In Greek.
- Amrhein, H.R., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13, 95-127. <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ944129>
- Athanasiou, L. (2007). *Research methods and techniques on educational studies*. Efiria. In Greek.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2007.11.004>
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2009). The contribution of written corrective feedback to language development: a ten-month investigation. *Applied Linguistics*, 31, 193-214. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp016>
- Creswell, J. W. (2016). *Educational research* (N. Kouvarakou, Trans.). Ion.
- Diab, N.M. (2010). Effects of peer- versus self-editing on students' revision of language errors in revised drafts. *System*, 38, 85-95. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2009.12.008>
- Dinas, K., Ksanthopoulos, A., & Tsakiridou, E. (2006). Teaching the Greek language in the primary school... twenty years later. In *Studies of the Greek language, Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Philosophy School, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki* (pp. 356-367). In Greek.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63, 97-107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective feedback and teacher development. *L2 Journal*, 1(1), 3-18. <https://dx.doi.org/10.5070/l2.v1i1.9054>
- Ferdouse, F. (2013). Learning from mistakes: using correction code to improve student's writing skill in english composition class. *Stamford Journal of English*, 7, 62-86. DOI:10.3329/sje.v7i0.14463
- Firwana, S. S. (2010). *Impact of Palestinian EFL Teachers' Attitudes toward Oral Errors on Their Students' Attitudes and Choice of Error Treatment Strategies* [Doctoral dissertation, Boston College University]. <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/1398>
- Ganji, M. (2009). Teacher-correction, peer-correction and self-correction: Their impacts on Iranian Students' IELTS Essay Writing Performance. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 6, 117-139.
- Goulas, V. (2010). *Written language at school; teaching practices, pedagogy and ideology*. In Greek.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. Pearson Education Limited. Retrieved from <https://ia600407.us.archive.org/21/items/HowToTeachEnglish/How%20to%20Teach%20English%20Harmer%2C%20Jeremy.pdf>

- Iseni, A. (2011). Assessment, Testing and Correcting Students' Errors and Mistakes. *Language Testing in Asia*, 1, 60-90. DOI:[10.1186/2229-0443-1-3-60](https://doi.org/10.1186/2229-0443-1-3-60)
- Karakoli, E. (2016). *Error analysis in written language of Roma and Albanian-speaking students* [MA Thesis, University of Western Macedonia]. In Greek.
- Kubota, M. (2001). Error correction strategies used by learners of Japanese when revising a writing task. *System*, 29, 467-480. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X\(01\)00026-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00026-4)
- Lee, I. (2003). How do Hong Kong English teachers correct errors in writing? *Educational Journal*, 31 (1), 153-169. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/34570765/How_Do_Hong_Kong_English_Teachers_Correct_Errors_in_Writing
- Leighton, J.P., Tang, W., & Guo, Q. (2015). Developing and validating the attitudes towards mistakes inventory (ATMI): A Self-Report Measure. In Proceedings of the National Council on Measurement in Education. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Attitudes-Towards-Mistakes-1-Developing-and-the-%28-%29-Leighton/e510631dcb464a7c15959796437fb084902b8354?p2df>
- Mahmoud, A. (2010). Strategy-based peer assistance in EFL writing: an alternative to traditional peer correction. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2, 1987-1992. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.10.1987-1992>
- Marmouta, V., Kapsalis, G. D., & Galani, A. (2025). Greek primary school teachers' attitudes and teaching practices towards students' oral errors. *International Journal of Education*, 17(2), 26-46. <https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v17i2.22674>
- Mills, G. E., Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2017). *Educational Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Methods-Applications* (A. Fissa, M. Nikolaidou & Ch. Tsorida, Trans.). Propompos. In Greek.
- Papadopoulou, S. (2005). *Whole language in the teaching of language expression in primary education*. Tipothito-Giorgos Dardanos. In Greek.
- Rapti, M. (2002). *The mistakes of students and their role in the learning process*. Gutenberg. In Greek.
- Riddell, D. (2011). *Teaching English as a foreign language (Teach yourself Series)*. Hobber & Stoughton.
- Robson, C. (2010). *Real world research* (V. Ntalakou & K. Vasilikou, Trans). Gutenberg. In Greek.
- Salteh, M. A., & Sadeghi, K. (2015). Teachers' and students' attitudes toward error correction in L2 writing. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 12(3), 1-31. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2015.12.3.1.1>
- Steuer, G., Rosentritt-Brunn, G., & Dresel, M. (2013). Dealing with errors in mathematics classrooms: Structure and relevance of perceived error climate. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 38, 196-210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2013.03.002>
- Tafani, V. (2009). Correcting or not Errors and Mistakes. *LCPJ*, 2, 49-57.

- Tulis, M. (2013). Error management behavior in classrooms: Teachers' responses to student mistakes. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 33, 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2013.02.003>
- Valero, A.L., Fernandez, E.E., Iseni, A. & Clarkson, C.P. (2008). Teachers' attitudes towards correcting students' written errors and mistakes. *Porta Linguarum*, 10, 21-30. <https://dx.doi.org/10.30827/digibug.31777>
- Verma, G. K., & Mallick, K. (2004). *Educational research: theoretical approaches and techniques* (El. Griva, Trans). Tipothito-Giorgos Dardanos. In Greek.
- Zarkogianni, E. (2016). *Feedback through error correction in written speech; beliefs and practices of Greek Language Teachers in Lower Secondary Schools* [PhD thesis, University of Macedonia]. <http://dspace.lib.uom.gr/handle/2159/19436>. In Greek.