

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English Language and Literature



**Exploring the Influence of Teachers' Written
Corrective Feedback on Students'
Grammatical Accuracy**

The Case Study of Third Year Students at University of Hama Lakhdar El Oued

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of a Master Degree in
Didactics of English

Submitted by

- Youcef MAIASSI
- Adel RAHMANI

Supervised by

Mrs. Salma BOUHALI

Board of Examiners

Supervisor: Mrs. Salma BOUHALI **Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University of Jijel**

Chairwoman: Mrs. Sabrina HADJI **Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University of Jijel**

Examiner: Mrs. Messaouda ARZIM **Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University of Jijel**

Academic Year: 2018 / 2019

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria
Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University
Faculty of Letters and Languages
Department of English Language and Literature



**Exploring the Influence of Teachers' Written
Corrective Feedback on Students'
Grammatical Accuracy**

The Case Study of Third Year Students at University of Hama Lakhdar El Oued

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements of a Master Degree in
Didactics

Submitted by

- Youcef MAIASSI
- Adel RAHMANI

Supervised by

Mrs. Salma BOUHALI

Board of Examiners

Supervisor: Mrs. Salma BOUHALI Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University of Jijel
Chairwoman: Mrs. Sabrina HADJI Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University of Jijel
Examiner: Mrs. Messaouda ARZIM Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia University of Jijel

Academic Year: 2018 / 2019

Dedication

I dedicate this work to:

The love of my life my mother, and the iron man my father,
my brothers Abderahmane, Mohammed Sadok and my little sister Aya,
my best friends Adel, Abdelbaki and Nacereddine,
the sugar of our family, my little cousin Yasmine,
and all my family and my friends.



Youcef Maïassi

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my beloved and dearest mother,

to my dear father,

to my lovely brothers and sisters Siham, Mona, Sana, Mariam, Zino, Hammada and,

Djamel,

on the memory of my Dear grandmother,

to all the family,

I hope they will find out through these little words my love and my full gratitude toward
them.



Adel Rahmani

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we thank the Almighty for giving us the opportunity to see this day. Secondly, we sincerely thank our generous parents for everything they are doing for us in this life in general and particularly for helping us in our studies from our first day in the kindergarten till today; we would like to thank them for the financial and moral accompaniments during this journey.

Thirdly, we address our indubitable thanks to our supervisor Mrs. BOUHALI for her time and helps, she has provided to us along this research. Our thanks go equally to the jury **Mrs. Sabrina HADJI** and **Mrs. Messaouda ARZIM** for taking the time to correct and discuss our dissertation.

Finally, we would like to address our gratitude to all the teachers who provided us the precious education along our studies here in Jijel. Our gratitude goes further to all classmates who have encouraged us throughout this research journey.

Abstract

Research into foreign languages (FL) has offered conclusive results about the role of writing in achieving success in college, work, community. However, little is known about the role of written corrective feedback (WCF) in relation to the writing ability in general and grammatical accuracy in particular. Achieving grammatical accuracy can be a difficult task for FL students since it requires a full mastery of grammar rules; however, there is a possibility that teachers can make it easy for them through the use of WCF. It is hypothesized that if teachers use written corrective feedback the students' grammatical accuracy will be enhanced. To test this hypothesis, a questionnaire and an interview were adopted and implemented. The former was administered with thirty third students of English at Hama Lakhdar university of El Oued, to know their perceptions towards WCF. The latter was done with six teachers for the sake of exploring the extent to which teachers use WCF, and their perceptions towards this strategy. The findings showed that when teachers use WCF to boost the process of writing in general and grammar accuracy in particular, by taking into consideration the students' proficiency levels, this enhances the students' grammatical accuracy in FL writing. The findings also showed that students give much importance to the teachers' WCF, they will benefit as much as possible. Consequently, these research findings validate the research hypothesis.

List of Abbreviations

DCF: Direct Corrective Feedback

EFL: English as Foreign Language

ESL: English as Second Language

FCF: Focused Corrective Feedback

FL: Foreign Language

ICF: Indirect Corrective Feedback

MCF: Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

UCF: Unfocused Corrective Feedback

WCF: Written Corrective Feedback

List of Tables

Table 3.01: Students' Gender.....	56
Table 3.02: Students' Age.....	56
Table 3.03: Years of Studying English at University.....	57
Table 3.04: Students' Level of English.....	58
Table 3.05: Students' Interest for Writing.....	58
Table 3.06: Reasons Behind Writing Difficulties.....	59
Table 3.07: Students' Difficulties When Writing.....	60
Table 3.08: Teachers' Corrections of Students' Errors.....	60
Table 3.09: The Obligation for Teachers' Correction.....	61
Table 3.10: Students' Justification for Teachers' Obligation of Correction.....	61
Table 3.11: The Students' Use of Multiple Drafts for Writing.....	62
Table 3.12: The Students' Draft Provided by Feedback.....	63
Table 3.13: Giving the Students their Piece of Writing Back.....	64
Table 3.14: The Type of Errors Teachers Correct.....	64
Table 3.15: Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing.....	65
Table 3.16: The Frequency of Making Grammatical Errors.....	66
Table 3.17: The Reasons Behind Making Grammatical Errors.....	66

Table 3.18: The Type of Written Corrective Feedback Used by Teachers to Correct Students' Grammatical Errors.....	67
Table 3.19: The Options of Direct Feedback.....	68
Table 3.20: The Options of Indirect Feedback.....	68
Table 3.21: The Use of Codes by Teachers.....	69
Table 3.22: Students' Understanding of Codes.....	70
Table 3.23: The Teachers' Correction of Errors.....	70
Table 3.24: The Way of Giving Errors by Teachers.....	71
Table 3.25: The Frequency of Revising the Correction of Grammar Errors.....	72
Table 3.26: The Improvement of Students' Grammar Accuracy.....	73
Table 3.27: Students' Justification for their Improving in Grammar.....	73
Table 3.28: The Influence of Written Corrective Feedback on Students' Grammar.....	74
Table 3.29: Years of Teaching English.....	75
Table 3.30: Years of Teaching Written Expression.....	75
Table 3.31: Writing Proficiency Level of the Students.....	76
Table 3.32: Difficulties of Writing.....	77
Table 3.33: The Type of Errors.....	77
Table 3.34: The Benefit of Providing Feedback for Students.....	78
Table 3.35: The Responsible for Errors Corrections.....	79

Table 3.36: The Aspects Teachers Should Know When Providing WCF.....	79
Table 3.37: Teachers' Corrections of Students' Grammatical Errors.....	80
Table 3.38: Teachers' Kind of Written Corrective Feedback Provide for their Students..	81
Table 3.39: Teachers' Use of Codes when Providing Feedback.....	81
Table 3.40: Teachers' Use of Correction Method that Fit Students' Proficiency Level...	82
Table 3.41: The Improvements of Students' Grammatical Accuracy.....	82
Table 3.42: The Importance of WCF in Improving Students' Grammatical Accuracy....	83

Table of Content

Dedication	2
Dedication	3
Acknowledgement	4
Abstract	5
List of Abbreviations	6
List of Tables	7
Table of Contents	10

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study.....	14
2. Statement of the Problem.....	14
3. Aims of the Study.....	15
4. Research Questions	15
5. Research Hypothesis.....	16
6. Research Methodology.....	16
7. Structure of the Study.....	16

Chapter One: The Writing Skill and Grammatical Accuracy

Introduction.....	19
1.1. The Writing Skill.....	19
1.1.1. The Nature of the Writing Skill.....	20
1.1.2. The Importance of Writing.....	22
1.1.3. The Major Approaches to Teaching Writing.....	23
1.1.3.1. The Control-to-Free Approach.....	23

1.1.3.2. The Free-Writing Approach.....	24
1.1.3.3. The Product Approach.....	25
1.1.3.4. The Process Approach	26
1.1.3.5. The Genre Approach.....	28
1.2. Learners' Writing Challenges and Difficulties	29
1.2.1. Learners' Writing Challenges.....	30
1.2.2. Learners' Writing Difficulties.....	31
1.3. The Grammatical Accuracy in Foreign Language	32
1.3.1. Definition of the Grammatical Accuracy.....	32
1.3.2. The Role of Grammatical Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing.....	33
1.3.3. The Effect of Different Types of Grammar Error Correction on Improving the Foreign Language Writing Accuracy.....	34
Conclusion.....	35

Chapter Two: Written Corrective Feedback

Introduction.....	37
2.1. Definition of Corrective Feedback.....	37
2.2. Types of Corrective Feedback.....	38
2.2.1. Direct Corrective Feedback.....	38
2.2.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback.....	39
2.3. The Importance of Corrective Feedback.....	39

2.4. Definition of Written Corrective Feedback.....	40
2.5. Types of Written Corrective Feedback.....	41
2.5.1. Direct Written Corrective Feedback.....	42
2.5.2. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback.....	42
2.5.3. Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback.....	43
2.5.4. Focused Corrective Feedback	44
2.5.5. Unfocused Corrective Feedback.....	44
2.5.6. Electronic Feedback.....	45
2.5.7. Reformulation.....	45
2.6. Theoretical Studies on Written Corrective Feedback.....	46
2.6.1. The Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback.....	46
2.6.2. The Ineffectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback.....	46
2.7. Factors related to the Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback.....	47
2.7.1. Individual Learners' Factors.....	48
2.7.2. Teachers' and Students' Perceptions.....	48
Conclusion.....	49

Chapter Three: Data Collection and Analysis

Introduction.....	51
3.1. Research Methodology.....	51
3.1.1. Research Approach.....	51
3.1.2. Research Design	52
3.1.3. Population and Sample.....	52
3.2. Tools of Research.....	53

3.2.1. Students' Questionnaire.....	53
3.2.1.1. Objectives of the Questionnaire.....	54
3.2.1.2. Questionnaire Procedures.....	54
3.2.1.3. Description of the Students' Questionnaire.....	54
3.2.2. Teachers' Interview.....	55
3.2.2.1. Procedures of the Interview.....	55
3.3. Data Analysis.....	56
3.3.1. Analysis of the Questionnaire.....	56
3.3.2. Analysis of the Interview.....	75
3.4. Discussion of the Results.....	84
Conclusion.....	85

General Conclusion

1. Summary.....	87
2. Research Implications and Pedagogical Recommendations.....	88
3. Limitations of the Study.....	88
4. Suggestions for Further Research.....	89

Reference List

Appendices

Résumé

ملخص

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study.....	14
2. Statement of the Problem.....	14
3. Aim of the Study.....	15
4. Research Questions	15
5. Research Hypothesis.....	16
6. Research Methodology.....	16
7. Structure of the Study.....	16

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study

Foreign language writing is considered an important issue in the field of foreign language education, since writing enables foreign language learners to plan and rethink in order to communicate their ideas and thoughts. Due to the fact that this skill involves not just a representation of speech, but also development and representation of thoughts in a structured way, it is often regarded the hardest of the skills.

Foreign language learners often make grammatical errors when writing and teachers are required to help them avoid such errors and improve their writing accuracy. Generally, overcoming the occurrence of grammatical errors depends on the way they are corrected, and teachers often respond to them in the form of written corrective feedback. Freedman (1987) believed that if students fail in well preference in writing, further feedback is necessary to help them take correct actions toward their writing in order to improve it and reach an acceptable level of performance. So, learners need some form of feedback to see how others think about their writing.

2. Statement of the Problem

In the Algerian English foreign language classrooms, students are required to write academic compositions accurately using the appropriate grammar rules. However, according to an observation made on third year students of English at El Oued University, students are continuously committing ranges of grammatical errors in writing sessions. The different grammatical errors that learners face such as subject-verb agreement errors, sentence fragments, run-on sentence, and missing coma after introductory element.

This commitment of grammatical errors, obviously, would affect their writing skill in general and more specifically their grammatical accuracy. In this case, teachers are

involved to help students to solve this problem and reduce the erroneous use of their grammatical knowledge to better refine their grammar accuracy. Teachers' actions are mostly shown in the form of written corrective feedback (WCF). So, the problem to be raised here is whether the role of teachers' written corrective feedback could have a positive effect on learners' grammatical accuracy in FL writing.

3. Aims of the study

Owing to the fact that the full mastery of grammar rules is of great value in enhancing students' writing in FL, on the one hand, and contributing significantly to writing skills achievement, on the other hand; thus, the current study aims to explore the influence of teachers' written corrective feedback (WCF) on students' grammatical accuracy. Additionally, it seeks to know teachers' and students' perceptions toward the influence of WCF on students' grammatical accuracy. Therefore, on the ground that learning writing are teachable, examining the use of WCF from teachers' and learners' perspectives may uncover whether WCF is effective or not.

4. Research Questions

This research work aims to answer the following questions:

→What are the students' perceptions toward the influence of written corrective feedback on their grammatical accuracy?

→What are the teachers' perceptions toward the influence of written corrective feedback on students' grammatical accuracy?

5. Research Hypothesis

Based on the above research questions, we suggest the following research hypothesis:

- If teachers use written corrective feedback, the EFL students' grammatical accuracy will be enhanced

6. Research Methodology

The present research work is conducted at Hama Lakhdar University of El-Oued in the department of English language and literature. The population is third year students, and the sample is chosen randomly to ensure validity. The sample is 30 students.

This study relies on different tools to gather data. These tools include a questionnaire and an interview. The questionnaire was handed to the participants sample (who were selected randomly from the population). It includes structured and mixed questions (close ended and open ended) to investigate the students' perceptions toward the influence of WCF on their grammatical accuracy.

The interview was conducted with six teachers. It includes specific and appropriate questions related to the theme. The answers were written word by word, dividing them into themes, coding and analysing them.

7. Structure of the Study

The current study consists of two parts: a theoretical part and a practical one. The theoretical part consists of two chapters. It begins with a general introduction which contains the background of the study, its aims, the research questions, research hypothesis, research methodology, and structure of the dissertation, followed by two theoretical chapters. The first chapter deals with the writing skill and the grammatical accuracy. It starts with different definitions of the writing skill, then, it tackles the importance of this

latter in general. After that, the major approaches to teaching writing are discussed. Finally, the chapter ends by the grammatical accuracy and its role in FL writing.

The second chapter deals with the written corrective feedback, starting by defining corrective feedback and highlighting its types. Then, it identifies the written corrective feedback, and the strategies which should be followed to provide CF, concluding by some theoretical studies about the effectiveness of WCF, in addition to some factors related to the effectiveness of WCF.

The practical part consists of one chapter. The third chapter concerns the field work. It provides an extensive description of the research methodology and procedures. It clearly identifies the tools used in this piece of research work, i.e., the questionnaire and the interview. In addition, it includes the analysis and discussion of the obtained results from both tools.

Finally, a general conclusion is presented to sum up what have been said in this piece of research work, and it presents briefly the most significant results of the study. Furthermore, it highlights the research implications and pedagogical recommendations that teachers and learners need in the future; it also mentioned the limitations of the study, and it ends with some suggestions for further researches.

Chapter One: The Writing Skill and Grammatical Accuracy

Introduction.....	19
1.1. The Writing Skill.....	19
1.1.1. The Nature of the Writing Skill.....	20
1.1.2. The Importance of Writing.....	22
1.1.3. The Major Approaches to Teaching Writing.....	23
1.1.3.1. The Control-to-Free Approach.....	23
1.1.3.2. The Free-Writing Approach.....	24
1.1.3.3. The Product Approach.....	25
1.1.3.4. The Process Approach	26
1.1.3.5. The Genre Approach.....	28
1.2. Learners' Writing Challenges and Difficulties	30
1.2.1. Learners' Writing Challenges.....	30
1.2.2. Learners' Writing Difficulties.....	31
1.3. The Grammatical Accuracy in Foreign Language	32
1.3.1. Definition of the Grammatical Accuracy.....	33
1.3.2. The Role of Grammatical Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing.....	33
1.3.3. The Effect of Different Types of Grammar Error Correction on Improving the Foreign Language Writing Accuracy.....	34
Conclusion.....	35

Introduction

Accurate writing refers to grammar accuracy which is an important aspect in the teaching of foreign language (FL) writing. For a long time, writing was a neglected area in language teaching. Much focus was on spoken language which was considered so important, while writing was regarded as being of secondary importance; however, nowadays writing becomes an essential component in language teaching (Brookes and Grundy, 1998). For that reason, this chapter introduces the writing skill in general. Then, it tackles the grammatical accuracy and explains its importance in writing. After that, it highlights the role of FL grammatical corrective feedback (GCF) in improving FL writing.

1.1. The Writing Skill

Language is the vehicle for effective communication. Every student needs to develop the skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Thus, they will be able to communicate properly in the society. Writing is a productive and active process of the mind by which the writer creates meaning. According to the United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization the writing skill is part of literacy skills. Literature review has revealed that the writing skill is the highest language skill paralleled to the development of brain and language involvement.

The writing skill plays a vital role for the instruction of foreign language learners, because it is not only an effective tool for the evolvment of academic language proficiency and a vital skill for academic success, but it also allows second language learners to enhance their perception of knowledge gaps (Warschauer, 2010, p.3).

1.1.1. The Nature of the Writing Skill

Rivers (1968) said that writing is the act of putting in conventional graphic form what has been spoken (p. 238). That is, to transfer what has been said or thought about into word and symbols. For Byrne (1988) writing involves the conventional arrangement of letters into words, and words into sentences that need to flow smoothly to form a coherent whole (p. 1). In other words, it is to relate letters to make words and to relate words to have a meaning. Lado (1971, p.272) also claimed that writing is a graphic representation of a language and information is conveyed through the written medium by the use of conventional graphemes. In other words, that writing is the drawing of the language. Another definition of the writing skill is provided by Urquhart and McIver (2005, p.5-6) who stated that writing is a recursive process, which means that students revise throughout the process, frequently moving back and forth among the stages.

In line with the previous definitions, Brown (2000, p.31) stated that the definition of language competence is linked to some extent with accurate writing, in the sense that language competence is “one’s underlying knowledge of system of a language, its rules of grammar, its vocabulary, and all the pieces of language and how those pieces fit together”.

However, writing is not only a matter of putting down on a paper the symbols of the writing system that represents the utterances, but it is also a determined step and organization of ideas, facts and experiences which is used to communicate with others. Roger (2001, p. 12) stressed that no one definition of writing can cover all the writing system that exists. He said that the writing should fulfil some of the following criteria which say that writing must fulfil the purpose of communication, and also it relates

conventionally to articulate speech (the systematic arrangement of significant vocal sounds) or electronic programming in such a way that communication is achieved.

In addition, Brown (2001) stressed that the compositional nature of writing should be taken as a compositional process that involves FL learners to think, draft, and edit what they have written. He highlighted the nature of writing in terms of written production and noted that the compositional nature of writing had produced a writing pedagogy that pushes students to focus on how to generate ideas, how to organize them appropriately, how to revise their piece of writing for clearer meaning, how to edit text for appropriate grammar, and how to produce a final product.

Additionally, writing is a social act that fulfils a set of communicative needs, and accomplishes particular purposes as Hyland (2003) stated:

While every act of writing is in a sense both personal and individual, it is also international and social, expressing a culturally recognized purpose, reflecting particular kind of relationship and acknowledging an engagement in a given community (p 27).

Al-Mutawa and Taisser (1989) pointed out that writing is a complex cognitive activity which requires the following elements: complete acquisition of the Alphabet, understanding how letters combine to form words and the relationship between the word and its meaning, knowledge of the mechanics of writing: speaking, capitalization, punctuation and other writing conventions, mastery of the most frequent rules governing the structure of sentences, ability of combining sentences to build an effective paragraph

and combining them to produce essays, and formalization with transitions to achieve coherence.

Writing is a difficult activity in both first and foreign language. Because of many factors which were classified by Byrne (1988, p. 4) into three categories, psychological, linguistic and cognitive factors.

First, writing can be difficult due to psychological factors, in the sense that writing is a solitary act that is done in the absence of readers. This means that there is a lack of interaction and feedback between the writer and readers. Second, the difficulty can be linked to linguistic factors, because writing lacks paralinguistic devices such as gestures and facial expression. This imposes a great necessity for careful and precise completion, organization and connection of sentences. Third, writing is not easy and this may be related to cognitive factors. Sometimes the task of writing is imposed on the writer and this may cause stress and loss of ideas, like in the classroom situation, since students do not often take any initiative to write outside the classroom.

1.1.2. The Importance of Writing

Writing is an essential way to express oneself through the written words which gives the opportunity to share ideas, knowledge and information in a clearer way. The most significant point is that writing is the primary basis upon which someone can work, can learn, and upon which one intellect will be judged in college, in the workplace, and in the community. An equally significance is that writing improves the ability to ask worthwhile questions. Another connected view to the importance is that writing helps refine ideas when feedback is provided. A linked point is that writing makes you improve logical and persuasive arguments. It is also sometimes suggested that writing improves your communication skills ("Why Is Writing Important," 2009). Furthermore, writing is

highly important. Communication is transmitted more through writing than any other type of media. The most binding contracts and agreements are written and signed. “Writing is the painting of the voice” (Williams, 2015)

1.1.3. The Major Approaches to Teaching Writing

A number of approaches had emerged to develop practice in the writing skill. Applying one approach or another depends on what teachers want their learners to do: whether they want them to focus on the product of writing or its process, or just want to encourage creative writing.

Starting from the control-to-free approaches that was introduced in the 1950's and 1960's, moving to the free writing approach, they were almost completely abandoned. In EFL classrooms, product and process approaches had dominated much of the teaching of writing over the last twenty years. In the last ten years, there had been an important growing of genre approaches in the EFL/ESL classrooms.

1.1.3.1. The Control-to-Free Approach

The control-to-free approach to writing is sequential. In this approach, learners are firstly, given a sentence as an exercise, then a paragraph to copy. Thus, learners work on what they have been given and perform strictly prescribed operations. So, learners' writing is controlled in this approach leading to limited opportunity to make errors; while learners of high, intermediate or advanced levels of proficiency are given free compositions where they express their own ideas. Obviously, this approach aims at training students to write frequently, giving them the opportunity to produce their own writings without mistakes because their productions are completely controlled (Hyland, 2003).

This approach was made up of four main stages. The first stage is familiarization in which learners are taught certain grammar and vocabulary through texts. The second stage is controlled writing in which learners manipulate fixed patterns often from a substitution table. The third one is called guided writing, here students imitate model texts. Finally, free writing: in this stage, learners use the patterns they have developed to write an essay, a letter ...etc. (Hyland, 2003, p. 3-4)

Students become free to express their own ideas only after achieving an intermediate level. The shift from control-to-free is up to the teacher's guidance, thus, when s/he sees his/her students able to go through this step.

1.1.3.2. The Free-Writing Approach

This approach emphasizes learners to be fluent and put content first, rather than worrying about the form. According to this approach, once learners' ideas are written down on the page, grammatical accuracy, organization and the rest will gradually follow. This approach is useful to emphasize fluency in the EFL classroom. In this way, "students feel that they are actually writing, not only performing exercise of some kind; they write what they want to write and consequently writing is an enjoyable experience." (Byrne, 1988, p.22)

In this approach, teachers see their role simply limited to provide students with the space to make their meanings. Hence, they try to avoid imposing their views, offering models, or suggesting responses to topics beforehand (Weigle, 2002). Otherwise, students may read their writing in front of their classmates and by doing that, they develop the sense of audience. In brief, content and audience are seen as integral in this approach.

1.1.3.3. The Product Approach

As the title indicates, the product approach gives much more importance to writing as an end product. This approach includes classroom activities in which students are engaged to imitate, copy, and transform the model text. Nemouchi (2008) said that “the model text is always taken as the starting point. It is studied and analysed from all points of view, that is, grammar structures, contents, and organization”. Obviously, the model text plays an important role in guiding learners to the writing task from the beginning till the end.

The interest of such an approach is in the correct use of form. Naturally, the role of the model is important in the sense that it leads students from a point of departure to an end with a task to replicate. The model then comes first and shows a completed text as well. “What the model does not demonstrate”, said White (1988) “is how the original writer arrived at that particular product, in other words, it gives no indication of process” (p.6).

In the product approach, the model comes first, and the product comes at the end, which both are final products indeed. White (1988; as cited in Nemouchi, 2014, p. 39) pointed out:

Not only does the model come first in the teaching sequence, it also shows a finished text. In other words, the focus right from the start is on the product, which is, of course someone else's writing. What the model does not demonstrate is how the original writer arrived at that particular product. In other words, it gives no indication of process. (p.7)

1.1.3.4. The Process Approach

During the early 1980's, the domain of teaching had a valuable change from the product approach to the process approach since the product approach emphasized the imitation of different types of model genres, letters. Zamel (1982) argued that the methods that stress on "form and correctness", disregarding the manner ideas are being "explored through writing", will fail to teach the students that the act of writing is mainly "a process of discovery" (p. 267).

Flower and Hayes (1981; as cited in María, 2011, p. 43) pointed to planning, drafting, revising and editing as the main stages of the composing process that help writers while writing. It was taken as a process that made up different stages and not only as a focus on the end product in itself. Though, these steps seem to be complex somehow, students need to go through them so they can produce a final product that is capable enough to communicate their own ideas and deliver a clear meaning to the audience. The main objective of the process approach is to make the students aware of the strategies involved in writing. According to Murray (1992):

"The process-oriented approach refers to a teaching approach that focuses on the process a writer engages in when constructing meaning. This teaching approach concludes with editing as a final stage in the creation, rather than an initial one as in a product-oriented approach. The process-oriented approach may include identified stages of the writing process such: pre-writing, writing and re-writing. Once the rough draft has been created, it is polished into subsequent drafts with the assistance of peer and teacher conferencing. Final editing and

publication can follow if the author chooses to publish their writing” (p. 16)

Scholars determined four important stages in writing. They are: pre-writing, drafting, revising, and editing. The first stage is pre-writing. This step includes gathering information by the learner and thinking about the ideas that will be used in writing. At this stage, learners decide on the form and goals of the writing task. Indeed, these goals help learners to generate ideas as mentioned above, taking into consideration that those goals can be changed and improved during the writing process and not only the prewriting stage. Murray (1988) said “practice in writing, no matter how short the exercise, is to make yourself confident about your writing and to improve your skill” (p.16). In other words, practice makes perfect, whenever students go through different writing activities, this will help them know what to say and how to say it in a paper.

The second stage is drafting. Flower and Hayes (1981) defined it as “the process of putting ideas into a visible language” (p. 373). In other words, the main task of the writer is to translate the ideas into a piece of written English. Thus, the writer is required to deal with all the demands of written English. Drafting may be more than once and teachers may help their students to write in a clear way taking into consideration the linguistic structures. It is preferable that the teacher should let his/her students work individually unless they got obstacles.

The third stage is revising. At this point, students will revise what they have written consciously so they can correct any error, making sure that their ideas are related. Furthermore, this stage could be done with the help of the teacher. White (1988) stated “showing students where their arguments are weak or where their logic breaks down

appears to be more effective approach". That is, students will be more confident when they write down on the paper what has been just thought about.

The last stage is editing. It was described as the final one, here students are required to check the accuracy of the grammar, linguistic structure and spelling mistakes. Teachers also can help their students to make sure that everything is done well.

In the process approach, students are not required to go through these processes in a linear model, Flower and Hayes (1981) stated that planning is not only restricted to the beginning of the first stage but can be used at all the levels of composing (p.375).

1.1.3.5. The Genre Approach

Swales (1990) defined the genre approach as "a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes". The idea here is that writers follow certain conventions for organizing their writing so that their readers can recognize their purposes. For example, if the writer wants to convince his/her readers that drugs are harmful, s/he should use argumentative passage. In genre approach, learners' writing reflects a particular purpose. Hyland (2003) supported this point of view claiming, "The central belief here is that we don't just write, we write something to achieve some purposes" (p. 18).

Johns (2003, p.198) believed that individuals who are familiar with common genres create shortcuts to the successful processing and production of written texts. Furthermore, applying this approach acknowledges that writing is taking place in a social situation, and shows students how real writers organise their texts, promotes flexible thinking, and, in the long run, encourages informed creativity, since students need to learn the rules before they can transcend them (Badger & White, 2000; Aleid, 2000; Kay &

Dudley-Evans, 1998). It gives the students the chance to benefit from peer feedback before giving their teacher the final draft.

Genres were seen as fixed types of development classified into categories and subcategories. For example, exposition, argument, description, and narratives were considered as the large categories, with sub-types such as definition, cause and contrast, business letter. (Freedman & Medway, 1994; as cited in Nemouchi, 2008, p. 45). Thus, in the traditional view of genres, teaching genres means teaching textual regularities in form and content of each genre. Obviously, the genre approach to teaching writing is more appropriate for students of English for specific purposes, but it is also highly useful for general English students as it enables them to produce texts that are well-formed, meaningful, and appropriate for readers.

From what have been discussed above there is no approach which is better than the others, the teacher needs to mix different approaches taking into account the different types of students as Badger and White (2000) and Raimes (1999) Recommended.

1.2. Learners' Writing Challenges and Difficulties

Learning to write appropriately in a coherent and cohesive way is really a difficult task for FL learners. Arguably, the process of writing needs a lot of time and much more attention. Furthermore, the skill of writing is crucial for EFL learners. It was considered a major factor for a successful academic performance in educational contexts. But, learning to write and developing it is a problem for EFL learners. (Annab. A, 2016)

The writing difficulties are commonly shared among English native speakers, and even students who are learning English both as a second or foreign language (Aragón, Baires & Rodriguez, 2013). In addition, "Students do not write very often and most of

what they write is classroom-bound” (Adas & Bakir, 2013, p. 254). Means that students do not write outside classroom, and all what they write is just curriculum lessons. So, they may face a lot of problems since they are not accustomed to write in a field out of their studying.

1.2.1. Learners' Writing Challenges

Writing could be a difficult skill to be learnt or taught due to the fact that it is not a simple cognitive activity; rather it is believed to be a complex mental production which requires “careful thought, discipline and concentration” (Grami, 2010, p. 9).

Different challenges learners may face when writing. Firstly, the lack of vocabulary is the most problem that face learners when they start to write, they do not have a good amount of vocabulary that fit each kind of writing. Learners cannot build up a vocabulary if they never meet any new words, and to meet new words means they have to read.

Secondly, the difficulties in grammar and syntax make learners commit mistakes when it comes to subject-verb agreement, pronouns, articles, and specially tenses. Also, making students read and write in their own words this could lead to grammar mistakes which may make students reluctant to paraphrase and summarize others' work (Amin & Alamin, 2012).

Thirdly, the sentence structure. The absence of framework for students' writing will affect the learners' productions and writing skill. To clarify more, whenever students start to write, they should choose a structure for their writing; for instance, report structure. Reports are always presented in sections and subsections since they contain a lot of information which needs to be organized in a way that makes sense to the reader. (Amin & Alamin, 2012)

Fourthly, the organization of their writing. Learners' drafts should be relevant in a way that makes readers do not double back to make sense of their writing. The organization of writing is always one of the problems due to the lack of those four items. First of all, chronology. Whatever you write, you should move from the earliest time to the latest one. Second, the importance. The elements should be ordered from the most important to the important ones. Third, problem/solution. If the aim of writing is to give answers for specific questions, learners should describe the problem and then give solutions. Fourth, numbering is considered one of the crucial items in writing because readers like lists. (Amin & Alamin, 2012)

1.2.2. Learners' Writing Difficulties

Problems in writing are not always linked to learners' deficiencies, i.e., not only learners' problems are a reason to face difficulties in writing, but it can also be something out of the learners' control. That is, the learners have no possibilities to develop their writing since everything is coming from other sides. To clarify more, teachers of writing who have high expectations in their students' production, for instance, might assign topics of a high level that learners might find very difficult and full of obstacles when writing (Al Murshidi, 2014). In other words, when teachers think that learners' performance is professional, they assign difficult topics that may be found difficult for them to write about. Also, an individual can have the confidence and be sure that he or she can write an article of his or her desire; however, he or she might suffer from lack of ideas that can affect the end result of the purposed writing. Furthermore, lacking confidence appears as the most dangerous obstacle that might affect how students write. Lacking confidence can affect an individual's ability to write even if he or she has the best skill in regards to writing. Additionally, an individual's lifestyle can play a huge role in affecting how individual deals with the aspect of writing. For instance, there exists a situation whereby

an individual might have the urge of writing but may lack the drive for developing a well-written article.

1.3. The Grammatical Accuracy in Foreign Language

Rigoberto (2018) said that some people think that correct grammar is important only to teachers, this is definitely not true. Grammar, regardless of the country or the language, is the foundation for communication. When a message is transmitted with correct grammar, the reader/hearer will understand the purpose and meaning of that message easily. In order to communicate, a learner should know the grammar of the language. It is crucial to express oneself in a right way, but this should be done in a way that people find it easy to understand.

Good grammar keeps people understandable when they express their thoughts. Poor grammar makes people form a negative impression of them. Also, good grammar is a mark of intelligence and good education. Therefore, on the point that Harris (1995) stressed grammatical accuracy does not involve just the use of a range of grammatical structures but also the use of more complex structures. Furthermore, Byrne (1991) noted “in most case, accuracy refers to grammatical accuracy” (p.551).

1.3.1. Definition of the Grammatical Accuracy

According to the British Council, accuracy refers to how correctly learners use the language system, including their use of grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. Accuracy is often compared to fluency when we talk about a learner's level of speaking or writing. For example, a learner might be fluent (make their meaning clear) but not accurate (make a lot of mistakes).

The grammatical accuracy is an important aspect in writing. For that, Celce-Murcia (1991) emphasized the importance of a reasonable degree of grammatical

accuracy in academic writing. The grammatical accuracy is a reference to being free of error; it is mostly about demonstrating confident and accurate sentence construction. Thus, to be grammatically accurate, your words should be delivering a clear meaning to the reader.

1.3.2. The Role of Grammatical Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing

The learning of grammar can improve learners' reading and writing if they learn grammar in context (Goode, 2000; Sams, 2003; Sedgwick, 1989). In other words, the learning of grammar in writing rather than for writing is crucial. Thus, learners understand better how the language works and functions. Weaver, et al. (2001) agreed that effective writing is a result of learning grammar in context because it allows learners to apply in mechanics and conventions ways and to be able to produce effective writing. Grammar has to be taught separately so that students know its important role in FL writing.

They also need to be aware of the use of grammar because any mistake leads to misunderstanding by readers.

The grammatical accuracy was stressed by researchers like (Celce-Murcia,1991; Shmidt,1994; Shaw & Liu 1998) because learners need it in order to control their writing and be able to use it in specific contexts. Learner's improvement in their writing performance over a substantial period had dramatically appeared when following the grammar-in-context approach (Graham & Perin, 2007, p.21). That means, writing needs to use correct grammatical sentences. By using regular contextualised grammar in practice, learners will learn grammar in writing, not for writing.

1.3.3. The Effect of Different Types of Grammar Error Correction on Improving the Foreign Language Writing Accuracy

A distinction was made between direct feedback (or grammar correction), that is, explicit correction provided by the teacher and indirect feedback, that is, directing the students to the error without giving the correct form. Roberts and Ferris (2001) said that direct grammar correction (CF) is probably better than indirect CF with students who have low levels of proficiency. In contrast, Ellis (2008) claimed that indirect CF is more effective when location of error is not shown, rather than direct corrective feedback where the location of the error is shown, so students go through deeper processing.

One of the types of feedback is the use of recast. Recast was defined as the teacher's paraphrasing of a part or the whole of what the learner has uttered with the erroneous part (Lyster and Ranta, 1997; as stated in Bitá, A & Dariush, 2014, p.584). Nelson, Denninger, Bonvillian, Kaplan, and Baker (1984) proposed two classification of recast, i.e. simple and complex recasts. The simple recast deals with minimal changes to the students' utterances and the complex one is concerned with providing the child with substantial additions. It is also mentioned that in terms of students' linguistic development, they benefit from simple recasts more than complex ones (Nelson et al., 1984).

Another type is elicitation, where the teacher does not provide the students with the correct form but tries to let his/her students correct their errors. Another type of grammar correction, is to provide students with metalinguistic information about the error, this means giving them extra information about the error. Sheen (2007) came up with this conclusion that metalinguistic elaboration is superior to direct feedback.

Furthermore, Van Beuningen et al. (2012) study was on the effectiveness of focused feedback, that is, directing the correction to only a particular kind of errors, and unfocused feedback, that is, broad correction of every error. Ellis (2008) study found out that focused CF on the English article system was more effective than unfocused CF. These studies that had investigated the effectiveness of focused CF showed that this latter can play a major role in targeting a limited range of errors.

Conclusion

The whole chapter tackles the writing skill, its importance for learners and the approaches that can be followed to teach it. It also deals with grammatical accuracy and the crucial role that it plays. Finally, it ends by going through the effectiveness of each grammar correction type on the process of FL writing accuracy.

Chapter Two: Written Corrective Feedback

Introduction.....	37
2.1. Definition of Corrective Feedback.....	37
2.2. Types of Corrective Feedback.....	38
2.2.1. Direct Corrective Feedback.....	38
2.2.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback.....	39
2.3. The Importance of Corrective Feedback.....	39
2.4. Definition of Written Corrective Feedback.....	40
2.5. Types of Written Corrective Feedback.....	41
2.5.1. Direct Written Corrective Feedback.....	42
2.5.2. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback.....	42
2.5.3. Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback.....	43
2.5.4. Focused Corrective Feedback.....	44
2.5.5. Unfocused Corrective Feedback.....	44
2.5.6. Electronic Feedback.....	45
2.5.7. Reformulation.....	45
2.6. Theoretical Studies on Written Corrective Feedback.....	46
2.6.1. The Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback.....	46
2.6.2. The Ineffectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback.....	46
2.7. Factors related to The Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback.....	47
2.7.1. Individual Learners' Factors.....	48
2.7.2. Teachers' and Students' Perceptions.....	48
Conclusion.....	49

Introduction

Written corrective feedback (WCF) in foreign language (FL) refers generally to error correction. Giving written feedback to students is an important part of a writing instruction. In an academic writing course, WCF is considered an important process in a FL instruction. This chapter introduces in details the meaning of written corrective feedback, its goals and purposes, its types. Then, it tackles the theoretical studies, and factors that affect the effectiveness of corrective feedback (CF).

2.1. Definition of Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback was defined as “any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect. This includes various responses that the learners receive” (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 171). This means that CF is the initiative of teachers in highlighting errors for their students in order to let them know that their work is not correct. It can also be defined as any feedback provided to a learner from any source that contains evidence of learners' errors of language form (Russel and Spada, 2006, p. 206). In other words, feedback is anything that is given to learners to help them discover their weaknesses in the language. Likewise, Ur (1996, p. 242) stated “feedback is information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of a learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance”.

Leeman (2007) claimed that “feedback refers to a mechanism which provides the learner with information regarding the success or a failure of a given process” (p. 112). That is, feedback is like a machine that tells the learners the necessary information that is possible for the given process. In line with this, feedback is described as the information provided to learners regarding their actions with the intent to assist them to either

reinforce correct responses or to search for replacement for the incorrect ones (Hattie et al., 1996).

Kulhavy (1977) defined feedback as “any of the numerous procedures that are used to tell a learner if an instructional response is right or wrong” (p. 212). From the last definition, corrective feedback is the response to students’ errors and the way that leads them to a correct form.

2.2. Types of Corrective Feedback

Written Corrective Feedback whether it is provided in a written form or orally has to be tackled according to a particular situation and students’ proficiency level. The most considerable classification of CF includes direct and indirect corrective feedback.

2.2.1. Direct Corrective Feedback

Direct corrective feedback (DCF) was defined by Ferris (2002) as “when an instructor provides the correct linguistic form for students (word, morpheme, phrase, rewritten sentence, deleted word[s] or morpheme[s]” (p. 19); Likewise, Ellis (2009) stated that it is the way to inform students about the location and the correct forms of the errors. Another group of scholars, Bitchener et al. (2005) indicated that direct feedback is the identification and the correction of errors provided by teachers to students. In other words, direct corrective feedback means that teachers give the correct form to students. This type is suitable for students of low-level of proficiency who are unable to self-correct and do not know what the correct form might be. However, it requires minimal processing on the part of the learner.

Direct corrective feedback helps students know directly what they have to do; therefore, it is also called explicit feedback. Through the explicit feedback, learners can

easily avoid errors. Sheen (2007) proved that the direct correction is more superior than the other type, namely the indirect correction, in producing more accurate writing.

2.2.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback

Lightbown and Spada (1999) defined indirect corrective feedback (ICF) as the situation in which a teacher indicates the location of the error, but leaves students to self-edit the errors. Likewise, Ferris & Robert (2001) stated that indirect corrective feedback is the indication made by a teacher by underlining the errors or giving the codes for the errors. That is, the teacher shows just the errors for learners and let them do self-correct. Another definition given by Bitchener et al. (2005) is that ICF is the teachers' identification of errors without any correction with the intention that students should correct the errors by themselves.

Ellis (2008) mentioned that indirect feedback is used when teachers only signal the location of errors. All in all, the purpose of indirect corrective feedback is just to indicate the location of errors without any information of the correct forms, and here the students are required to self-correct the errors that they have made; using such strategy helps learners develop their autonomy and become independent.

2.3. The Importance of Corrective Feedback

Corrective feedback has a very essential role in the teaching and learning processes as almost all learners pointed out. This importance lies mainly in developing their competences, and changing their interlanguage for better. So, correction helps students to clarify their understanding of the meaning and construction of language.

The importance of correction also lies in the type of feedback the teacher is providing, whether it is negative or positive feedback. Brown (2000; as cited in Hill and

Flynn, 2006) contended that it would not be useful if students get only positive messages about their output, because this discourages them to make attempts to restructure their grammar and encourages the fossilization of those incorrect forms. In the same sense, Tsui (1995) emphasized the fact that without correction, the erroneous output will facilitate the way for students to get these errors or to change their correct hypotheses about the target language to accommodate these incorrect forms.

Allwright and Bailey (1991) wrote about the importance of correction in that it helps learners improve their output, pointed out that:

if one of our goals as language teachers is to help our learners move along the interlanguage continuum, getting closer and closer to the target language norm, then, the thinking goes, we must provide with the feedback they need to modify their hypotheses about the functions and linguistic forms they use. (Notice that there is an assumption here- the assumption that providing feedback will help learners to alter their output in constructive and long-lasting ways); However, we are often faced with difficult choices about how best to do this without discouraging the learners (p. 99).

The above quotation supported that CF can improve learners' interlanguage form, when teachers provide their learners with the feedback. They need to modify their hypotheses about the functions and linguistic forms they use, and teachers should do this in a way that does not discourage them.

2.4. Definition of Written Corrective Feedback

Written corrective feedback, according to John and Dana (2012), was defined as grammar or error correction. It can be direct (the wrong word is crossed out and the right word is given), indirect (an explanation, an example, a hint is given, but not the correction

itself), or focused (only one or a smaller number of errors are corrected), or unfocused (all errors are corrected). In other words, written corrective feedback refers to written teacher feedback on a student writing with the aim of improving grammatical accuracy (including spelling, capitalization, and punctuation) as well as idiomatic usage (such as word order and word choice).

Ferris (2011) stated that WCF takes the form of written input provided by teachers about learners' errors in their written texts. In addition, Keh (1990) explained that written corrective feedback is the input given from the reader to the writer that provides information for revision.

Written Corrective Feedback refers to various ways a reader can respond to FL writer by indicating that some usage in the writing composition does not follow the language's norms. WCF can be also provided by a reader of the composition. In a foreign language context, "teacher response and evaluation are typically the principal means by which L2 learners measure their progress as writers" (Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1996, p. 1). In other words, the main thing that learners depend on to measure their improvement is their teachers' evaluation and assessment.

2.5. Types of Written Corrective Feedback

Written corrective feedback was considered as an important phase in teaching FL writing. The fact that there are different types, using the suitable type is to be determined according to specific norms such as students' level, students' FL background and other factors that should be taken into consideration. According to Ellis (2008) there are six types of WCF. They are: direct corrective feedback (DCF), indirect corrective feedback (ICF), metalinguistics corrective feedback (MCF), focused corrective feedback (FCF), unfocused corrective feedback (UCF), electronic feedback, and reformulation.

2.5.1. Direct Written Corrective Feedback

Direct corrective feedback (DCF) which is also known as explicit feedback is the strategy that should be employed to assist lower proficiency or beginner EFL students to overcome the difficulties of uncomplicated grammatical rules in their writing. Lalande said that direct corrective feedback refers to the situation in which the teacher provides the students with the correct form. Furthermore, Ferris (2003) stated that explicit written corrective feedback takes place when the teacher gives the correct linguistic form near or above the error. To be more specific, it is the way in which the teacher provides the learner with the right answer without any reference or indication.

Sheen (2007) later concluded that direct corrective feedback is effective in assisting students to correctly use English articles. Moreover, it helps promote the students' analytic skill in using the language. Though this type of feedback is advantageous, it has to be carefully implemented in writing classes. Without teachers' thoughtful use, it may be a harmful tool which can discourage students' language learning.

2.5.2. Indirect Written Corrective Feedback

Indirect corrective feedback (ICF) should be used with students who have a good command of the target language. Ferris & Robert (2001) stated that indirect corrective feedback is the indication made by a teacher by underlying the errors or giving the codes for the errors. Another definition given by Bitchener et al. (2005) is that ICF is the teachers' identification of errors without any correction with the intention that students should correct the errors by themselves.

This strategy was studied by Ferris and Roberts (2001); they mentioned that ICF occurs when the teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the learner with

the correct form. In addition, the students require the sufficient linguistic knowledge to correct and edit their own errors.

It can be divided into two forms, the first one which is; indicating and locating the error; this strategy takes the form of underlining and use of cursors to show the error in the students' production. While the second form indicate only the placement of errors which is indicated in the margin next to the line of the error or errors that have been made.

2.5.3. Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

In the metalinguistic corrective feedback (MCF), teachers indicate the error without giving the right answer to the learner. It indicates that when learners make an error, they are provided a clue on how to correct the errors. MCF works on the side of giving learners some form of explicit comments about their errors' nature. The explicit comments could be done in two ways. The first one is to use error codes with brief grammatical descriptions, and the second one which is the most common one is the use of error codes alone. It consists of abbreviated labels for different kinds of errors. The labels can be written just under the line of the error in the text or in the margin.

In providing feedback in form of error codes, i.e., the first type, the teacher might use abbreviated labels (e.g. prep. means preposition error). The labels on the different errors are varied and given at the location of error or in the margin. While in the second type which is the first type annexed with grammatical description, the teacher might give students a brief description of grammatical errors. Then, errors are numbered and a metalinguistic explanation of the errors is provided at the bottom of the text.

2.5.4. Focused Corrective Feedback

Focused or selective WCF concentrates on specific types of errors and ignores the other types. Highly focused WCF will focus on a single error type. Somewhat less focused CF will target more than one error type but still limit corrections to only a few pre-selected types (Ellis et al., 2008).

Ellis (2008) considered that focused CF is done when the teacher wants to direct the students to specific type of error and ignore the other errors. This strategy is used when teachers wants to make their students pay attention to specific rules and by this mastering them. Consequently, students become more aware about that kind of error after being stressed by the teacher. FCF also makes learners able to examine multiple corrections of a single error which may lead them to find the evidence why they have committed such errors in their composition.

2.5.5. Unfocused Corrective Feedback

In the unfocused or comprehensive WCF method, WCF is directed at all or a wide range of errors in learners' written work (Ellis et al., 2008). Unfocused CF is totally the opposite of what was mentioned in the previous paragraph. Here, the teacher corrects all the errors that have been made by the students. So, learners should pay attention to all what have been corrected and master it. What teachers aim from this strategy, is making students work on most usual errors.

In Hartshorn's (2008) study, students in the treatment group wrote for 10 minutes each day, received comprehensive WCF on their writing, and tracked their progress. The results revealed significant improvements in lexical accuracy and in some grammar categories for the treatment group. Hartshorn concluded that this study "provides

evidence that grammatical accuracy as well as nongrammatical accuracy can be improved through corrective feedback.

2.5.6. Electronic Feedback

Electronic Feedback (EF) is a strategy that uses the computer as tool to provide the feedback for the students. In EFL, students are going to use an online or offline software that will provide them with the correct form.

Extensive feedback of written English is stored in such a software program that allows students to use it as a reference to correct their errors; this data has been added by teachers based on their students' errors. Teachers also from time to time can add new rules that will help students each time to have new ideas and keep them updated.

2.5.7. Reformulation

The idea of reformulation as a technique for providing feedback is based on the operation of reconstruction. That is, the teacher needs to construct a native-speaker version of that part containing the error. Ellis 2009 (as cited in Devo Yilmaz, 2015 p. 35)

Reformulation involves the rewriting of the student's text to be like the writer's ideas as possible. Cohen (1989) noted: "it is to preserve as many of the writer's ideas as possible while expressing them in his/her own words so as to make the piece sound native like" (p.4), i.e. it is to keep the same ideas that the writer used and paraphrase them using their own words.

2.6. Theoretical Studies on Written Corrective Feedback

Written feedback has been an arguable topic in SLA, some researchers argued that WCF helps students improve their writing accuracy, while others stressed that WCF provides nothing but confusion and takes learners attention away from the lesson.

2.6.1. The Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback

Chandler (2003) pointed out that the correction or underlying students' errors give them opportunity for self-correction and that is proved by making a significant improvement in their accuracy. He found that direct correction is very important to know exactly the type of error.

Hyland (2000) stressed the importance of building an interpersonal relationship between learners and their teachers, and at the same time he emphasized that teacher WCF should be clear, specific, and include praise and criticism through teacher learner interaction.

Sheen (2007) claimed that WCF is of great value in promoting grammatical accuracy. Also, she said that focused WCF on article errors produced is a positive effect on acquisition. Roberts (2001) argued that WCF can help learners improve their written accuracy when they are asked to revise their texts. Other studies (Treglia, 2009; Furnborough and Truman 2009) had revealed the effectiveness of WCF on accuracy improvement in the writing of new texts.

2.6.2. The Ineffectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback

Bitchener (2008) argued that all the studies that have claimed the effectiveness of written feedback on learners' writing are not accurate because most of them does not include a control group to make a comparison between those who received written

corrective feedback and those who did not receive it. He said that studies which have proved the effectiveness cannot be interpreted.

Truscott and Ferris (2004) agreed on the studies that fail to make the comparison between control group and treatment group should not provide evidence of the effectiveness of the written feedback. Semke (1985) and Kepner (1999) pointed out that WCF provided by teachers is unclear. They think that teachers' WCF provide nothing but confusion and also takes learners' attention away from the lesson.

Zamel (1982) argued, "ESL writing teachers misread student texts, are inconsistent in their reactions, make arbitrary corrections, write contradictory comments, provide vague prescriptions, impose abstract rules and standards, respond to texts as fixed and final products, and rarely make content-specific comments or offer specific strategies for revising the text" (p. 86). In other words, when the teacher does not understand his students' writing, he will fail to give them the right feedback they need.

Truscott (1996) stated that grammar correction has no correlation with writing instruction. It is due to either the research evidences did not show that the grammar correction is effective or grammar correction has significant harmful effect.

2.7. Factors related to the Effectiveness of Written Corrective Feedback

In most foreign language classrooms teachers and learners take corrective feedback for granted. It is considered as crucial means for the development of learners' progress. But teachers recognize that corrections are not always effective, and do not lead to permanent development in the learner language. Thus, there are some factors that affect the effectiveness of WCF. We have mentioned two which they are: individual learners' factors and teachers' and students' perceptions towards WCF.

2.7.1. Individual Learners' Factors

Individual learners' factors include for instance, motivation, language aptitude, age, personality, language anxiety, and learners' attitudes and beliefs. Sheen (2007) conducted a study on three learners' factors (analytic ability, anxiety, and learners' attitudes towards error correction) on the learners' uptake and retention of information after receiving different corrective feedback. She found that students with high analytic ability benefit more from direct written corrective feedback than learners with low analytic feedback.

Learners' beliefs and goals was also investigated by Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) in which they used a case study approach to investigate students' beliefs about CF. They found that if CF contradicted with learners' beliefs, those learners could not engage in it, thus could not revise it when rewriting their texts. Another study conducted by Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) reached the conclusion that students' individual goals also affect their uptake, i.e., learners who want to enhance their writing accuracy achieved their higher levels of uptake.

2.7.2. Teachers' and Students' Perceptions

(Amrhein & Nassaji, (2010); Down et al., (2013) suggested that teachers and students have to work closely so they can solve the misunderstanding and miscommunication in the process of giving feedback. They suggest also that students should be taught how to respond to corrective feedback. The response is missing in most studies on WCF. Indeed, students need to understand the meaning and the purpose of WCF.

In another study conducted by Amrhein and Nassaji (2010), its results showed that students think that teachers should provide feedback on all the errors, while teachers think that they should only provide feedback for the most important errors. This is similar to the

previous study that was conducted by Lee (2008) which investigated the teachers' perceptions about WCF. It showed that teachers have their own concerns when giving feedback.

Conclusion

This chapter came under title written corrective feedback as a main title. It starts by defining corrective feedback in general and going through its types. After that, it represents a specific corrective feedback which was the written one, continued by mentioning the strategies for providing it. Finally, it goes through the effectiveness of WCF from different points of view.

.

Chapter Three: Data Collection, analysis, and interpretation

Introduction.....	51
3.1. Research Methodology.....	51
3.1.1. Research Approach.....	51
3.1.2. Research Design	52
3.1.3. Population and Sample.....	52
3.2. Tools of Research.....	53
3.2.1. Students' Questionnaire.....	53
3.2.1.1. Objectives of the Questionnaire.....	54
3.2.1.2. Questionnaire Procedures.....	54
3.2.1.3. Description of the Students' Questionnaire.....	54
3.2.2. Teachers' Interview.....	55
3.2.2.1. Procedures of the Interview.....	55
3.3. Data Analysis.....	56
3.3.1. Analysis of the Questionnaire.....	56
3.3.2. Analysis of the Interview.....	75
3.4. Discussion of the Results.....	84
Conclusion.....	85

Introduction

This chapter outlines the methodology that we followed in conducting the study. It highlights the research approach and design. It therefore portrays an explicit and systematic account of the approach followed in data preparation and analysis, the type of data required (qualitative and quantitative), the target population and sample from which data was obtained, the research tools that were used, and also how the data is analysed. At the end of the chapter we tried to interpret and discuss the data we gathered. In addition, we provided some recommendations.

3.1. Research methodology

Research methodology discussed the methodological consideration followed in this study namely: research approach, research design, data collection tools, and data collection procedures.

3.1.1. Research Approach

The present study was conducted on the basis of a mixed methods design which is an approach to inquiry that matches both quantitative and qualitative data within the same research as Tashakkori & Teddlie (1998) stated that “mixed method studies are those that combine the qualitative and quantitative approaches into the research methodology of a single study or multi-phased study”(p. 17, 18). The reason we opted for this approach is that the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches provides a complete understanding of the research topic rather than using one approach. It measures and explores the behaviour and attitudes of both teachers and students.

Arguably, using various types of procedures for collecting data ensures the validity and reliability of the data and their interpretations. Therefore, everything chosen, i.e., the selected tools, is to boost the validity and reliability of the data obtained.

3.1.2. Research Design

Burns & Grove (2003) defined a research design as “a blueprint for conducting a study with maximum control over factors that may interfere with the validity of the findings” (as cited in Rezaul, 2018, p. 4), and Parahoo (2014) described it as “a plan that describes how, when and where data are to be collected and analysed” (p. 164). To explain more, research design was considered as a roadmap or a blueprint for researchers to conduct and address their research problem logically and as explicitly as possible. Setting a plan for the collection, measurement, and the analysis of data is very important to incorporate the different elements of the work in a coherent and logical order.

3.1.3. Population and sample

Selecting a population is an important step and it is one of the main concerns in conducting the fieldwork. The researchers have to define the target population relevant to their research study, but the population is still very large, which is somehow challenging to study all of it. Subsequently, researchers have to select a sample that reflects the characteristics of the chosen population to facilitate the process. Houser (2016) stated that “Sample, if selected carefully, can effectively represent the broader population, because samples are more efficient and economical to study, their use enables researchers to study phenomena when reaching the entire population would be impossible.” (p. 159) Therefore, a sample is a small division of the population.

The target population in the current study were six teachers of written expression and students of third year at the same university, since studying the whole population is impossible. The focus was on a small sample, which was a limited number of teachers and students at El Oued University. The sampling technique in our study was a probability sample where both samples were simple and random.

3.2. Tools of Research

The base of any good research is a successful data collection process. The success or the failure of research is strongly related to the accuracy of the data. Therefore, wrong choices in collecting data, including the selection of the wrong tools, will influence the findings and questions the validity of the research work.

Researchers should not rely on any single source of data, interview, observation, or instrument (Unsworth et al, 2005, p. 123). In other words, it is very important to rely on more than one research tool, which makes the researcher more confident about its results and to ensure the validity and reliability of the results.

In the present study, two research tools were exploited: an interview and a questionnaire. The selection of the instrument was in a way or another related to the research questions. Explanation of each data collection tool was provided in details when tackling each tool, in addition to providing the rationale behind each choice.

3.2.1. Students' Questionnaire

Questionnaire is basically data collection tool that refers to a string of questions addressed to a defined sample from a population with the objective of bringing out respondents' opinions, behaviours, perceptions, attitudes and so forth about a specific subject. On the whole, questionnaires can appear in three main types: closed-ended, Open-ended, and a mixture of closed-ended and open-ended questionnaires. As a matter of fact, the closed-ended or structured questionnaire provides the researcher with quantitative or numerical data. Whereas open-ended or unstructured questionnaire provides qualitative data, and finally semi-structured questionnaire combines the two forms. Our questionnaire consists of closed and open questions. It included 22 questions and it is divided into 4 sections.

3.2.1.1. Objectives of the Questionnaire

The main objectives of the students' questionnaire are to discover the importance of teacher' written corrective feedback in improving students' grammatical competence and also to see the students' and teachers' perceptions toward written corrective feedback.

3.2.1.2. Questionnaire Procedures

The questionnaire was handed to thirty students who were chosen randomly from a population of nearly 100 third year students in El Oued university.

3.2.1.3. Description of the Students' Questionnaire

To facilitate the answering procedure of the questionnaire and to make it clear we divided it into four sections. The first section included two questions about the respondents' personal information such as gender, age and years of studying English at university. Such questions will provide us with a general background of the respondent. The second section is entitled "students' perceptions about the writing skill". It contained four questions. Such questions aim to know the reasons behind their writing difficulties and the kind of difficulties they face. These questions sought to know what makes the writing task difficult for students. The third section entitled "written corrective feedback", contained four questions. These questions aimed to know the types of errors that teachers correct. They sought to know if teachers correct all their students' errors. The last section, entitled "written corrective feedback to achieve grammatical accuracy" contained eleven main questions. Such questions aimed to know the kinds of corrective feedback that students receive, their opinion about how corrective feedback should be given and how written corrective feedback can improve their proficiency level.

3.2.2. Teachers' Interview

An interview is a conversation for gathering information. A research interview involves an interviewer, who coordinates the process of the conversation and asks questions, and an interviewee, who responds to those questions. Interviews are an appropriate method when there is a need to collect in-depth information on people's opinions, thoughts, experiences, and feelings. Interviews are useful when the topic of inquiry relates to issues that require complex questioning and considerable probing. (Easwaramoorthy, M & Fataneh, Z, 2006)

We conducted an interview since it is a qualitative research tool that can support our quantitative results. We interviewed six teachers of written expression who all work in the department of foreign languages at Hama Lakhdar University, El Oued. The interview consisted of fifteen questions. It aimed to know the teachers' perceptions about written corrective feedback and how they provide their learners with those corrections.

3.2.2.1. Procedures of the Interview

The interview was done with six teachers at Hama Lakhdar University in El Oued. It consists of fifteen questions; it was divided into 4 sections. The first section was about general information. The second section was about teachers' perceptions toward the writing skill. The third section was about written corrective feedback. And the last section shed light on written corrective feedback that may lead to the improvement in grammar accuracy.

3.3. Data Analysis

Analysing the data that was gathered required too much effort and attention, and especially that of numerical statistics. In addition, analysing the descriptive data required deep understanding behind the answers.

3.3.1. Analysis of the Questionnaire

Section one: Personal Information

Q1: Gender

Table 3.01

Students' Gender

Gender	Subjects	Percentages
Male	8	26.7 %
Female	22	73.3 %
Total	30	100%

The first table shows that the majority of the participants are females. This is because the number of females (73.3%) is more than males (26.7%), which is the case of all universities in Algeria

Q2: Age

Table 3.02

Students' Age

Age	Subjects	Percentages
21	2	6.67 %
22	18	60 %
23	8	26.66 %
24	2	6.67 %

According to the data we have collected in table two, most of the students are between 22-23 years old (86.66 %), which is the average age for this level, while only two students are 21 years old (6.67%) and two others are 24 years old (6.67%).

Q3: How long have you been studying English at university?

Table 3.03

Years of Studying English at University

Options	Subjects	Percentages
3 years	26	86.67 %
4 years	4	13.33 %
5 years	2	5 %

The table shows that the majority of the students have studied English at university for three years (86.67%), and the rest of the students have the lowest percentages. Four students have studied English for four years (13.33%) and only two students have studied English for five years.

Section two: Students' Perceptions about the Writing Skill**Q4: How do you consider your level in English?****Table 3.04***Students' English Level*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Poor	3	10%
Average	12	40%
Good	15	50%

The table four demonstrates that half of the students (50%) consider their level of English are good, while twelve students (40%) consider their level of English average, and only two students see themselves poor in English.

Q5: Do you find writing interesting?**Table 3.05***Students' Interest for Writing*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	26	86.7%
No	4	13.3%
Total	30	100%

The aim of this question is to know whether students are interested to write or not. As table five shows, the number of students who said that writing is interesting is 26 (86.7%) means the majority are interested, and just four students (13.3%) answered no, which means they are not interested at all.

Q6: Why is the writing skill is difficult for you?

Table 3.06

Reasons' of Writing Difficulty

Options	Subjects	Percentages
- You lack English vocabulary	7	23.3%
- You do not practice writing in the classroom	10	33.4%
- You lack interest or motivation in the writing skill	13	43.3%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to know what makes writing difficult for students, in other words what is the main reason behind students' writing difficulties. As table six shows, the results are close. Seven students (23.3%) answered that they lack English vocabulary, ten students (33.4%) said that they do not practice writing in the classroom, and thirteen students (43.3%) said that they simply lack interest in writing, so the reasons vary.

Q7: What are the difficulties you face when writing?**Table 3.07***Students' Difficulties when Writing*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Lexical errors	4	13.3%
Organizational errors	11	36.7%
Grammar errors	9	30%
Mechanical errors (punctuation)	6	20%
Total	30	100%

The aim of this question is to know what difficulties face students when writing. The seventh table shows that the majority of students answered that they either face organizational or grammatical errors. Eleven students (36.7%) answered organization errors, while nine students said it is grammar errors, six others (20%) answered mechanical errors and the rest, i.e., four students (13.3%) said lexical errors. Thus, the number of students who face grammatical errors is considerable (30%) in contrast with the other types of errors.

Section Three: Written Correction Feedback**Q8: Does your teacher correct the errors that you have made?****Table 3.08***The Teacher's Correction of Errors*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	23	76.7%
No	7	23.3%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to know whether students' writing errors are corrected by their teachers or not. Table eight shows that the majority of the students 76.7% said yes and the minority of students 23.3% answered teachers do not correct their errors.

Q9: Do you think that the teacher must correct your errors?

Table 3.09

The Teacher Correction of Errors

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	28	93.33%
No	2	6.67%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to see the students' point of view towards their teachers in the issue of correcting their errors. Table nine demonstrates that 93.33% of students said yes, their teacher must correct their errors, and only 6.67% who said no they should not.

Table 3.10

The Students' Justification for Teachers' Obligation of Correction

 Justification

- In order not to repeat the error again, the teacher must correct it.
 - To improve their writing, the teacher must correct their errors.
 - Correcting the error is the teacher's job.
 - I like to correct my own errors.
-

Table ten shows that 50% of students want the teacher to correct their errors to not repeat it another time, 33.33% of students want the teacher to correct their errors so they improve their writing. Others that represent 10% of students said that the teacher should correct the errors because it is his/her job, whereas only two students that represent 3.67% said that they want to correct their own errors.

Q10: When writing about a particular topic, do you need to write in multiple drafts?**Table 3.11***the Students' Usage of Multiple Drafts when Writing*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	23	76.7%
No	7	23.3%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to know whether students use multiple drafts when writing or just use one draft. Table eleven shows that 76.7% of students are using multiple drafts when writing regardless of how many drafts, while the rest of the students 23.3% use only one draft. It means that the majority of students use multiple drafts in order to produce a clear and understandable piece of writing.

- If yes, on which of the drafts do teachers usually provide written corrective feedback?

Table 3.12

The Students' Draft that Teachers Provide Feedback on it

Options	Subjects	Percentages
First draft	7	23.3%
Second draft	8	26.7%
Final Draft	13	43.3%
All of them	2	6.7%
Total	30	100%

The aim of this question is to know on which draft does the teacher focus when providing feedback for his/her students. As table twelve shows, the students who answered first draft are 23.3%, the students who said second draft are 26.7%, and the majority of students said final drafts represent the largest number 43.3%. Only 6.7% said all the drafts are corrected by the teacher. This means that teachers correct only the students' last draft in order to gain time for making other activities and focus also on other aspects.

Q11: Does your teacher give your piece of writing back?**Table 3.13***Giving Back the students' Piece of Writing*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	21	70%
No	9	30%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to know whether the teacher gives students their piece of writing back. As table thirteen shows, the majority of students 70% said yes and the minority 30% said no. This means that teachers want their students to benefit from the written feedback they provide on their papers.

- Which type of errors do teachers correct in your assignment?**Table 3.14***Type of Errors Teachers Correct.*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Grammatical errors	7	23.3%
Lexical errors	0	0%
Mechanical errors	1	3.4%
Organizational errors	7	23.%
All of them	15	50%
Total	30	100%

The aim of this question is to know what types of errors teachers focus on when correcting students' writing. Table fourteen illustrates that most of students (50%) said that their teachers correct all of the errors, 7 students (23.3%) answered grammatical errors as well as 7 students said organizational errors, and no one answers for the mechanical errors. It means that the majority of teachers corrected all the types of errors, including grammatical errors.

Section Four: Written corrective feedback to achieve grammatical accuracy

Q12: Do you make grammatical errors in writing?

Table 3.15

Students' Making of Grammatical Errors in Writing

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	27	90%
No	3	10%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to investigate whether the students make grammatical errors when writing or not. Tables fifteen shows that the majority of students 90% answered yes, only 10% who said that they do not make grammatical errors. It means that almost all drafts include grammatical errors. Thus, teachers are supposed to make their initiative to correct them.

Q13: How often?**Table 3.16***Frequency of Making Grammatical Errors*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Always	3	10%
Very often	2	6.7%
Sometimes	15	50%
Rarely	10	33.3%
Never	0	0%

The aim of this question is to know the frequency of the commitment of grammar errors by students, or to what extent students make grammar errors. Table sixteen illustrates that most of students 50% have answered sometimes while 33.3% make grammar errors rarely. Others 10% they always make errors, while 6.7% of them make errors very often. This means that the average of students often makes grammatical errors.

Q14: Do you make grammar errors because**Table 3.17***The Reasons Behind Making Students' Grammar Errors*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
- You focus more on other aspects when writing such as: organization, mechanics.	15	50%
- You do not have a high proficiency level that allows you to be grammatically accurate.	12	40%
- Your teacher does not pay much attention to grammar errors.	3	10%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to see the main reason behind students making of grammar errors when writing. The big percentage 50% is for students who make grammatical errors because they focus on others aspects; also 40% of students make grammar errors because they are not proficient. And only 10% said that their teachers do not give much importance to grammar errors.

Q15: Which one of the following you like most when the teacher corrects your grammatical errors?

Table 3.18

The Preferable Type Used by Teachers to Correct Students' Grammatical Errors

Options	Subjects	Percentages
A- The teacher provides you with the correct form of your errors (direct feedback)	15	50%
B- The teacher highlights the errors without giving you the correct form (indirect feedback)	15	50%
Total	30	100%

The aim of this question is to know what type of correction students like their teachers to use when correcting their grammatical errors. Table eighteen shows that 50% of students prefer their teachers to use direct corrective feedback, whereas 50% of students prefer their teachers use indirect corrective feedback.

- If the answer is A (direct feedback), does the teacher

Table 3.19

Options of Direct Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentages
- Cross out the unnecessary word	8	26.6%
- Add a missing word	2	6.6%
- Write the correct form above/near the grammatical error	4	13.4%
- All of them	16	53.4%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to know what options students like when their teachers give them direct feedback. The table shows that the majority (53.4%) like to correct their grammar errors through different ways, others 26.6% like their errors to be corrected through crossing out the unnecessary word, and 13.4% like writing the correct form above or near their grammatical errors by the teachers. Only 6.6% which represents two students likes to add missing words.

- If the answer is B (indirect feedback), does the teacher

Table 3.20

Options of Indirect Feedback

Options	Subjects	Percentages
- Underline or circle the grammatical errors	18	60%
- Use cursor to show omissions in your text	0	0%
- Place cross in the margin next to the line containing errors	2	6.6%
- All of them	10	33.4%
Total	30	100%

The aim of this question is to know what options students like when their teachers give them indirect feedback. The big percentage (60%) of students prefer their teachers to underline or circle the grammatical errors and 33.4% of them like using all what have been mentioned in the table, whereas only 6.6% of students prefer placing a cross in the margin next to the line containing errors. So, from their answers one can understand that students are really interested to know their errors to learn how to avoid them in their writings.

Q16: Does your teacher use codes (adj, art, prep...) to highlight your errors?**Table 3.21***Use of Codes by Teachers*

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	23	76.7%
No	7	23.3%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to see if teachers use codes to highlight students' errors. Table twenty-one shows that 76.6% of students said that their teachers use codes and only 23.3% of students said no, their teachers do not use codes to highlight their errors. This means that the majority of teachers use codes when providing feedback for their students.

Q17: Do you understand them?

Table 3.22

Students' Understanding of Codes

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	26	86.7%
No	4	13.3%
Total	30	100%

The aim of this question is to know if students understand the codes that teachers use to highlight errors for them. Table twenty-two shows that 86.7% of students understand codes and 13.3% of the rest do not understand those codes. This means that the majority of the students have no problem understanding those codes that teachers use when they provide them with feedback.

Q18: Does your teacher correct?

Table 3.23

Teachers' Correction of Errors

Options	Subjects	Percentages
All of the errors	13	43.3%
Some of the errors	17	56.7%
Total	30	100%

This question aims to see if teachers correct all of the errors or they just focus on a specific type of errors. The table 22 shows that 56.7% of students said that their teachers correct some of the errors while 43.3% of students said that their teachers correct all of the errors.

Q19: When you are provided with error correction, do you think that error correction should be given?

Table 3.24

Way of Giving Corrective Feedback for Errors by Teachers

Options	Subjects	Percentages
- In clear form so you understand it.	12	40%
- Regularly so that you improve your writing.	10	33.3%
- Immediately after your writing so you improve it.	8	26.7%
Total	30	100%

This question aims to know what ways students prefer when their teachers give them the correction (feedback). The table shows that 40% of students prefer to perceive their feedback in clear form. Others 33.3% prefer to take their correction regularly to improve their writing, while the rest 26.7% of students prefer to take their feedback immediately after writing.

Q20: How often do you revise the grammar errors that have been corrected in your writing?

Table 3.25

Frequency of Revising the Correction of Grammar Errors

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Always	6	20%
Very often	7	23.3%
Sometimes	12	40%
Rarely	5	16.7%
Never	0	0%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to see how often students do revise the correction that is provided for them by teachers. Table twenty-five shows that 40% of students revise the correction sometimes, 23.3% of students revise the correction very often, 20% of students revise the correction always, while the rest 16.7% of students revise the correction rarely. The results interpret that most of the students revise their teachers' corrections in order to master their grammar.

Q21: Does your grammar accuracy improve after each time your teacher provides you with written correction on your writing?

Table 3.26

Improvement of Students' Grammar Accuracy

Options	Subjects	Percentages
Yes	24	80%
No	6	20%
Total	30	100%

The purpose of this question is to know whether students' grammatical accuracy improves after their teacher's correction. Table twenty-six shows that the majority of students' grammar accuracy have improved and the minority has not.

- Justify

Table 3.27

Students' Justification for their Improving in Grammar

Justification
- Because they follow the teachers' instruction, so they do not repeat the errors again.
- Because they work too much on their errors to fix it, so they can improve their grammar accuracy
- Because of the more practice of grammar
Total

The table shows that the majority of students said that they follow the teachers' instructions, 30% of students answered that they work so much on their errors to fix them, whereas 1% of students said they have practiced grammar too much.

Q22: To what extent written corrective feedback helps you to improve your grammatical accuracy?

Table 3.28

The Influence of Written corrective Feedback on Students' Grammar Accuracy

Justification
- It helps them too much to improve their grammar accuracy
- they became better than before
- Made a big difference in their grammar
- Helps them improve their writing skill
- Just few changes
- Many aspects
- They feel that their level improved by 60%
- They feel that their level improved by 95%

This question aims to know whether students improve their grammar accuracy after perceiving corrective feedback or not. Table twenty-eight shows that 40% of students, corrective feedback helps improve their grammar accuracy, while for 20% of them helps them, it helps them improve their writing skill, other 13.33% of students answered that they became better than before, and 6.67% of students, said that corrective feedback made a big difference in their grammar as well as some others (6.67%) said that

they improve in many aspects and the others (6.67%) answered they got just few changes. Only a few numbers of students gave a percentage of their improvement, 3.33% have improved (95%) in their grammar accuracy and also 3.33% have improved (60%).

3.3.2. Analysis of the Interview

Section One: General Information

Q1: How many years have you been teaching English?

Table 3.29

Years of Teaching English

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	28 Years
Teacher 2	12 years
Teacher 3	13 years
Teacher 4	5 years
Teacher 5	8 years
Teacher 6	10 years

Q2: How many years have you been teaching written expression?

Table 3.30

Years of Teaching Written Expression

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	10 Years
Teacher 2	4 years
Teacher 3	3 years
Teacher 4	2years
Teacher 5	1 years
Teacher 6	3 years

Section one of the interview aims to know the years that our sample (teachers) have been teaching English and specifically how much years they have been teaching written expression. As we see the results are between 5 and 28 years concerning teaching English in general, and between 1 and 10 years in teaching written expression. Our sample is mixed between experienced and novice teachers.

Section Two: Teachers Perceptions about Writing Skill

Q3: How do you consider the writing proficiency level of your students?

Table 3.31

Writing Proficiency Level of Students

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	Average
Teacher 2	low
Teacher 3	weak
Teacher 4	Still need further improvement
Teacher 5	Not good
Teacher 6	Less than average

Q4: What are the difficulties that your students face when writing?**Table 3.32***Difficulties of Writing*

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	Finding ideas, vocabulary items, structuring ideas logically, sentence structures
Teacher 2	Handwriting is horrible, lack of vocabulary, and no grammar mastery
Teacher 3	Interference, accuracy
Teacher 4	English structures, developing essays, punctuation
Teacher 5	Writing accuracy, vocabulary, grammar, relating
Teacher 6	Lack of vocabulary, structures of sentences

Q5: What are the most frequent errors that you notice your students make when writing? (spelling/ vocabulary/ grammar/ organization/ mechanics).**Table 3.33***Type of Errors*

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	All kinds of errors
Teacher 2	All of them
Teacher 3	Syntactic, and grammatical errors
Teacher 4	Spelling and grammar
Teacher 5	Vocabulary, grammar, and sometimes spelling mistakes
Teacher 6	Vocabulary and grammar

In answering about the students' level, all teachers considered their students level in writing are not that good in general, where some of them said it is average, not good, and others said that it is weak or low. Less than average also is given.

Typically, the answers came similarly when we asked teachers about their student's difficulties and errors they make when writing; most of them said that students do not have an acceptable luggage of vocabulary, in other words, they lack vocabulary. Also, some teachers agreed on the lack of grammar rules and writing accuracy. Concerning students' errors, they all agreed on the grammar errors since it is so common in writing. Others mentioned vocabulary errors as a part of students' errors.

Section Three: Teacher Perceptions about Written Corrective Feedback

Q6: What do you think about providing corrections for students' writings? Is it beneficial? And why?

Table 3.34

The Benefit of Providing Feedback for Students

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	It is crucial, students cannot develop their writing proficiency without feedback
Teacher 2	It is very fruitful and it helps students know their weaknesses
Teacher 3	It is the best tool to equip the learners with the diction of writing
Teacher 4	Yes, it is and students need it and it makes them learn from their errors
Teacher 5	Of course, it is. So, they can avoid making the same mistakes
Teacher 6	Yes, it is because they need to fix the errors in order to improve their writing

Q7: Who are responsible of errors corrections in your opinion teachers or students?**Table 3.35***The Responsible for Errors Corrections*

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	Both, teachers highlight and students correct
Teacher 2	Both of them
Teacher 3	Teachers and students (peer-feedback)
Teacher 4	Teachers
Teacher 5	Teachers first, as it is teachers' roles, and students later (peer-correction)
Teacher 6	Teachers

Q8: What should you take into consideration when providing written corrective feedback for your students?**Table 3.36***The Aspects that Teachers should Know when Providing Written Corrective Feedback*

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	- The writing situation and students' level
Teacher 2	- It should be clear, simple and targeted
Teacher 3	- Students' understanding of the errors and acquiring the remedies to these errors
Teacher 4	- Prompt feedback is needed. And students need to be corrected in a way they feel comfortable
Teacher 5	- Their understanding and levels
Teacher 6	In a way that suits their way of thinking, and their learning capacities

All the teachers agreed on the importance of providing feedback for students. Feedback is one of the crucial stages in writing; it helps students improve their levels and writing proficiency through the avoidance of making the same mistakes or errors, i.e., they fix them. Then, teachers also agreed on the responsible of errors corrections when they said that both; teachers and students are responsible whereas others said it is only teachers' role to correct, students are not included in the correction process. Furthermore, all teachers agreed on taking into consideration the students' levels when providing feedback because it is useless giving high method of feedback to students with limited knowledge (less able students).

Section Four: Written Corrective Feedback to Achieve Grammar Accuracy

Q9: When you read your students drafts do you correct every grammatical error?

Table 3.37

Teachers' Corrections of Students' Grammatical Errors

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	Not always
Teacher 2	Absolutely no
Teacher 3	No
Teacher 4	No, impossible
Teacher 5	No, I do not
Teacher 6	Of course, no

Q10: What is the kind of written corrective feedback that you provide to your learners (direct/ indirect)? and why?

Table 3.38*Teachers' Kind of Written Corrective Feedback Provide for their Students*

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	Both, it depends on the targeted skill and on students' level
Teacher 2	Both, according to the situation
Teacher 3	Direct as it is more effective in my point of view
Teacher 4	Indirect, learners need to correct themselves so they will remember those errors and avoid making it
Teacher 5	Both, it depends on their understanding and what have tackled before
Teacher 6	Direct, because it is effective and time saving

Q11: What about error codes do you use them as a strategy to provide feedback?**And in case you use them do your students understand these codes?****Table 3.39***Teachers' Use of Codes when Providing Feedback*

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	Of course, they understand as long as I explain them beforehand
Teacher 2	Yes, I use them but I tell students before, so they can understand those codes
Teacher 3	I use codes, and they understand them easily
Teacher 4	No, I do not.
Teacher 5	Yes, of course they understand because they are third year students
Teacher 6	Not always, but in case I use them they understand those codes.

Q12: Does the method of error correction you utilize in your students writing depend on students' proficiency level?

Table 3.40

Teachers' Use of Correction Method that Fit Students' Proficiency Level

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	It should
Teacher 2	Yes, it does
Teacher 3	Most of times
Teacher 4	Yes
Teacher 5	Yes, of course
Teacher 6	Yes

Q13: Does the grammar accuracy improve after each time you provide them with correction on their writing

Table 3.41

The Improvements of Students' Grammatical Accuracy

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	In some case it does; it depends on students' interest
Teacher 2	To some extent, yes
Teacher 3	Yes, they do
Teacher 4	Yes
Teacher 5	Of course, most of students but not all of them
Teacher 6	Not always, it depends on the student him/herself

Q14: According to your teaching experience, do you think that written corrective feedback is helpful in improving student's grammatical accuracy?

Table 3.42

The Importance of Written Corrective Feedback on students' Grammatical Accuracy Improvements

Teachers	Answers
Teacher 1	Yes, writing develops better with readers' feedback. Teachers as readers can show language learners their weaknesses in expressing and help them to develop.
Teacher 2	Very sure
Teacher 3	It can be
Teacher 4	Yes, it is very helpful
Teacher 5	Yes, it is very helpful otherwise students' level will not be improved
Teacher 6	Yes, it is

Arguably, all teachers when it comes to corrections, they do not correct every grammatical error and that was revealed in their answers; though, they do provide their students with written corrective feedback whenever they ask. Concerning providing feedback, most teachers agreed on using different types of WCF, but providing it should depend on learners' levels and their understanding. It is worth mentioning that all the teachers use codes when providing feedback for their learners. All in all, all teachers asserted that students' grammar accuracy improves after each feedback they provide.

Finally, teachers said that providing feedback for learners helps them a lot to discover their errors, fix them, and avoid making them again, whatever the type of feedback that is given as long as the learners' accuracy level is improving.

3.4. Discussion of the Results

After analysing the results that we have obtained, we discuss those results. We have raised two research questions at the outset of our study.

Q1: What are the students' perceptions toward the influence of written corrective feedback on their grammatical accuracy?

The analysis of the students' questionnaire, which explained the opinions, and perceptions of the participants point out that there is sort of convergence among students' perceptions towards the effectiveness of written corrective feedback.

The results displayed above revealed that learners seem to like the written corrective feedback, as a way to enhance their grammatical accuracy in particular, and their writing in general.

The results also reveal that each student prefers a method to receive feedback through it. To sum up, the students' preferences of written corrective feedback is shown in their answers. Their answers also indicate that their perceptions about written corrective is positive.

Q2: What are the teachers' perceptions toward the influence of written corrective feedback on students' grammatical accuracy?

The analysis of the teachers' interview revealed that they believe that written corrective feedback enhances students' grammatical accuracy. Their answers revealed that providing learners with written corrective feedback is crucial and learners can learn from their errors and master their proficiency level. Besides, they claimed that teachers and students both of them are responsible for the error corrections to achieve the set goals. It would be more challenging for teachers to provide the corrections for each error students

make. By introducing feedback to them, within this perspective, the teachers of writing have shown a positive attitude about the written corrective feedback to help the students reach an acceptable level of writing.

Consequently, it can be said that EFL university students can improve their grammatical accuracy through teachers' affordance of written corrective feedback.

Conclusion

In this final chapter, we introduced our methodological procedure through which we carried out the research study, where we have chosen the most suitable research method that fits our topic and goes along with the nature of the chosen population and sample of our research. In this chapter, we also dealt with the analysis of the collected data and the procedure we have followed. Finally, we moved to the discussion of our results where we highlighted the findings and discussed it.

General Conclusion

1. Summary.....	87
2. Research Implications and Pedagogical Recommendations	88
3. Limitations of the Study.....	88
4. Suggestions for Further Research.....	89

General Conclusion

1. Summary

Writing has always been considered as difficult task for EFL learners. Specifically, grammatical accuracy is one of the most challenging and complex aspect to be respected FL learners. It is a process that requires teachers' help to achieve an acceptable level, this rises the importance of teachers' written corrective feedback to assess the learners. The question is whether teachers' written corrective feedback really enhances students' grammatical accuracy or not.

The present research study, then, is an attempt to explore the influence of teachers' written corrective feedback on students' grammatical accuracy from the perspectives of both teachers and learners. It compromised three chapters. The first and second chapters are the descriptive parts that have reviewed the related literature. The third chapter is devoted to the practical side. The first chapter reviews the writing skill in general and the grammar accuracy in particular in relation to FL. The second chapter introduces the corrective feedback and dives into its aspects. The last chapter tackles the research methodology and the analysis of the findings.

It was hypothesized that there is a positive influence of written corrective feedback on grammatical accuracy. More precisely, the use of written corrective feedback by teachers will enhance students' grammatical accuracy. To test this hypothesis, two research tools were implemented namely, a students' questionnaire and a teachers' interview. The questionnaire was used to explore the students' perceptions towards the writing skill and written corrective feedback. Besides, the teachers' interview was used to uncover the teachers' way of treating errors and also their perceptions about written corrective feedback.

The results yielded by the previously mentioned research tools answer the research questions raised earlier and maintain what was hypothesized so far: If teachers use written corrective feedback, the EFL students' grammatical accuracy will be enhanced.

2. Research Implications and Pedagogical Recommendations

The literature review and empirical study have shown the importance of written corrective feedback on enhancing students' grammatical accuracy; here, we suggest some pedagogical recommendations for both teachers and students. They are as follows:

For teachers, they have to adopt WCF as a strategy in the process of teaching the writing skill, i.e., they should provide the WCF whenever they feel their students are in need for. Furthermore, when providing feedback teachers should take into their consideration the proficiency levels of their students, so students can benefit as much as they can. In addition, teachers should use different ways of providing feedback according to the targeted goal, learners' motivations and understanding. Also, teachers' feedback should focus on the students' errors rather than the student him/herself.

For learners, it is advisable to pay attention to every point teacher says when correcting their errors as well as peers' errors. They also should revise their teachers' corrections in order to avoid making the same grammatical errors. In addition, students should tell their teachers about the type of corrective feedback they prefer in order to gain as much as possible from teachers' corrections.

3. Limitations of the study

The most important limitations which confronted us throughout the process are presented here to draw the attention of those who can make such experiences better

The first problem is that we attempted to conduct an experimental study, but the time of our research coincided with the students' strikes and with the end of courses at university. The second problem is that students are careless, not interested and do not take it seriously. So, we have suffered to make them answer our questionnaire. The third problem is that some teachers did not reply and give back the papers, so we were obliged to contact other teachers. The fourth problem was the time table of the teachers that was not compatible with the time we were in El Oued.

4. Suggestions for Further Research

On the basis of the results obtained from the findings, it is important to give some points for future researchers. It is as follows:

Future researchers can dig deeper into this subject by using classroom observation. It is preferable to know whether teachers really do what they report doing in interviews.

Future researchers are recommended to make a comparison between teachers' feedback and peers' feedback to exactly what students prefer when it comes to correction. That is, which feedback students find better for them to make a progress.

Generalisability is not of a good strategy. Researchers who want to make their results more accurate could use survey. It is not, and cannot be impossible to survey all the university teachers in Algeria, but to gain more numbers in various region. Future researchers may involve other researchers from different places to use the same tool and in order to have the same questions.

Reference List

- Adas, D. & Bakir, A. (2013). Writing Difficulties and New Solutions. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 3(9), 254-266. Retrieved from <https://staff.najah.edu/sites/default/files/28.pdf>
- Ahmed, S. A., & Alamin, A. (2012). Skills and strategies used in the comprehension and production of academic writing in Taif University. *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2(3), 134.
- Al Murshidi, G. (2014). UAE university male students' interests impact on reading and writing performance and improvement. *English Language Teaching*, 7(9), 57-63.
- Al-Mutawa, N., & Taisser, K. (1989). *Methods of teaching English to Arab students*. UK: Longman Group Limited.
- Amrhein, H., & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written Corrective Feedback: What Do Students and Teachers Prefer and Why? *EROC*. 13(2), 95–127.
- Annab, A. (2016). Investigating EFL Students' Writing Difficulties and Common Errors in writing. The case of third year LMD students of English. Bejaia
- Allwright, R., Allwright, D., & Bailey, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Badger, R. and White, G. (2000) 'A process genre approach to teaching writing', In ELT

Journal, Vol. 54 No. 2, pp 153 – 160.

Bitá, A., & Dariush, N. (2014). Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 581-587. doi:10.4304/tpls.4.3.581-587.

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 14(3), 191-205.

Brookes, A., & Grundy, P. (1998). *Beginning to write: Writing activities for elementary and intermediate learners*. Cambridge University Press.

Brown, H. Douglass (2000). *Principles of Language learning and teaching*. 4th Ed. Longman. Print.

Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching writing skills*. London & New York: Longman.

Can, G. (2009). A model for doctoral students' perceptions and attitudes toward written feedback for academic writing (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Utah State University.

Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language teaching. *TESOL quarterly*, 459-480

Chandler, J. (2003). The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing.

Cohen, A. D. (1989). Reformulation: A technique for providing advanced

feedback in writing. *Guidelines*, 11 (2), 1-9.

Devo Yilmaz, D. (2015). *Teaching Grammatical Metaphor: Designing Pedagogical Interventions*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Donn, B. (1988). *Teaching writing skills*. Hongkong: Longman Group (FE) Ltd.

Easwaramoorthy, M & Fataneh, Z. (2006). *INTERVIEWING FOR RESEARCH*.

Ellis, R. (2008). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT journal*, 63(2), 97-107.

Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context.

Fischer, S. R. (2003). *History of writing*. Reaktion Books.

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College composition and communication*, 32(4), 365-387.

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

[https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743\(01\)00039-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1060-3743(01)00039-x)

Graham, S. & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: effective strategies to improve writing of*

adolescents in middle and high schools. A Report to Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Grami, G. M. A. (2010). The effects of integrating peer feedback into university-level ESL writing curriculum: A comparative study in a Saudi context (Doctoral dissertation, Newcastle University).

Goode, D. (2000). Creating a context for developmental English. *Teaching English in the Two-Year College*, 27(3), 270-277.

Harris, J. (1995). *Introducing writing*. Penguin English Press.

Hattie, J., Biggs, J., & Purdue, N. (1996). Effects of learning skills interventions on student learning: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 66(2), 99-136.

Hartshorn, K. J. (2008). The effects of manageable corrective feedback on ESL writing accuracy. Unpublished dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Hedgcock, J. & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity in second language writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 141-163.

Houser (2016). *Nursing Research: Reading, Using and Creating Evidence*.

Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, 33-54.

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<http://enl.Wikipedia.org/wiki/Awareness>.

John, B & Dana, F. (2012). WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND WRITING. By Routledge

Johns, A. M. (2003). Genre and ESL/EFL composition instruction. *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*, 195-217.

Keh, C. (1990) 'Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation', In *ELT Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 4, pp 294 – 304.

Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(1), 211-232.

Lado, R. (1964). LANGUAGE TEACHING, A SCIENTIFIC APPROACH.

Lalande, J. (1982). Reducing composition error: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140–149.

Leeman, J. (2007). Feedback in L2 learning: Responding to errors during practice. *Practice in a second language: Perspectives from applied linguistics and cognitive psychology*, 111-137.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1999). How languages are learned. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

María del Pilar A, L. (2011). Lexical Errors and Accuracy in Foreign Language Writing *Second Language Acquisition. Multilingual Matters.*

Matsuda, P. K., Canagarajah, A. S., Harklau, L., Hyland, K., & Warschauer, M. (2003).

Changing currents in second language writing research: A colloquium. *Journal of second language writing*, 12(2), 151-179.

Mingwei, P. (2015). Nonverbal Delivery in Speaking Assessment: From An Argument to A Rating Scale Formulation and Validation

Murray, D. (1988). *Read, write, and revise: A guide to academic writing*. New York: St. Martin press.

Nemouchi, A. (2014). Approaches to teaching writing. *Faculty of Letters and Languages Magazine*, 14-15.

Nelson, K. E., Denninger, M., Bonvillian, J. D., Kaplan, B., & Baker, N. (1984). Maternal input adjustments and non-adjustments as related to children's advances and to language acquisition theories.

Parahoo, K. (1997). *Nursing research: principles, process and issues*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Raimes, A. (1991) 'Out of the woods emerging traditions in the teaching of writing', In *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 25 No. 3, pp 407-30.

Rezaul Islam, M. (2018). *Social Research Methodology and New Techniques in Analysis, Interpretation, and Writing*.

Rigoberto, R. (2018). Is grammar important in writing. Retrieved from <https://www.quora.com/Is-grammar-important-in-writing>

Rivers, Wilga M. (1968). *Teaching Foreign Language Skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Russel, J., & Spada, N. (2006). The effectiveness of corrective feedback for second language acquisition: A meta-analysis of the research. *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching*, 133-164.

Sedgwick, E. (1989). Alternatives to teaching formal, analytical grammar. *Journal of Developmental Education*, 12(3), 8-10, 12, 14, 16.

Semke, H. (1984). The effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17, 195–202.

Sheen, Y. (2007). The Effect of Focused Written Corrective Feedback and language Aptitude on ESL Learners' Acquisition of Articles. *TESOL Quarterly*, 41(2), 255-283.

Steven, R. (2003). *History of Writing*. Reaktion Books.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2010). LEARNERS' PROCESSING, UPTAKE, AND RETENTION OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON WRITING: Case Studies. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 303-334.

<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990532>

Swales, John. M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Setting*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Tashakkori, A., Teddlie, C., & Teddlie, C. B. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches* (Vol. 46). Sage.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning* 46, 327-369.

Unsworth, L et al. (2005). *Children's Literature and Computer Based Teaching*.

Ur, P. (1996) *A Course in Language Teaching Practice and Theory. Cambridge Teacher Training and Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Urquhart, V., & McIver, M. (2005). *Teaching writing in the content areas*. ASCD.

Van Beuningen, C., de Jong, N. H., & Kuiken, F. (2012). Evidence on the effectiveness of comprehensive error correction in Dutch multilingual classrooms. *Language Learning* (forthcoming).

Warschauer, M. (2010). Invited commentary: New tools for teaching writing. *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(1). Retrieved from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol14num1/commentary.pdf>

Weaver, C., McNally, C., & Moerman, S. (2001). To grammar or not to grammar: That is not the question!. *Voices from the Middle*, 8 (3). Retrieved from <http://www.learner.org/workshops/middlewriting/images/pdf/W8ReadGrammar.pdf>.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing*. Ernst Klett Sprachen.

White, R. V. (1988). Process and Product. In P. Robinson (Ed) *Academic Writing*. ELT Document, 129:4-16

WhyIsWritingImportant. Retrieved from <https://public.district196.org>.

Williams, S, B. (2015). Writing is the Painting of the Voice. Retrieved from

<https://authorswilliams.wordpress.com/2015/10/20/writing-is-the-painting-of-the-voice>.

Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 195-200.

Appendices

Appendix A: Students' Questionnaire

Dear students,

This questionnaire is designed for the students at Hama Lakhdar University of El Oued. It aims to investigate students' perceptions towards written corrective feedback on enhancing grammatical accuracy in writing. There is no right or wrong answer. Please give your answers sincerely as only this will guarantee the success of this study. Thank you for your help.

Please put a tick (√) in the corresponding box, or boxes and make full statements whenever necessary

Section One: Personal Information

1. Gender:

- Male

- Female

2. Age.....

3. How long have you been studying English at university?

.....

Section Two: Students' Perceptions about the Writing Skill

4. How do you consider your level in English?

-Poor

-Average

-Good

5. Do you find writing interesting?

-Yes

- No

6. Why is the writing skill is difficult for you?

a) You lack English vocabulary

b) You do not practice writing in the classroom

c) You lack interest in the writing skill

7. What are the difficulties you face when writing?

- a) Lexical errors (spelling)
- b) Organizational errors
- c) Grammar errors
- d) Mechanical errors (punctuation)

Section Three: Written Corrective Feedback

8. Does your teacher correct the errors that you have made?

- Yes -No

9. Do you think that the teacher must correct your errors?

- Yes -No

Justify.....

10. When writing about a particular topic, do you need to write in multiple drafts?

- Yes -No

If yes, on which of the drafts should your teacher provide you with written corrective feedback

- a) First draft
- b) Second draft
- c) Final draft
- d) All of them

11. Does your teacher give your piece of writing back?

- Yes -No

Which type of errors do teachers correct in your assignment?

- a) Grammatical errors
- b) Lexical errors (spelling)
- c) Mechanical errors (punctuation)
- d) Organizational errors
- e) All of them

Section Four: Written Corrective Feedback to Achieve Grammatical Accuracy

12. Do you make grammatical errors in writing?

- Yes - No

13. How often?

- Always - Very often - Sometimes
- Rarely - Never

14. Do you make grammar errors because?

- You focus more on other aspects when writing such as: organization, mechanics
- You do not have a high proficiency level that allows you to be grammatically accurate
- Your teacher does not pay much attention to grammar errors

15. Which one of the following you like most when the teacher corrects your grammatical errors?

A. The teacher provides the correct form of your errors (direct feedback)

B. The teacher highlights the errors without correcting them (indirect feedback)

If the answer is A (direct feedback), does the teacher:

a) Cross out the unnecessary word
b) Add a missing word
c) Write the correct form above or near the grammatical error
d) All of them

If the answer is B (indirect feedback), does the teacher:

a) Underline or circle the grammatical error
b) Use cursor to show omissions in your text
c) Place cross in the margin next to the line containing errors

d) All of them

16. Does your teacher use codes (adj, art...) to highlight your errors?

-Yes -No

17. Do you understand them?

-Yes -No

18. Does your teacher correct:

a) All of the errors b) some of the errors

19. When you are provided with error correction, do you think that error correction should be given:

- a) In clear form so you understand it
- b) Regularly so that you improve your writing
- c) Immediately after writing to improve it

20. How often do you revise the grammar errors that have been corrected in your writing?

-Always - Very often - Sometimes
- Rarely - Never

21. Does your grammar accuracy improve after each time your teacher provides you with written correction on your writing?

-Yes - No

Justify.....
.....
.....
.....

22. To what extent written corrective feedback helps you to improve your grammatical accuracy?

.....
.....

Thanks for the valuable time and attention you devoted to answer these questions

Appendix B: Teachers' Interview

The present interview is an attempt to collect information about your experience as a teacher of written expression and about providing written corrective feedback on students written errors. It also aims at investigating teachers' perceptions towards written corrective feedback on enhancing grammatical accuracy in writing. Thus, the teachers were kindly requested to answer the following questions

Section One: General Information

1- How many years have you been teaching English?

.....

2- How many years have you been teaching written expression?

.....

Section Two: Teachers' Perceptions about Writing Skill

3- How do you consider the writing proficiency level of your students?

.....
.....

4- What are the difficulties that your students face when writing?

.....
.....

5- What are the most frequent errors that you notice your students make when writing?
(spelling/ vocabulary/ grammar/ organization/ mechanics).

.....

Section Three: Teachers' Perception about Written Corrective Feedback

6- What do you think about providing corrections for student's writings? Is it beneficial? And why?

.....

7- Who are responsible of errors corrections in your opinion teachers or students?

.....

8- What should you take into consideration when providing written corrective feedback for your students?

.....

Section Four: Written Corrective Feedback to Achieve Grammar Accuracy

9- When you read your students drafts do you correct any grammatical errors?

.....

10- What is the kind of Written corrective feedback that you provide to your learners (direct/ indirect)? and why?

.....

.....

11- What about error codes do you use them as a strategy to provide feedback? And in case you use them do your students understand these codes?

.....

.....

12- Does the method of error correction you utilize in your students writing depends on students' proficiency level?

.....
.....

13- Does the grammar accuracy improve after each time you provide them with correction on their writing?

.....
.....

14- According to your teaching experience, do you think that written corrective feedback is helpful in improving student's grammatical accuracy? And why?

.....
.....

Thanks for the valuable time and attention you devoted to answer these questions

Résumé

L'objectif principal de cette étude est d'explorer l'efficacité des commentaires écrits sur la précision grammaticale des étudiants. Un questionnaire a été présenté à trente (30) étudiants en troisième année de l'Université de Hama Lakhdar à Wadi. En outre, six professeurs de la même université ont été interviewés. Les résultats que nous avons recueillis confirment l'hypothèse préexistante : si les enseignants utilisent des commentaires correctifs écrits dans les structures écrites des élèves, la précision grammaticale des élèves anglais sera améliorée. Les étudiants ont également déclaré que les commentaires correctifs écrits les aidaient à améliorer la précision grammaticale et avaient été confirmés par des professeurs qui avaient affirmé que l'utilisation de commentaires écrits correctifs leur assurait une amélioration spectaculaire de la précision grammaticale.

ملخص

الهدف الرئيسي من هذه الدراسة هو استكشاف فعالية التعليقات المكتوبة المصححة حول الدقة النحوية للطلبة. تم تقديم استبيان لثلاثين (30) طالباً في السنة الثالثة بجامعة حمى لخضر بالوادي. بالإضافة إلى ذلك ، أجريت مقابلة مع 6 أساتذة من الجامعة نفسها. أكدت النتائج التي جمعناها فرضية البحث المقدمة سلفاً: إذا استخدم الأساتذة تعليقات تصحيحية مكتوبة في الانشاءات الكتابية للطلبة، فسيتم تحسين الدقة النحوية لطلبة اللغة الإنجليزية . أيضاً، صرح الطلبة أن التعليقات التصحيحية المكتوبة تساعدهم على تحسين الدقة النحوية و قد تم تأكيد ذلك من قبل الأساتذة الذين قالوا إن استخدام التعليقات التصحيحية المكتوبة يضمن للطلاب تحسناً رهيباً في مستوى ضبط الدقة النحوية.