

The Extent to Which Female Arabic Language Teachers in Kuwait Use Dictation Correction Methods

Mohammed Ali Al-Khawaldeh*

Department of Curriculum & Instruction, Yarmouk University, Irbid, Jordan

Musaed Awad Al-Anzi

Ministry of Education, Kuwait

Abstract—This paper aimed at investigating the extent to which female Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use dictation correction methods and whether there are statistically significant differences due to the variables of the academic qualification and years of experience. To achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers developed a scale for dictation correction methods that consisted of 12 methods, which was administered to 380 female elementary school teachers in the Al-Jahra Governorate of Kuwait. The results of the study showed that the degree of teachers' use of correction methods (detailed, coded, indicative, common errors, selective, and self-correction) was high, whereas their use of correction methods (peer, good student, portfolio, observation cards, and family involvement) was moderate. Finally, the electronic correction method showed a low level of use. The results of the study indicated that there was no statistically significant difference in the degree to which the study sample used all dictation correction methods attributed to the academic qualification variable, except for the electronic correction, observation cards, and the portfolio methods, which were in favor of postgraduate. The results also showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the degree of use of all dictation correction methods, attributed to the years of experience variable. In light of the results of the study, several recommendations were made, the most notable of which was providing Arabic language teachers at the primary stage with methods of correcting dictation, especially modern ones.

Index Terms—Arabic language teachers, dictation, dictation correction methods

I. INTRODUCTION

Language is regarded as a symbol of civilization, a reflection of thought, planning, and identity. It holds a special place among its people, serving both as a medium of communication and as a means of understanding. In learning a language, it is essential to recognize four fundamental and interconnected skills that learners must master: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. According to Al-Hallaq (2018), language represents an integrated system of skills, divided into receptive skills—listening and reading—and productive skills—speaking and writing. Together, these skills culminate in linguistic communication, which has become the ultimate goal of language learning and teaching.

Writing is one of the most significant cognitive achievements of the human mind. It has preserved the heritage of nations, embodied history, and bridged the past with the present. It is a complex cognitive process, involving multiple interrelated aspects of content and form that occur almost simultaneously and are inherently challenging. This complexity stems from the transformation of ideas, meanings, and abstract mental images into written symbols (Khasawneh, 2008). Writing also entails a sequence of stages, beginning with the acquisition and organization of information into coherent ideas. The writer then employs language to articulate these ideas in a comprehensible way, progressing until the message is successfully conveyed to the reader (Kuhn & Udell, 2003).

Dictation is one of the linguistic practices that has been employed across successive eras. Its importance lies in helping students recognize and correct their linguistic errors, assessing their ability in terms of listening skills, comprehend a text read aloud to them, and training them to distinguish different sounds, in addition to fostering oral comprehension (Kavaliauskienė & Darginavičienė, 2009).

Dictation is also a tool for written composition and idea transmission, serving as a means of communication between individuals and groups. To learn to write and use it correctly, a learner must develop a set of abilities, including the ability to write letters, pronounce them, compose sentences, and express meanings and ideas effectively (Al-Dulaimi & Al-Waeli, 2005).

Training students in dictation and teaching them its rules in the correct way promotes accurate, error-free writing, thereby supporting their language acquisition. It enables them to construct words and sentences to express their thoughts and feelings, which contributes to their progress in other academic subjects by improving their comprehension of written

* Corresponding Author. Email: moh.alkhawaldeh@yu.edu.jo

material. An inability to read written material hinders their achievement in these subjects and negatively impacts their advancement in subsequent academic stages (Abu Faida, 2008).

Although dictation is very important, students nevertheless encounter numerous difficulties when writing, which can lead to dictation problems (Al-Hashemi, 2008). Factors such as the absence of objectivity in correcting dictation and insufficient attention to functional and practical training, as well as students' limited mastery of skills related to dictation, including reading, spelling, listening, and maintaining attention, contribute to these difficulties (Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 2001; Farhat, 1997).

In this context, the importance of linguistic assessment in language learning and teaching is emphasized. It aligns with the processes of learning and teaching language skills and reflects the structure of the language educational system, including its inputs, processes, and outputs. It is not limited to describing the current situation but also extends to diagnosis and intervention. Therefore, it should be given special attention to determine the extent to which desired outcomes are achieved and to make necessary decisions for development and improvement (Khawaldeh, 2012).

The educational importance of correction in any academic subject stems from the fact that informing the learner about the accuracy of their work ensures that the educational process proceeds correctly, while recognizing errors and striving to avoid them constitutes a form of corrective guidance (Atta, 1999).

Based on the above, the researchers conclude that dictation has an important place among language skills. Students cannot fully understand other educational subjects without mastering dictation and writing. Therefore, regularly evaluating students' performance in dictation is crucial, as it enables them to comprehend educational topics and effectively participate in various language learning activities.

A. Problem and Questions of the Study

Weakness in dictation is a widespread phenomenon across all stages of general education. The frequency and prevalence of dictation errors—particularly at the primary level—represent an issue that warrants research, especially regarding identifying, analyzing, and addressing such errors (Al-Dosari & Al-Subaie, 2020).

Due to the weak dictation performance among primary school students in Kuwait, as reflected in the reports of educational supervisors, parents' complaints, and teachers' observations, and given the importance of the correction process in enabling teachers to identify the nature and causes of dictation errors and work to address them, as well as the scarcity of studies that examined how Arabic language teachers identify, analyze, and correct such errors, and in light of Kuwait's efforts to facilitate dictation for young learners, the researchers were motivated to investigate the methods of dictation correction used by Arabic language teachers at the primary stage in Kuwait. Specifically, the present study sought to answer the following questions:

Q1: What is the extent to which female Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use dictation correction methods?

Q2: Is there a statistically significant difference in the extent to which female Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use dictation correction methods, attributed to the academic qualification?

Q3: Is there a statistically significant difference in the extent to which female Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use dictation correction methods, attributed to teaching experience?

B. Significance of the Study

The significance of this study lies in highlighting the key practices of Arabic language teachers at the primary stage. These practices help identify dictation errors, provide a model for effective correction methods for primary students, and motivate teachers to diversify their correction approaches. The findings can inform those responsible for teacher preparation programs in the Kuwaiti Ministry of Education about the importance of including these methods in their training programs.

C. Operational Definitions

The study included the following definitions:

Dictation: "The correct drawing of words, and the conversion of audible sounds into written words, provided that the letters are written in their correct positions in the word, for the integrity of the pronunciation, and the appearance of the intended meaning" (Sbitan, 2010, p. 63).

Dictation Correction Methods: The methods included in the study tool are indicative, coded, detailed, selective, common error, good student, peer, family involvement, electronic, observation cards, portfolio, and self-correction.

Arabic Teachers: Primary female Arabic teachers in the Jahra Governorate in Kuwait who teach grades from 1 to 5.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND PREVIOUS STUDIES

A. Dictation Correction Methods

Correcting dictation errors is crucial in training students in writing, as it helps both teachers and students identify and address errors. This allows students to recognize their progress, feel motivated by the work, and sense the teacher's interest in their efforts. Conversely, if errors are not corrected, students may perceive the teacher as inattentive, which diminishes their motivation and leads to neglect. Therefore, teachers should review all student work, provide continuous guidance, and address errors promptly to encourage progress (Zahran et al., 2019).

For dictation correction to be effective, the teacher should follow general principles in teaching dictation to help students correct dictation errors. It is the teacher's duty to help students overcome errors, foster self-motivation to correct errors, explain how dictation errors can distort the language, and provide opportunities to practice the same linguistic behaviors multiple times (Musa & Mohammed, 2001).

Maarouf (2007) believes that there are multiple methods for correcting students' dictation, each having its own purposes and advantages. It is preferable for the teacher not to rely on a single method; instead, the choice should vary according to the educational context and necessity.

In confirmation of the above, researchers have identified several methods used to evaluate and correct students' written assignments (Al-Kalbani, 2022; Jagdol, 2020; Al-Masry, 2006; Al-Waeli, 2004; Al-Sowayrki, 2011; Al-Nuaimi, 2005), including:

- **Direct Correction:** The teacher corrects dictation in front of students inside the classroom.
- **Indirect Correction:** The teacher corrects dictation outside the classroom.
- **Indicative Correction:** The teacher underlines the errors and asks students to correct them themselves.
- **Coded Correction:** The teacher marks dictation errors with symbols indicating the type of error, allowing students to correct them independently.
- **Detailed Correction:** The teacher writes the correct answer above the student's error in detail.
- **Selective Correction:** The teacher selects some students' notebooks, corrects them as examples, and displays them in the classroom.
- **Common Errors Correction:** The teacher discusses common errors with students and asks them to rewrite the incorrect words and sentences correctly.
- **Peer Correction:** Each student corrects a classmate's dictation.
- **Self-Correction:** Each student corrects their own dictation.
- **Good Student Correction:** Students who excel in dictation help correct their classmates' writing.
- **Family Involvement Correction:** Parents correct their children's writing, with the teacher providing appropriate feedback.
- **Portfolio:** The teacher records students' errors, provides corrections, and gathers them in a file to monitor performance improvement.
- **Observation Cards:** The teacher uses observation cards to identify the difficulties students face and helps them overcome these challenges.

Based on the above, the researchers conclude that the methods for evaluating and correcting written work are diverse, and the teachers must select the method or approach that best suits the educational situation and the number of students in the class. The researchers utilized these methods in developing the study tool to determine the extent to which primary-stage Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use these methods.

B. Previous Studies

Only a limited number of studies have examined dictation correction methods specifically in the context of Arabic language teaching at the primary stage. However, several related studies have explored dictation practices in broader language-learning contexts, providing useful insights for the present study. Cheng et al. (2004) conducted a study in Canada that aimed at comparing methods for evaluating language skills among English language teachers. The results showed that teachers use four methods—student journal, portfolio, self-assessment, and peer assessment—at different levels. The student journal is used to a greater extent in Canada than in Hong Kong and Beijing, and a large percentage of teachers in Canada and Hong Kong use the portfolio more than in Beijing, with little difference between them in the use of self-assessment and peer assessment methods.

Ketabi (2015) conducted a study in Iran that aimed to reveal methods for evaluating the writing skills among teachers of adult and young adult learners and whether there is a statistically significant difference in their use of evaluation methods depending on the stage they teach. The results of the study showed that writing essays and dictation are the most common methods for evaluating writing skill, as perceived by teachers, for young and older students, respectively. Alternative assessment methods (e.g., journals, portfolios, and peer/self-assessment) were the least commonly used methods.

In Congo, Nakam'dey (2017) conducted a descriptive desk study to search for methods of correcting spelling, through which he came up with several methods, namely, the mimicry-memorization method, the props method, the self-correction method, the peer correction method, the teacher-student correction method, and the question-and-answer style.

The study by Galeano et al. (2020) in Ecuador aimed to reveal methods for correcting the writing skills of English language learners and to describe their benefits. The results of the study showed that teachers use several correction methods—peer correction, self-correction, and coded correction—which allow learners to improve their writing and learning of the English language.

Al-Dosari and Al-Subaie (2020) conducted a study aimed at revealing the degree of Arabic language teachers' practices in dealing with spelling errors among primary school students in Egypt. The results showed that the degree of Arabic teachers' practices in identifying, discovering, analyzing, and treating spelling errors among primary school students was moderate.

In Indonesia, Ramadhani and Abdul Hadi (2021) carried out a study to explore error correction strategies used by English teachers for the tenth-grade students of Senior High School in Pekanbaru. The results showed that English teachers used self-correction, peer correction, and teacher correction in correcting students' writing. In teacher correction, they also used one-to-one correction and correction code to improve students' writing.

Al-Kalbani's (2022) study sought to determine the level of use of writing composition evaluation methodologies among Arabic teachers in the Sultanate of Oman. The study's findings revealed that the following approaches were moderately used: remedial, selective, coded, observation cards, indicative, good student, self-correction, portfolio, peers, observation cards, family involvement correction, and widely used direct individual, common errors, detailed, and performance. The results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the degree of teachers' use of written composition evaluation methods due to gender in all methods except for the indicative correction method in favor of males, and there was no statistically significant difference in the use of all methods based on teaching experience.

Recent studies on spelling correction highlight a clear shift toward neural and context-aware approaches. Liu et al. (2025a) focus on improving Chinese spelling correction through a fine-grained perspective in error classification. The authors note that traditional models often treat text globally without distinguishing between different types of errors, which reduces correction accuracy in complex cases such as contextual errors or multiple errors within a single sentence. To address this limitation, they proposed a framework that combines detailed error categorization with modern language models capable of understanding the context of a word within a sentence. The results demonstrate that this fine-grained approach enhances model effectiveness and improves correction accuracy, making it a valuable reference for developing modern AI-powered spelling correction systems.

Liu et al. (2025b) focus on improving Chinese spelling correction through a collaborative framework between a BERT-based corrector and a large model (LLM) verifier, called Automatic Corrector Iteration (ACI). In this framework, the corrector generates potential corrections, while the verifier checks their accuracy and suggests alternatives when necessary, and the verified results are then used to iteratively retrain the corrector. This process allows the model to progressively improve without requiring manually annotated data. Experiments show that this approach significantly enhances correction accuracy compared to traditional data augmentation methods and brings model performance close to levels achieved with human-annotated data, making it a promising method for developing intelligent, self-learning spelling correction systems.

Bijoy et al. (2025) focus on developing a spelling error correction framework for Bangla and other resource-scarce Indic languages using a Transformer-based model called DPCSpell. The framework consists of three main components: an error detector, a text purifier, and a final corrector, and it leverages a large custom dataset to cover the diversity of potential errors and compensate for limited resources. Experiments show that the model achieves very high accuracy, reaching approximately 95%, highlighting the effectiveness of Transformer-based neural approaches in low-resource languages and providing a promising model for building intelligent and reliable spelling correction systems.

It is clear from the previous studies that they aimed to reveal the methods of evaluating the learners' writing skills. Studies were conducted in multiple environments (Canada, Iran, Congo, Ecuador, Indonesia, Egypt, the Sultanate of Oman, China, and Bangladesh), and the current study benefited from these studies in its theoretical framework, methodology, and tool construction. The current study coincides with previous studies in the goal it sought, which is to reveal methods for correcting writing skills. However, what distinguished this study from other studies was its investigation into the degree to which female Arabic language teachers at the primary level in the State of Kuwait use spelling correction methods.

III. METHODOLOGY

A. Study Methodology

The study followed the descriptive survey method for its suitability to the research objectives.

B. Population and Sample of the Study

The study population consisted of all primary Arabic teachers in the Jahra Governorate in Kuwait. The study sample consisted of 380 female teachers, who were selected by the available method.

C. Data Collection Tool

To achieve the objectives of the study, the researchers prepared a dictation correction methods scale based on the literature review (Al-Khukun, 1983; Al-Hashemi, 1994; Hamadneh, 2010; Al-Kalbani, 2022; Jagdol, 2020; Cheng et al., 2004; Ketabi, 2015; Galeano et al., 2020; Ramadhani & Abdul Hadi, 2021). The final form of the scale consisted of 12 methods, namely, indicative, coded, detailed, selective, common errors, self-correction, good student, peer, family involvement, electronic correction, observation cards, and portfolio, followed by a clear description of each. The students' responses were analyzed using a five-point Likert scale ("Always," "Usually," "Sometimes," "Rarely," and "Never") with the numerical values of five, four, three, two, and one, respectively.

To examine the validity of the scale, a panel of educational experts reviewed it. The jury was asked to validate the content of the scale concerning its methods, appropriateness to the purposes of the present study, and language clarity.

The team's comments and recommendations were studied carefully and taken into account in amending the final version of the scale.

To verify the homogeneity of the sample's performance on the scale, internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha for the scale domains was conducted and ranged between 0.71 and 0.96. Furthermore, the test-retest reliability coefficient for the twelve methods ranged between 0.82 and 0.98, which are all considered high and applicable to measuring teachers' dictation correction methods.

D. Procedures of the Study

To carry out the study, the following procedures were followed:

- Determining the problem, questions, and objectives of the study.
- Reviewing previous studies related to the current study.
- Constructing the study tool (the scale) and verifying its validity and reliability.
- Selecting the sample using the available method from primary Arabic language teachers in the schools of Al-Jahra Governorate in Kuwait.
- Distributing copies of the scale to the study sample electronically via Google Form.
- Conducting appropriate statistical analyses, extracting results, and making the necessary recommendations.

E. Variables of the Study

In this study, the independent variables comprised academic qualification (viz., undergraduate, postgraduate) and teaching experience (viz., up to ten years, over ten years). On the other hand, the dependent variable is the extent of the teachers' use of dictation correction methods, as represented by the mean scores of the participants' responses to the scale.

F. Data Analyses

To answer the questions of the study, the means and standard deviations were calculated in addition to a paired samples t-test for independent samples.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Results Related to the First Question

To answer the first question, "What is the extent to which female Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use dictation correction methods?" the means, standard deviations, rank, and level of teachers' use of dictation correction methods were extracted. Table 1 shows the results:

TABLE 1
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF TEACHERS' USAGE OF DICTATION CORRECTION METHODS

| Correction Methods | Mean | Std. | Rank | Level of Usage |
|-------------------------------|------|------|------|----------------|
| Detailed Correction | 3.73 | 1.30 | 1 | High |
| Coded Correction | 3.67 | 1.27 | 2 | High |
| Indicative Correction | 3.59 | 1.23 | 3 | High |
| Common Error Correction | 3.55 | 1.31 | 4 | High |
| Selective Correction | 3.50 | 1.31 | 5 | High |
| Self-Correction | 3.45 | 1.49 | 6 | High |
| Peer Correction | 3.36 | 1.03 | 7 | Moderate |
| Good Student Correction | 3.25 | 1.28 | 8 | Moderate |
| Portfolio | 3.19 | 1.19 | 9 | Moderate |
| Observation Cards | 3.09 | 1.20 | 10 | Moderate |
| Family Involvement Correction | 2.74 | 1.48 | 11 | Moderate |
| Electronic Correction | 2.56 | 1.33 | 12 | Low |

Table 1 shows that the results of the descriptive statistics indicate that the mean scores of teachers' usage of dictation correction methods ranged from 2.56 to 3.73 with low to high levels of usage, as follows: the mean for Detailed Correction Mean was 3.73; the mean for Coded Correction was 3.67; the mean for Indicative Correction was 3.59; the mean for Common Error Correction was 3.55; the mean for Selective Correction was 3.50; the mean for Self-Correction was 3.45; the mean for Peer Correction was 3.36; the mean for Good student Correction was 3.25; the mean for Portfolio was 3.19, the mean for Observation Cards was 3.09; the mean for Family Involvement Correction was 2.74; and, the mean for Electronic Correction was 2.56.

The most widely used dictation correction methods—detailed, indicative, coded, common error, selective, and self-correction—are favored due to the distinct advantages each provides. The detailed method provides students with clear corrections for all their errors and encourages them to avoid repeating them. It is commonly used at the primary stage, despite placing stress on the teacher. In coded correction, students identify their errors using symbols, which helps develop their research and investigative skills, providing educational experiences that guide them toward correct choices and enable them to learn about different types of errors. Indicative correction encourages students to think critically, guide themselves toward the correct answers, and develop self-learning skills (Hamadna, 2010; Al-Waeli, 2004).

Selective correction and common error correction enable the teacher to address the common errors made by most students. This approach saves time and effort and helps manage the challenges of overcrowded classrooms (Al-Masry, 2006).

The self-correction method helps students develop careful observation, self-confidence, honesty, responsibility, self-awareness of errors, and self-learning skills, while encouraging active thinking. This is effective when the teacher monitors students during the process, ensuring they do not overlook their errors and can track their ability to identify and correct errors independently (Abu Mughli, 2007; Al-Baja, 2000).

Several factors may explain the moderate use of correction methods such as peer correction, good student correction, portfolios, observation cards, and family involvement. Although peer correction helps develop students' self-confidence and their ability to address others' errors, it has some drawbacks, such as fostering unnecessary competition by highlighting nonexistent errors, concealing actual errors, or showing a lack of accuracy and observation. Students may overlook many errors, and some may feel that the teacher does not fully trust them. Consequently, this affects the accuracy and effectiveness of correcting their classmates' dictation (Al-Baja, 2000; Zaqout, 1999).

The method of correcting through good student may cause other students to feel inferior to their high-achieving classmates, which can negatively affect teaching, assessment, and students' psychological well-being. Although family involvement correction is a modern approach that involves parents in the educational process, it may lead to subjectivity and a lack of objectivity in handling children's dictation errors. Furthermore, some families may not possess adequate knowledge of the dictation skills being taught.

The portfolio method allows teachers to assess students' progress, correct their writing, and provide feedback on their level of proficiency. However, its use may be limited by factors such as teachers' lack of awareness of its importance, heavy workloads, and overcrowded classrooms (Felbman, 2010; Abu Hussein, 2012). The method may be more suitable for adult learners than for young students, which aligns with Ketabi (2015), who found that English language teachers in Iran use portfolios more frequently with adult learners than with younger ones. Similarly, the use of observation cards also requires adequate training for effective classroom implementation (Felbman, 2010; Abu Hussein, 2012).

The limited use of the electronic correction method may be due to teachers' insufficient knowledge and background in this approach. This finding is partly consistent with Al-Kalbani (2022), who reported that Arabic language teachers frequently use detailed correction and correction of common errors, whereas their use of observation cards, portfolios, peer correction, family involvement correction, and good student correction was moderate. However, teachers' use of selective, indicative, coded, and self-correction methods was also found to be moderate. This result differs from Ketabi (2015), who found that English language teachers in Iran rarely use peer assessment and portfolios to evaluate learners' writing skills. It also contrasts with Cheng et al. (2004), whose study showed that a large percentage of teachers in Canada and Hong Kong extensively use portfolios to assess English language learners' writing skills.

Overall, these findings are consistent with Abu Sharkh (2016), who stated that "the methods for correcting writing are numerous and varied, and teachers must select the method that best suits the educational context, class size, task length, and the type of errors to be corrected" (p. 66).

B. Results Related to the Second Question

To answer the second question, "Is there a statistically significant difference in the extent to which female Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use dictation correction methods, attributed to the academic qualification?" a t-test for independent samples was used.

TABLE 2
RESULTS OF T-TEST ON THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS' QUALIFICATION ON DICTATION CORRECTION METHODS

| Methods | Categorical Variable | Mean | Std. | T-Value | df | P-Value |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|------|------|---------|-----|---------|
| Detailed Correction | Undergraduate | 3.68 | 1.39 | -1.068 | 378 | .286 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.84 | 1.06 | | | |
| Indicative Correction | Undergraduate | 3.55 | 1.32 | -.934 | 378 | .351 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.68 | 1.01 | | | |
| Coded Correction | Undergraduate | 3.69 | 1.40 | .458 | 378 | .647 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.62 | .92 | | | |
| Peer Correction | Undergraduate | 3.30 | 1.12 | -1.831 | 378 | .068 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.51 | .79 | | | |
| Good Student Correction | Undergraduate | 3.18 | 1.30 | -1.662 | 378 | .097 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.41 | 1.21 | | | |
| Self-Correction | Undergraduate | 3.40 | 1.55 | -1.012 | 378 | .312 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.57 | 1.33 | | | |
| Common Errors Correction | Undergraduate | 3.54 | 1.40 | .009 | 378 | .993 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.56 | 1.06 | | | |
| Selective Correction | Undergraduate | 3.48 | 1.43 | -.568 | 378 | .571 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.56 | 1.01 | | | |
| Family Involvement Correction | Undergraduate | 2.78 | 1.48 | .781 | 378 | .436 |
| | Postgraduate | 2.66 | 1.50 | | | |
| Electronic Correction | Undergraduate | 2.30 | 1.25 | -5.997 | 378 | .000 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.15 | 1.33 | | | |
| Observation Cards | Undergraduate | 3.01 | 1.22 | -2.084 | 378 | .038 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.28 | 1.13 | | | |
| Portfolio | Undergraduate | 3.09 | 1.23 | -2.474 | 378 | .014 |
| | Postgraduate | 3.41 | 1.09 | | | |

Table 2 shows a statistically significant difference between undergraduates and postgraduates in using the methods electronic correction ($t [338] = -5.997; P = 0.000$), observation card ($t [338] = -2.084; P = 0.038$), and portfolio ($t [338] = -2.474; P = 0.014$) in favor of postgraduates. In contrast, there is no statistically significant difference between undergraduates and postgraduates in using the other correction methods. This may be due to the fact that female Arabic language teachers at the primary level who have postgraduate academic qualifications may possess advanced skills that have enabled them to use relatively modern methods in correcting dictation errors, such as observation cards, portfolios, and electronic correction. This may also be due to the fact that they have undergone preparation and training required to use these methods while enrolling in graduate programs in educational disciplines at the university or through the teaching profession.

C. Results Related to the Third Question

To answer this question, "Is there a statistically significant difference in the extent to which female Arabic language teachers in Kuwait use dictation correction methods, attributed to teaching experience?" a t-test for independent samples was used.

TABLE 3
RESULTS OF T-TEST ON THE EFFECT OF TEACHERS' EXPERIENCE ON DICTATION CORRECTION METHODS

| Methods | Categorical Variable | Mean | Std. | T-Value | df | P-Value |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|------|------|---------|-----|---------|
| Detailed Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.72 | 1.21 | -.132 | 378 | .895 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.74 | 1.38 | | | |
| Indicative Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.64 | 1.26 | .770 | 378 | .441 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.55 | 1.21 | | | |
| Coded Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.73 | 1.22 | .874 | 378 | .383 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.61 | 1.32 | | | |
| Peer Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.39 | .97 | .489 | 378 | .625 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.34 | 1.08 | | | |
| Good Student Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.23 | 1.27 | -.362 | 378 | .718 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.27 | 1.29 | | | |
| Self- Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.32 | 1.44 | -1.620 | 378 | .106 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.57 | 1.52 | | | |
| Common Errors Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.53 | 1.22 | -.281 | 378 | .779 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.57 | 1.38 | | | |
| Selective Correction | Up to 10 years | 3.42 | 1.26 | -1.133 | 378 | .258 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.58 | 1.36 | | | |
| Family Involvement Correction | Up to 10 years | 2.66 | 1.50 | -1.008 | 378 | .314 |
| | Over 10 years | 2.82 | 1.47 | | | |
| Electronic Correction | Up to 10 years | 2.58 | 1.32 | .381 | 378 | .704 |
| | Over 10 years | 2.53 | 1.35 | | | |
| Observation Cards | Up to 10 years | 3.15 | 1.19 | .963 | 378 | .336 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.04 | 1.21 | | | |
| Portfolio | Up to 10 years | 3.17 | 1.22 | -.258 | 378 | .796 |
| | Over 10 years | 3.20 | 1.17 | | | |

Table 3 also shows that there were no statistically significant differences among the teachers in using all the correction methods according to their teaching experience. This may be attributed to the fact that primary female Arabic teachers were subjected to the same training in light of the educational development plan and professional development programs of the Kuwaiti Ministry of Education, and they received the same guidance from educational supervisors and educational administrations of all levels about correction dictation methods. This result is consistent with Al-Kalbani (2022), whose results showed that there is no statistically significant difference in the degree of Omani Arabic teachers using evaluating writing composition methods according to their teaching experience.

V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study showed that Kuwaiti females who teach Arabic mainly use traditional dictation correction methods, while modern ones, especially electronic correction, are rarely applied. Based on the findings of the current study, the researchers recommend the following: First, there should be a focus on the preparation and continuous professional development of female Arabic language teachers to enhance their knowledge and application of dictation correction methods, especially peer correction, good student correction, portfolio assessment, observation cards, family involvement, and electronic correction. Second, parents should be made aware of their children's language proficiency and should become actively engaged when addressing dictation errors. Finally, Arabic language teachers should be provided with training courses on dictation correction methods with an emphasis placed on diversifying practices to accommodate students' varying proficiency levels and error types.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abu Faida, H. (2008). *The effectiveness of a proposed program based on linguistic activities to treat common spelling errors among middle school students* [Master's thesis]. King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia.
- [2] Abu Hussein, W. (2012). Using E-portfolio as an alternative tool for assessing students with learning difficulties. *Journal of the Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University*, 4(36), 244-282.
- [3] Abu Mughli, S. (2007). *Modern methods of teaching Arabic*. Dar Majdalawi for Publishing & Distribution.
- [4] Abu Sharkh, A. (2016). *The effectiveness of a proposed strategy based on reading the picture to develop the written expression skills of third-grade students* [Master's thesis]. Islamic University, Palestine.
- [5] Al-Baja, A. (2000). *Basics of teaching the Arabic language between theory and practice in the lower basic stage*. Dar Al-Fikr for Publishing & Distribution.
- [6] Al-Dosari, H., & Al-Subaie, A. (2020). The reality of Arabic language teachers' practices in addressing spelling errors among primary school students in Al-Aflaj Governorate. *Scientific Journal of the Faculty of Education, Assiut University*, 38(1), 151-210.
- [7] Al-Dulaimi, T., & Al-Waeli, S. (2005). *The Arabic language: Its curricula and teaching methods*. Dar Al-Fikr for Publishing & Distribution.
- [8] Al-Hallaq, A. (2018). *Reference in teaching Arabic language skills and sciences*. Mu'assasat Al-Kitab Al-Hadith.
- [9] Al-Hashemi, A. (1994). *The impact of correction methods on the expressive performance of middle school students* [Doctoral dissertation]. University of Baghdad, Iraq.
- [10] Al-Hashemi, A. (2008). *Teaching syntax, dictation, and punctuation*. Dar Al-Manahij for Publishing & Distribution.
- [11] Al-Kalbani, A. (2022). *The degree of using methods of evaluating written composition from the point of view of Arabic language teachers in Al Dhahirah Governorate in the Sultanate of Oman* [Master's thesis]. University of Nizwa, Sultanate of Oman.
- [12] Al-Khukun, A. (1983). Correction method and its impact on students' dictation performance. *Dirasat Journal, Human Sciences*, 10(1), 81-109.
- [13] Al-Masry, Y. (2006). *The effectiveness of a multimedia program in developing and retaining written expression skills for eighth-grade students* [Master's thesis]. Islamic University, Palestine.
- [14] Al-Nuaimi, A. (2005). *Comprehensive teaching of the Arabic language*. Dar Osama for Publishing & Distribution.
- [15] Al-Sowayrki, M. (2011). Evaluation of the performance level of written expression among basic stage students in Jordan. *Journal of the Faculty of Arabic Language in Mansoura, Al-Azhar University*, 6(30), 639-685.
- [16] Al-Waeli, S. (2004). *Methods of teaching literature, rhetoric and expression between theory and application*. Dar Al-Shorouk for Publishing & Distribution.
- [17] Atta, I. (1999). *Methods of teaching Arabic language and religious education*. Egyptian Renaissance Library.
- [18] Bijoy, M. H., Hossain, N., Islam, S., & Shatabda, S. (2025). A transformer-based spelling error correction framework for Bangla and resource scarce Indic languages. *Computer Speech & Language*, 89, 101703.
- [19] Chandler, G. (2003). The efficiency of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of students' writing. *Journal of Second Learning Writing*, 12(3), 267-296.
- [20] Cheng, L., Rogers, T., & Hu, H. (2004). ESL/EFL instructors' classroom assessment practices: Purposes, methods, and procedures. *Language Testing*, 21(3), 360-389.
- [21] Farhat, M. (1997). *Writing rules*. Dar Osama for Publishing & Distribution.
- [22] Felbman, A. (2010). *The reality of Arabic language teachers using the portfolio in evaluating the linguistic performance of sixth-grade female students in Makkah Al-Mukarramah* [Master's thesis]. Umm Al-Qura University, Saudi Arabia.
- [23] Ferris, D. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Learning Writing*, 10(3), 161-184.
- [24] Galeano, F., Barriga Fray, L., Barriga Fray, J., & Cabezas Llerena, K. (2020). Analysis of error correction methods to improve writing skill. *Horizontes Revista de Investigación en Ciencias de la Educación*, 4(14), 118-126.

- [25] Hamadneh, A. (2010). The effect of correcting written expression on improving the expressive performance of secondary school students in the Mafraq Education Directorate. *Damascus University Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 26(3), 281-316.
- [26] Jagdol, I. (2020). Evaluation of writing skill in Morocco: The sixth year of primary education as a model. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 4(20), 118-135.
- [27] Kavaliauskienė, G., & Darginavičienė, I. (2009). Dictation in the ESP classroom: A tool to improve language proficiency. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 8(2), 1-10.
- [28] Ketabi, S. (2015). Different methods of assessing writing among EFL teachers in Iran. *International Journal of Research Studies in Language Learning*, 5(2), 3-15.
- [29] Khasawneh, R. (2008). *Basics of teaching creative writing*. Alam al-Kutub Al-Hadith.
- [30] Khawaldeh, A. (2012). *Linguistic assessment in writing and reflective thinking*. Dar Al-Hamid for Publishing & Distribution.
- [31] Kuhn, D., & Udell, W. (2003). The development of argument skills. *Child Development*, 74(5), 1245-1260.
- [32] Liu, L., Wu, H., & Zhao, H. (2025a). Driving Chinese spelling correction from a fine-grained perspective. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Computational Linguistics* (pp. 10727-10737).
- [33] Liu, L., Wu, H., & Zhao, H. (2025b). Evolving Chinese spelling correction with corrector-verifier collaboration. In *Proceedings of the 2025 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 29010-29016).
- [34] Maarouf, N. (2007). *Learning and teaching dictation in the Arabic language*. Dar Kunooz Al-Ma'rifah.
- [35] Musa, M., & Mohammad, K. (2001). The impact of direct training in developing the skills of analyzing linguistic errors in writing among students of the Arabic language division at the College of Education. *Reading and Knowledge Journal, Ain Shams University*, (3), 166-197.
- [36] Nakam'dey, K. (2017). Some techniques in the correction of pupils' mistakes and mispronunciations of lexical "en" in the dictation lesson. *Éducation et développement*, 1(22), 1-9.
- [37] Ramadhani, T., & Abdul Hadi, P. (2021). Teachers' error correction strategies of students' writing at senior high school in Pekanbaru. *Journal of Education and Teaching*, 2(2), 159-167.
- [38] Sbitan, F. (2010). *Fundamentals and methods of teaching the Arabic language*. Dar Al-Janadriyah for Publishing & Distribution.
- [39] Zahran, H., Taima, R., Al-Ashwal, A., and Sheikh, M., Makhoulouf, L., Qandil, M., Abu Zanadah, S., Jad, M., & Zaki, A. (2019). *Linguistic concepts in children: Foundations, skills, teaching, and evaluation*. Dar Al Masirah for Publishing & distribution.
- [40] Zaqout, M. (1999). *The guide in teaching Arabic*. Al-Amal for Publishing & distribution.

Mohammed Ali Al-Khawaldeh is a Full Professor of Arabic Language Curriculum and Teaching Methods in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at Yarmouk University, Jordan. He received his PhD in Arabic Language Curriculum and Teaching Methods from Yarmouk University, Jordan, in 2009. His research interests include teaching language skills, language learning and teaching strategies, and teaching Arabic to non-native speakers. He is currently serving as a member of the Supreme Council at the National Center for Curriculum Development in Jordan.

Musaed Awad Al-Anzi has been an Arabic language teacher at the Kuwaiti Ministry of Education since 2020. He received his MA in Arabic Language Curriculum and Teaching Methods from Yarmouk University, Jordan, in 2022. His research interests include teaching reading and writing skills.