University of Mohammed Seddik Ben-Yahia, Jijel

Faculty of Letters and Languages

Department of English Language and literature.

A Comparative Study of Corrective Feedback Strategies in Writing Used by Novice and Experienced Teachers

The Case of Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar and Kiamouch Farhat secondary schools, Jijel

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Master Degree in Language Sciences

Submitted by   **Supervisor**

Amira BOUSSOUAR   Fouzia BENNACER

Khadidja AIROUDJ

Board of Examiners

Supervisor: Fouzia BENNACER……University of Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel.

Chairperson: Sara LEKKAT …......... University of Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel.

Examiner: Malika NOURI …….…..... University of Mohamed Seddik Ben Yahia, Jijel.

2017

Dedication

In the name of Allah,

The most compassionate,

The most merciful, without whom this

Work would have never been possible.

This work is dedicated

To My dear parents; for their support, and for being proud of me all the time;

To my beloved brothers "Aimed, Adel, Hakim, Charif, Hani, Mohammed, Ahcen, And Yasser;

To my dearest sister "Loubna", and her hasband " Farid";

To my wonderful nephews "Bassem, Farah, and Malak"

To all my family members;

And to my work-partner Khadidja ;

Thank you all.

Amira

All my gratitude is to Allah the Almighty,

I lovingly dedicate this work to:

My respectful parents who have been my constant source of inspiration,

My dear brothers "Mohieddine" and Adem" thank you for being proud of me all the time,

My beloved sisters "Halima, Nada, and Loubna thank you for your love, support and understanding,

My dearest husband "Faiycel" for his support, and encouragement and all his Family,

My cousins: "Amina, Soumia, Zineb, Djihane, Chaima,Kawtar, Mohammed, Hicham, And Karim",

My uncles and their wives, my aunts, and my grandmothers "Fatma and Houria",

My partner in this work "Amira" for her support and patience,

And all those who would be interested in reading our research paper.

Khadija

Acknowledgements

First of all we would like to thank Allah the Almighty for providing us with power and scared guidance to pursue this study.

We would like to express our deepest and sincere thankfulness and appreciation to our supervisor **Mrs. Fouzia Bennacer** who provided us with judicious guidance and valuable advice throughout this research work .

We would like to thank the members of the jury: **Mrs. Malika Nouri** and **Mrs. Sara Lekkat** for their acceptance to examine this dissertation. We appreciate your awareness and careful reading of this dissertation.

We would like, also, to thank all teachers of Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar, and kiamouch Farhat secondry schools for their collaboration and access to their classes during the classroom observation.

Our gratitude is due to anyone who has willingly contributed to the study in a way or another, to those who friendly consented to cooperate and aid the accomplishment of the present research.

Abstract

Feedback as a strategy has come to play an eminent role in improving students' writing skill. Based on this consideration, this study aims at casting light on the corrective feedback strategies used by both novice and experienced teachers while teaching writing in Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar and Kiamouch Farhat Secondary Schools, in Taher, Jijel. To achieve this aim, two main research tools, namely a classroom observation and a questionnaire, were devised and implemented with four novice and four experienced teachers. The findings showed that novice and experienced teachers make use of written corrective feedback strategies differently. That is, experienced teachers are more disposed to use the educational ideology learner-centeredness while correcting students' written errors than novice teachers. Finally, it can be said that the use of written corrective feedback strategies relates to a large extent to the teaching experience, rather than the educational training.

List of Abbreviations

BA: Bachelor of Art

CBLT: Competency Based Language Teaching

CF: Corrective Feedback

CV: Curriculum Vitae

DF: Direct Feedback

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ENS: Ecole Normale Supérieure

ESL: English as a Specific Language

L1: First Language

L2: Second Language

MA: Master of Art

N°: Number of Teachers

Q: Question

TL: Target Language

WCF: Written Corrective Feedback

List of Tables

Table of Contents

General Introduction

Chapter One: Corrective Feedback Strategies Used by Novice and Experienced   Teachers in Writing

General Introduction

General Introduction

Introduction

1. Background to the Study

2. Statement of the Problem

3. Research Questions

4. Hypotheses

5. Aim of the Study

6. Methodology

7. Structure of the Study

General Introduction

1.   Background to the Study

Writing is an important skill to be developed in school and beyond that in any learning institution. Often, students need to be guided in their writing. They generally learn the writing skill through instructions provided by the teacher in a form of feedback. However, not all teachers necessarily provide their learners with written corrective feedback (WCF) the same way or with the same commitment. Bitchener and Ferris (2012) stated that "the attention teachers give to (WCF) is most often determined by their academic and training backgrounds and by their experience as L2 teachers" (p. 173).

Although researchers have been, and are still, debating about the role of written CF in second language learning (Bitchener, 2008; Brutten, 2009; Chandler, 2003; Ferris, 1999; and Truscott, 1996) and its value for either short and long-term improvement in learners' accuracy, a number of recent studies (e.g., Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima, 2008) have posited evidence to show that written CF can result in acquisition. Besides, Corder (1973); George (1972); and Kennedy (1973), claimed that correction is important because it is expected to help learners identify their own errors and discover the functions and limitations of the syntactical and lexical forms of the target language.

Through reading the literature, several studies distinguishing between novice and experienced teachers with regard to different aspects have been found. However, there is no research that directly aimed at exploring the different written CF strategies used by novice and experienced teachers.

2. **Statement of the Problem**

From their past experience in the Algerian secondary schools, and their surrounding secondary school students, the researchers noticed that during the writing process, students encounter many difficulties that prevent them from enhancing their writing skills. For that reason, an interview with some secondary school students was conducted. Based on this interview, it was recognized that there is a lack of the writing sessions, generally, and of written corrective feedback specifically. These latters may lead to inappropriate written scripts full of errors, reflecting a low-level of language proficiency. Besides, teachers in the Algerian secondary schools are divided into novice and experienced teachers. The former refers to the teachers who have been trained in recent approaches, but have less experience, whereas, the latter refers to the teachers who have been teaching for a long period of time. Accordingly, the written corrective feedback provided by the two would vary. So, it would be worthy to conduct a comparative study corrective feedback strategies in writing used by novice and experienced teachers in the Algerian secondary schools

3. **Research Questions**

Based on the problem stated, this study is an attempt to answer the following questions:

1. Do secondary school teachers use corrective feedback strategies in writing regularly?

2. What are the written corrective feedback strategies used by novice teachers?

3. What are the written corrective feedback strategies used by experienced teachers

4. Does the teaching experience influence the use of written corrective feedback strategies?

5. Does the educational background of novice teachers determine the extent to which they succeed in implementing written corrective feedback?

4. Hypotheses

In the light of what has been previously said, it is hypothesized that:

1. The use of corrective feedback strategies in writing differs from novice to experienced teachers.

2. The use of corrective feedback strategies in writing is firmly linked to the teaching experience.

5. Aim of the Study

The main aim of the present study is to shed light on the written corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers of Labani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar, andKiamouch Farhat secondary schools in Taher. The results to be obtained will probably unveil the possible differences between novice and experienced teachers regarding their usage of written corrective feedback strategies. As a result, findings of the study would raise the awareness of novice and even experienced teachers of the importance of written corrective feedback in improving students' proficiency.

6. Methodology

For the sake of making a comparative study of corrective feedback strategies in writing used by novice and experienced Teachers at Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar

and Kiamouch Farhat secondary schools, and to meet the research aforementioned aim two research tools will be used. First, for data validity, a questionnaire will be administered to all teachers of Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar, and Kiamouch Farhat secondary schools. Second, in order to obtain realistic data from the teaching environment, a classroom observation will be carried out with four novice teachers from different educational backgrounds, and four experienced teachers each of those EFL teachers is observed in the writing sessions.

7. Structure of the study

The current study is made up of two chapters. The first chapter is divided into three sections; the first section takes a broader look at the writing skill, the second is devoted to the related literature on written corrective feedback, while the third section deals with novice and experienced teachers. However, the second chapter concerns with the empirical part of the study. It is divided into three sections. The first section highlights the methodology to be applied to collect data; the second section will present and analyze these data, and the third and final section will attempt to interpret the major findings. Finally, general conclusion will sum up the most important points in the whole research and briefly present most significant outcomes of the study, together with recommendations for further research.

Chapter One

Chapter One: Corrective Feedback Strategies in Writing Used By Novice and Experienced Teachers

Introduction

1.1   Section One: The Writing Skill

1.1.1 Definition of Writing

1.1.2 Stages of Writing

>   1.1.2.1 Pre-writing

>   1.1.2.2 Drafting

>   1.1.2.3 Revising

>   1.1.2.4 Editing

>   1.1.2.5 Publishing

1.1.3 Approaches to Teach Writing

>   1.1.3.1 The Controlled-to-Free Approach

>   1.1.3.2 The Free Writing Approach

>   1.1.3.3 The Product Approach

>   1.1.3.4 The Process Approach

>   1.1.3.5 The Genre Approach

1.1.4 Writing through the Competency- Based Language Teaching

1.1.5 Types of Writing Tasks

1.1.6 Difficulties Faced by EFL Learners While Writing

>   1.1.6.1 Grammar

>   1.1.6.2 Vocabulary

>   1.1.6.3 Mechanics

>   1.1.6.4 Organization

>   1.1.6.5. Coherence and cohesion

>   1.1.6.6 Content

1.1.7 The Role of Writing in EFL Classes

1.2 Section Two: Written Corrective Feedback

1.2.1 Definition of Corrective Feedback

1.2.2 Types of Feedback

Chapter One: Corrective Feedback Strategies in writing Used by Novice and Experienced Teachers

Introduction

Given that the present research seeks to investigate the various written corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers in secondary schools, the first chapter discusses three main issues: the writing skill, corrective feedback on writing, and novice and experienced teachers. It is divided into three sections. The first section is devoted to give an overview about the writing skill. It directs attention to some issues regarding this skill, including its definition, the description of the ways it is taught, the types of its tasks as well as its importance. The second section is devoted to written corrective feedback, starting with giving brief definitions of feedback. Then, it moves to its various types, forms, and practices in language classrooms. Finally, the third section is devoted to novice and experienced teachers, and ends with a conclusion.

1.1 Section One: The Writing Skill

This section provides a theoretical background about the writing skill. First, it begins with a general definition of writing. Then, it moves to a more detailed description of the writing skill by giving its stages, the different approaches to teach it, and the way it is taught through the competency based language teaching. In addition to that, it includes the types of the writing tasks, and the major writing difficulties that secondary school students may face while writing in English. Finally, the present section concludes with stating the role of writing in English as a Foreign Language classes.

1.1.1 Definition of Writing

Writing is a communicative tool that translates thoughts into language. It is defined by Rivers (1978) as "the act of putting in conventional graphic form what has been spoken" (p. 242). For Dribble (1996), writing is a language skill that involves not just a graphic representation of speech, but the development and presentation of thoughts in a structured way. Byrne (1988) agreed on that when he said, "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 addition, Grami (2010) has defined writing as a 'complicated cognitive task' because of the fact that it "demands careful thought, discipline, and concentration, and it is not just a simple direct production of what the brain knows or can do at a particular moment"(p. 84).

In comparison to other skills, writing is said to be the Cinderella skill which is not only the most sophisticated one, but the easiest to acquire as well. In addition, writing is a complex skill that engages the writer in a physical as well as mental effort. Byrne (1988) classified problems writers face into three categories. The first category, he called psychological, stems from the lack of interaction and feedback between the writer and the reader; there is a physical absence of the reader. The second classification involves linguistic problems caused by the necessity to compensate for the absence of certain devices that the spoken medium has, such as pitch and intonation, through a clear and correct expression of ideas. The third category involves cognitive problems due to the fact that unlike speech which can be developed in a natural way; writing requires formal instruction to develop. Richard (1990) agreed

with this idea when he said that "the rules of written discourse are largely learned through instruction and practice" (p. 101).

In short, writing is the act of translating one's ideas and thoughts into words and sentences. Moreover, learning to write especially in a second or foreign language is not an easy matter; it has a complicated system of rules and conventions.

1.1.2. Stages of Writing

over the twentieth century Researchers and methodologists such as (Badger & white,2000; Goa, 2007; Liu & Hansen, 2002; Silva, 1987) have found that activities like pre-writing, drafting, revising and editing allowed instructors to focus on the writer and the writer's experiences when composing instead of evaluating a single written product thereby making the process a student-centered activity(Matsuda, 2003) . According to Murray (1974), "writing is rewriting", therefore, writing implies the revision of a text and its composition at any stage of the writing process. The term revision refers to any type of change made by writers on their writing. Changes may involve aspects of meaning or surface such as change of tense, punctuation or spelling.

1.1.2.1 Pre-writing

The crucial stage of a good writing piece is the planning. It refers to the activities done prior to or during early drafting which engage students in thinking about and gathering ideas. Students can benefit from free association techniques, such as brainstorming listing, clustering, visualization, or free writing, as well as more structured techniques such as the use of graphic organizers, outlining, or questioning.

Soven (1999) recommended that teachers use the following steps when introducing students to a pre-writing activity:

- Explain the purpose of the technique being used.

- Model use of the technique.

- Allow students to experiment with the technique.

- Ask the student how it felt to use the technique.

1.1.2.2 Drafting

Drafting refers to the actual process of composing during writing. When students are involved in drafting their writing, they may need support developing their thinking, figuring out how to say what they want to say, or finding a form for their writing. Zemelm & Daniels (1988) suggested that teachers can help students during the drafting stage through the following:

- Conducting teacher student conferences,

- providing in-class time for writing when appropriate, and

- helping students understand the writing process.

1.1.2.3 Revising

It is the most important stage in the writing process. Revising refers to changes made in context and structure of writing to achieve a particular purpose. Teachers may find that it is worth the effort to make the revising process visible to students by modeling specific revising techniques, allowing some class time for revision, and conferencing with students. (Peterson, 2008).

1.1.2.4 Editing

Although the terms "revising" and "editing" are sometimes used interchangeably, editing is a particular type of revision focusing specifically on language conventions and mechanics. Teachers can help students during the editing process by engaging them in peer editing opportunities, conferencing with students about error patterns that are evidenced in their writing, and guiding students through the editing process by focusing on targeted errors such as correct use of commas, or spelling new content areas terminology (Peterson, 2008).

1.1.2.5 Publishing

EFL learners write in order to communicate their ideas and opinions in English. So, they should share their writings through publishing. Publication generally refers to the time when writing is read by the targeted audience. At times this may be a specific audience outside the school (such as a member of the school board, visitors to a website, judges of a writing contest, family members). However, teachers can also publish student writing by simply making it "public".

1.1.3 Approaches to Teach Writing

Writing is considered to be one of the most difficult skills to be mastered by EFL learners. Also, the fact of developing this process is not an easy task. Therefore, many EFL teachers, and researchers have been searching to come up with the effective approaches which positively impact the learning process. Moreover, Zamel (1985) argued that "good writers are those who are ready to compose and express their ideas using strategies similar to those of native speakers of English" (p.32).So, teachers should apply different approaches that suit the needs of learners. These approaches are

the controlled-to-free approach, the free writing approach, the product approach, the process approach, and the genre approach.

1.1.3.1. The Controlled-to-Free Approach

In the 1950s and 1960s, when audio-lingual approach prevailed, writing was taught only to reinforce speech which was considered primary. There was the belief that the mastery of grammar rules and syntactic forms would lead to the improvement of the spoken form of a foreign language. This was the reason for allocating grammar teaching to writing. According to Raimes(1983) "the controlled-to-free approach to writing is sequential: students are first given sentence exercises, then paragraphs to copy or manipulate grammatically by, for instance, changing questions to statements, present to past, or plural to singular"(p. 6).Consequently, engaging learners in controlled writing in second language (L2) can be as Silva(1990) mentioned, "an exercise in habit formation in which EFL learner is simply a manipulator of previously learned language structures"(p.13). By implementing these types of exercises, EFL learners will be able to avoid errors in their writing and to achieve a high level of accuracy. This approach is made up of four stages:

1. Sentence exercises, learners are taught certain grammar and vocabulary usually through a text.

2. Paragraphs to copy or manipulate grammatically, learners manipulate fixed patterns often from substitution tables.

3. Controlled composition, learners are encouraged to write with the help of the teacher.

4. Free writing, once learners reach a certain level of proficiency, they are encouraged to write free compositions.

The controlled-to-free approach in writing is considered as an effective instrument for teaching compositions to EFL learners. Initially, it is a useful tool for teaching composition for beginner learners who are completely new to the language. Also, by using controlled writing, learners will have the chance to practice correct grammar forms as opposed to some other approaches.

Despite the advantages that the controlled-to-free approach has, the latter was criticized for the following four aspects:

- Writing was regarded as "habit formation", i.e., the student manipulates previously learned language structures.

- Readership was restricted to the teacher who focused solely on "formal linguistic features", neglecting the quality of ideas and the organization of content.

- The notions of audience and purpose were largely ignored, because of the restriction of writing to the classroom environment.

- More importantly, writing was used as "handmaid of the other skills" (listening, speaking, and, reading); writing was not considered as a skill of its own but a kind of "service activity" (Silva, 1990, p. 13)

1.1.3.2 The Free Writing Approach

The free writing approach is essentially based on the belief that when we write freely and frequently, we improve our ability in that language skill. Raimes (1983)

defined free writing as a way used when students write without teacher's correction and when they only emphasize content and fluency. She argued that once the ideas are on paper, grammatical accuracy, organization and the rest will gradually follow.

This approach stresses writing quantity rather than quality. Contrary to controlled-to-free approach, the role of the teacher is limited to reading learners' production and sometimes making comments on the expressed ideas. In other words, pieces of writing should not be corrected, but, possibly should be read and the content commented upon. In this way, the focus is put on the audience and content which are seen as important in this approach (Raimes, 1983).

1.1.3.3 The Product Approach

It is one of the most practiced approaches in the schools around the world. It focuses mainly on the end product which may be likened to a model or the essay normally provided by teachers. As Nunan (1989) claimed "the product approach to writing focuses on the end results of the act of composition, i.e.; the letter, essay, story, and so on" (p.36).

In this type of writing approach, EFL students are required to imitate already prescribed texts, models that constitute good writing in their teachers' views in order to give them insights into how to correctly arrange words into clauses, clauses into sentences, and sentences into larger discourse units.(Hyland ,2003). To do so, a variety of activities which can raise students' awareness in second language writing are available such as the use of model paragraphs, sentence-combining, and rhetorical pattern exercises. This approach emphasizes accuracy and correctness at the expense of the process through which texts are produced. Pincas (1982) viewed learning as

assisted imitation, and adopted many techniques (e.g. substitution tables), where learners respond to a stimulus provided by the teacher.

Tribble (1990) pointed out that writing is viewed as a simple linear model of the writing process which proceeds systematically from prewriting to composing to correcting. However, Raimes (1983) claimed that the product approach to writing can in no way be described as generally believed, rather, it is a discursive model of writing, "contrary to what many text books advice, writers do not follow a neat sequence of planning, organizing, writing, and then revising. For a while, a writer's product - the finished essay, story or novel - is presented in lines, the process that produces is not linear at all. Instead, it is recursive" (p. 20).

Badger and White (2000) stated that product approach can be praised for "providing linguistic knowledge about text and understanding that imitation is one way in which people learn" (p.157). In other words, the product approach raises students' awareness especially in grammatical structures, sentence organization, and rhetorical features. On the other hand, writing in this approach, gives little attention to the writing purpose since learners tend to over emphasize the importance of grammar, syntax, and organization. They will lack motivation in creating their writing tasks, as their teachers mostly focus on the accuracy of the language structures.

1.1.3.4 The Process Approach

As opposed to what noted above, the process approach is an approach to writing, where fluency is more focused. Raimes (1983) pointed out that "learning to write is seen as developmental process that helps students write as professional authors do, choosing their own topics and genres, and writing from their experiences or observation"(p. 21). Also, Applebee (1986) stated that the process approach "provided

a way to think about writing in terms of what writer does (planning, revising, and the like) instead of in terms of what the final product looks like (patterns of organization, spelling, and grammar" (p.96).In other words, in this approach learners focus on the process by which they produce their written products rather than on the products themselves.

The major aim of this approach is to make the writing process clear and understandable. To reach this aim, learners need to improve their knowledge and skills by utilizing the appropriate help and cooperation of the teacher and the other learners. Steele (1986)demonstrated the following stages of writing within the process approach: brainstorming, planning, structuring, mind mapping, writing the first draft, peer feedback, editing, final draft, evaluation, and teacher's feedback (as cited in Hasan and Moniruzzaman, 2010, p.79).

The process approach has been accepted and applied to EFL writing classes because of its effectiveness. Brown (2001) claimed that the process approach is advantageous to students in language learning because students are the creators of language, they need to focus on content and message and their own intrinsic motives are valued. Nunan (1991) also affirmed that the process approach also encourages collaborative group work among learners as a way of enhancing motivation and developing positive attitudes towards writing. However, there is no such perfect theory or approach and the process approach is no exception since people have to concern that the process approach pays less attention to grammar and structure, and puts little importance to the final products.

1.1.3.5 The Genre Approach

The genre approach in writing, in some ways, can be regarded as an extension of the product approach. Like product approaches, genre approaches regard writing as predominantly linguistic. But, unlike product approaches, they emphasize that writing varies with the social context in which it is produced. Paltridge (2004) indicated that the ultimate aim of this approach is to engage learners with particular genre in order to succeed in exact setting. By implementing this approach in writing, EFL learners are first provided with a text then they analyze its lexical and grammatical features and practice them extensively.

Teachers may use wide range of writing patterns as business letter, the academic report, and the research paper to make variation in learners' written production. However, Badger and white (2000) emphasized that learners during this approach are largely passive because their abilities as writers are ignored, and their knowledge about certain topic may be not sufficient to express their intended meaning. It is emphasized also that language is functional, that is; through language writers achieve certain goals.

The focus of writing in this approach is to integrate the knowledge of a particular genre and its communicative purpose, this helps learners to produce their written products to others in the same discourse community successfully. In this way, learners will come up with appropriate actual writing in their real life outside the classroom.

The negative side of genre approach is that learners may not have enough knowledge of appropriate language or vocabulary to express what they intend to communicate to a specific audience. Accordingly, teachers should pay attention to the

skills that will help learners develop their writing competence through the writing process.

1.1.4 Writing through the Competency- Based Language Teaching

The teaching of English as a foreign language in the Algerian educational system has witnessed many changes in methods from the Grammar Translation to more so called "modern approaches". Within this evolution, the latest to date to be adopted is the Competency- Based Approach. This new approach, which seeks to establish competences in learners, has been embraced starting the school year 2003/2004.

As mentioned in the literature review concerning the different approaches to writing instruction, we have found that all of them have been criticized and no single approach fits all kinds of learners. However, in Competency Based Language Teaching, there is a tendency to combine more than one approach seeking better results in language learning and also writing. For instance, Hyland (2004, p. xi) asserted that "writers need realistic strategies for drafting and revising, but they also must have a clear understanding of genre to structure their writing experiences according to the demands and constraints of a particular context". So, this is a call for a combination of both the process and genre approach for a more effective teaching of writing.

1.1.5 Types of Writing Tasks

Tasks in the second language writing are either authentic tasks, in which the students replicate challenges faced in the real world, or pedagogical tasks which are designed to develop the genre knowledge and composing skills. Their main aim is to

promote discrete skills, such as improving punctuation, developing pre-writing abilities, or increasing an understanding of rhetorical forms. The pedagogical tasks should be known first to establish the competence required to accomplish authentic objectives at a later stage (Hyland, 2003). Besides, in writing classes, tasks can be placed into two major categories which are controlled and guided writing tasks. The controlled writing tasks seek to develop the learners' confidence and fluency by providing the activities that involves reworking or finishing a model. The most known controlled writing tasks are:

Jigsaw sentences: the students match the halves of several sentences and write them out.

The student replay with correction: the class writes a paragraph, change incorrect details.

Find and copy: this is a vocabulary expending exercise. The writing can be of words, phrases or of whole sentences.

Sentence combining: the class is given a passage written in short sentences; they combine these sentences, using appropriate correctives, which are scrambled with extra ones as distracters.

Sentence reduction: the class copies a passage, taking out all unnecessary words, making only minor necessary changes to the original structures.

Dictogloss: this is essentially a note taking exercise.

On the other hand, the guided tasks give more opportunity for the learners to explore the language. The following are the major guided writing tasks:

Picture description: students compose a few questions about the picture; they answer in writing in the form of a description.

Formal practice: a grammar point can become the basis of a guided paragraph to practice, for example, the passive voice.

Summary: after a passage has been read intensively, it can be rewritten in a summary focusing on the major points of content.

Replacing to letters: the students reply to a stimulus letter, and writing in a natural way, but answering a certain number of requests from information to shape the response.

Newspaper clippings: newspaper headlines can be given as a starter of students' writing activity, creating the full article.

Story completion: it consists in building up a story, with the writers responding to what others have written.

(Bouchair, 2013)

1.1.6 Difficulties Faced by English as Foreign Language Learners While Writing

Writing is a difficult skill for students to acquire. Writing is unlike spoken language in that it requires the reader or the audience to understand and interpret what has been written. Nunan (1999) stated that the most difficult task to do in language learning is to produce a coherent, fluent, extended piece of writing, which is even more challenging for second language learners. Accordingly, there are many areas in which EFL learners face difficulties. But the most common ones are the following.

1.1.6.1 Grammar

Grammar presents the core of any foreign language. Unfortunately, EFL learners still have difficulties in grammar; some of them are related to (L1) interference and others to (L2) interference itself. These latters are called developmental errors, which are signs of learners' progress of mastering English language. These errors are caused by overgeneralization or incomplete application of grammatical rules. According to experts, Most grammatical errors fall in the following categories: subject-verb agreement, verb tense and form, the use of negative form, run on sentences, prepositions, word order, articles, and plurality(Nunan, 1999)

1.1.6.2 Vocabulary

Learning vocabulary is a very important part of learning a language. Unfortunately, among the main difficulties faced by EFL learners while writing is poor vocabulary. As Shelby (2016) stated "vocabulary is one of the most comprehensive and difficult aspects of English for a foreign learner to master thoroughly" (p. 3). Having a good repertoire helps learners to generate more ways for expressing their ideas. However, EFL learners use limited vocabulary because, in the writing process, students tend to think in the mother tongue and write in English. Consequently, EFL learners are obliged to use the same vocabulary words without any extension to more words and hence more ideas.

1.1.6.3 Mechanics

Many students are frustrated in their attempts at written expression because of the difficulty in the mechanical aspects of writing. Problems with spelling,

punctuation, and capitalization may draw attention away from the writer's focus on ideas. First, spelling is the most challenging task because it is difficult to guess how to spell a word in English based on how it sounds since English is full of these tricky spellings. Saddler (2006), Thomson and Snow (2002) reported that learning to spell in a language like English is not an easy task, many students find difficulties to generate the correct spelling of the words they want to use in their writing (as cited in Westwood, 2008). Second, when speaking, we punctuate without thought. But it can be challenging to translate spoken pauses into written punctuations, particularly when there may be more than one acceptable way to punctuate a sentence. Punctuation problems are the result of inadequate learning and poor teaching. Third, the misuse of capital latters is another writing problem that misleads the learners, and hence, affects their writing negatively.

1.1.6.4 Organization

Organization presents a serious problem to EFL learners in that the organization patterns differ according to genre; from writing an essay to a letter, from a speech to an article, from an invitation to an e-mail, etc. Also, they differ according to the type of discourse (argumentative, narrative, descriptive…). Many EFL learners fail to organize the sentences and paragraphs systematically and arrange them logically. Consequently, this may lead to misunderstanding of ideas and failure to communicate the purpose of writing. Mkude (1980) noted this problem with great concern; he reported that "EFL learners often fail to appreciate the value of organizing linguistic material strategically so to secure the maximal impact. Again, this weakness can be seen within and across sentences"(p.62). Poor organizing may lead to misunderstanding of ideas, hence, the failure to communicate the purpose of writing.

1.1.6.5. Coherence and Cohesion

By the appearance of communicative competence and mainly discourse competence, the great focus shifted towards coherence and cohesion. Discourse competence is based mainly on producing a sequence of sentences that are linked with cohesive devices (cohesion) and ordered in a logical way (coherence). Many EFL learners face various difficulties in achieving coherence and cohesion. Learners, while trying to produce cohesive texts, commit a lot of errors. On one hand, some of them are related to (L1) interference. On the other hand, some other errors result from L2 itself. In English, there are many cohesive devices which have multiple uses, and sometimes they overlap with each other. In addition to this, coherence seems more difficult to be achieved than cohesion. Maintaining the same point of discussion or providing a logical order of ideas in a written work is a hard task for EFL leaners because their problem is in the recognition of coherence ; organizing from the simplest to the most difficult, from less important to more important ….(Mkude , 1980).

1.1.6.6 Content

EFL learners face another difficulty which is poor content. The topic of the writing task should be interesting and beneficial for the learners in order to help them produce a good piece of writing. But unfortunately, most of the times the learners are obliged to write about pre-selected topic. This may lead them to deal with some topics about which they do not have enough ideas to build effective illustration. (Saddler, 2006)

1.1.7 The Role of Writing in English as a Foreign Language Classes

Writing is among the most important skills that second language students need to develop. Bacon (1989) stated that "in English learning classroom, the teacher aims at developing the four skills of his/her learner: ability to understand, to speak, to read, and to write. The ability to write occupies the last place in this order, but it does not mean that is least important" (as cited in Mandel 2009, p. 39). Moreover, writing is considered as a main tool of communication between people. It is used to express ideas as well as to transmit thoughts. According to Raimes (1983)

> The fact that people frequently have to communicate with each other in writing is not the only reason to include writing as a part of second language-syllabus. There is an additional and very important reason: writing helps our students learn. How? First, writing reinforces the grammatical structures, idioms, and vocabulary that we have been teaching our students (p.3).

 That is, writing is of a considerable importance because it helps learners acquire the system of the language. Besides, practicing writing helps EFL learners to be familiar with the different types of writing such as letter, reports, CVs…

Writing is also viewed as a basic means of assessing knowledge of the language since most exams require students to answer in writing. Moreover, writing is certainly easier to assess then students' speaking. Bacha (2002) stated that writing is important in students' academic course since most examination, reports, research work depend on it. Coffin (2003) claimed that writing is important since it is used as a means of assessment. It improves students' communicative skill, and it trains students as future professionals in particular disciplines.

The importance of writing is also emphasized in the Book of "Writing Skill Success in Twenty Minutes a Day" (2005).the book summarize its importance in terms of three advantages:

1. In writing, you can take it back. It is considered as a careful, thoughtful way of communicating.

2. It forces the writers to clarify their thoughts. So that, the writer can discover and organize what he think.

3. Writing is permanent, unlike speaking, writers may have many opportunities to revise, change, and correct what they have written before giving it to the intended audience.

In short, writing plays a crucial role in enhancing the learning process. Yet, one major significant feature of the writing skill is that it cannot be taught alone, but with the incorporation of the other skills.

1.2 Section Two: Corrective Feedback on Writing

Teacher corrective feedback is an important and ubiquitous classroom activity. It can arguably be linked to almost everything students learn in the classroom context. On the light of this, the value of such feedback in second language (L2) writing has been debated in the literature for several decades. However, recent studies have considered written corrective feedback WCF as a major aspect of language pedagogy. This great importance leads to the emergence of many investigations concerning its types, forms, time of occurrence, and effectiveness. The second section of the present research is devoted to giving brief definitions of feedback in general and of written corrective feedback in particular. This section is also concerned with the various types, and forms of written corrective feedback WCF practices.

1.2.1 Definition of Corrective Feedback

The concept of feedback has been defined by many researchers and scholars and an emphasis on it has been drawn from many advocated studies. Duly, Burt and Krashen (1982) provide a general definition of feedback. They defined it as follows: "feedback generally refers to the listener's or reader's response given to the learner's speech or writing" (cited in Maarek. 2009, p. 34). This is to say that feedback is that reaction which is made by either the listener or the reader towards the students' production whether in speaking or writing. This reaction can be positive or negative, or a combination of both (Long 1996; White, 1998). The positive one involves providing the learners with models of what is grammatical and acceptable in the target language (TL). Whereas, the negative one involves the provision of information about what is unacceptable in the target language (TL). Within this view, corrective feedback is considered a core component of language learning and teaching.

Furthermore, feedback serves each of the language teaching and the writing skill, by providing clear, well-structured ideas, accurate and meaningful paragraphs (Hyland, 2003). That is, due to feedback students learn to respect and appreciate the different perspectives of composing, such as teacher explanation, or proposition of other options.

Moreover, feedback is a vital concept in most theories of learning and is closely related to motivation (Weiner, 1990). In language learning and teaching, varying types of feedback can be provided to students. As in other disciplines, feedback that motivates students' language learning should receive particular attention. On particular ground, feedback for motivation and language correction are key concerns for language educators.

Besides, Hattie and Timperly (2007) stated that feedback is "information provided by an agent regarding some aspects of one's task performance" (p. 81). Also, Nariciss (2008) defined feedback as all-post response information that is provided to a learner to be informed on his/her actual state of learning or performance. This means, in other way, to give the learner information about the strengths and weaknesses of his or her work. Moreover, Boud and Molloy (2013) claimed that feedback is a process whereby learners obtain information about their work in order to appreciate the similarities and differences between the appropriate standards for any given work, and the qualities of the work itself in order to generate improved work" (p.6). Hyland and Hyland (2006) have defined feedback as:

> A concrete expression of recognized social purposes […] it is also
> mediated by the institutions and cultures in which it occurs. Every

feedback act carries assumptions about participant relationships and how teachers think these should be structured and negotiated (p. 207).

Here, they are looking at feedback as a social element which is based on the relationship between participants (teacher-student). Also, they claimed that written corrective feedback is an instrument designed to carry a heavy informational charge. They argued that the information "offers the assistance of an expert, guiding the learner through the 'zone of proximal development' (p. 207). So, via feedback learners are provided with data that illustrate and explain a variety of choices. Thus, a focus from theories of classroom psychology suggested by Drown (2009) that feedback does not occur randomly, but it is a combination of many interrelated subsystems which have a dual impact to one another by stating that "the output of a system becomes an input to the same system causing the system to respond dynamically to its previous products" (p. 407).

In short, written corrective feedback is provided as a response to errors that learners have made in their written output. As a form of instruction, "written CF is understood to be effective because it is provided at a time when learners are most likely to notice it, understand it, and internalize it" (Bitchener &Ferris, 2012, p. 125). Thus, its role is to help learners identify where their errors have been made and to provide them with information about why their output was incorrect and on how they can correct it.

1.2.2Types of Feedback

It is a matter of fact that EFL learners commit different types of errors in their writing; consequently, they receive different types of feedback. The teacher provides his/her learners with the type of feedback that is likely to be appropriate to the kind of

error. In this context, it is important at the outset to clarify the most common dichotomies of feedback which are: Positive/negative feedback, form-focused, content-based, and integrated feedback

1.2.2.1 Positive/Negative feedback

Feedback can be positive or negative. "Positive feedback affirms that a learner response to an activity is correct. It may signal the veracity of the content of a learner utterance or the linguistic correctness of the utterance" (Ellis, 2009, p. 3).When the learners make an acceptable output, they generally receive a positive feedback from the teacher which can be appraising compliment to their performance and skills. Senior (2006) summarized the previous explanation saying "when the student say an utterance which is free of stuttering, the teacher immediately follows with a reinforcement comment that praises the child's speech"(p. 47). Positive feedback is viewed as important because it develops the learners' positive attitude towards writing and it provides affective support that fosters their motivation to continue learning.

However, "negative feedback signals, in one way or another, that the learner's utterance lacks veracity or is linguistically deviant" (Ellis, 2009, p. 3). On the contrary of positive feedback, negative feedback is considered as an unpreferable comment by the learner, because it presents a threat to their progress and is painful when it occurs in front of classmates. Yet, teachers give this kind of feedback because they consider it as a "crucial means of subtly adjusting their pedagogic behavior to meet the immediate needs of their class" (Senior, 2006, p. 47). Moreover, negative feedback shows to the learners that what has been produced is erroneous, and hence, awareness is made of the gap in the learners' interlanguage (Ellis, 1998).

1.2.2.2 Form-Focused, Content-Based, and Integrated Feedback

Based on Park's (2006) review on teacher written feedback in(L2) writing, there are three types of teacher written feedback that are commonly used in (L2) writing classrooms, which are: 1) form-focused feedback, 2) content based feedback and 3) integrated feedback. Form- focused feedback is based on indicating problems pertaining to grammar, vocabulary and mechanics. In the second type of feedback, that is content or meaning- based feedback, teachers comment on the compositions without pointing out specific grammatical errors (Park, 2006). In a study by Alamis (2010) in the Philippines, it was found that students have high preference for feedback in the area of content/organization compared to vocabulary and language use/grammar. The third type of written feedback is integrative feedback. This type of feedback results from the combination of grammar correction with content-related feedback (Park, 2006).

Bitchener and Ferris (2012) argued that, in students' first drafts, teachers should provide content-based feedback and delay form-focused feedback to final drafts for several strong reasons. First, if a student writer will truly revise, add, delete, and rearrange the text, then it is a waste of teacher time and energy to mark errors in early versions of a paper when portions of that text may disappear later on. Second, excessive attention to grammatical, lexical, and mechanical errors may distract students' cognitive ability to develop their content and arguments. Third, and most significantly, if a teacher focuses too much feedback on errors when the content is still formulated students may get the idea that writing is more about pristine final products than it is about engaging in the process to produce interesting and mature content. Accordingly, most composition instructors have been specifically trained to avoid

form focused feedback on early versions of student papers, emphasizing ideas and arrangement instead.

1.2.2   Responding to Students Writing

Responds towards learners' writing can vary widely, and feedback practices differ according to the teachers' preferences as well as to the kind of writing task they have set and the effect they wish to create. But while a response to written work is probably essential for the development of writing skills, there is less certainty about who should give this response. Hyland (2003) distinguished three types of feedback: teacher written feedback, peer feedback, and teacher-student conferencing.

1.2.3.1 Teachers' Written Feedback

Teacher written response plays a central role in most (L2) writing classes. This is through motivating them to write more, to rewrite and correct their mistakes or by confusing and obstructing students from writing. However, teachers need to consider what students want from feedback and what they attend to in their revisions.

Teacher written feedback is highly valued by second language writers, the effect of written feedback on student' revisions in subsequent drafts has not been extensively studied although it seems that students try to use most of the usable feedback they are given (Hyland, 1998, cited in Hyland, 2003, p.179). It is important to note that what individual students want from feedback varies considerably. Some students want a response to their ideas, some demand to have all their mistakes marked, others use teacher commentary effectively, and other students ignore it all together. A great deal of research, however, has questioned the effectiveness of teacher written feedback as a way of improving students' writing. Research on first

language writing suggested that much written feedback is of poor quality and frequently misunderstood, by students, being too vague and inconsistent (Hyland, 2003, p. 178).

Moreover, although studies on the nature of teacher feedback and its effects on student writers are rare more substantial works in both (L1) and (L2) compositions examined student reactions to teacher response (Arndt, 1993; Brice, 1995; Cohen, 1987; Cohen & cavalcanti, 1990; Enginarlar, 1993). Findings across these studies are surprisingly consistent and include the following insights:

- Students greatly appreciate and value teacher feedback, considering teacher

  commentary extremely important and helpful to their writing development.

- Students see value in teacher feedback on variety of issues, not just language

  errors.

- Students are frustrated by teacher feedback when it is illegible, cryptic (e.g.,

  Consisting of symbols, circles, single-word questions, comments) or confusing (e.g., consisting of questions that are difficult to incorporate into emergent drafts).

- Students value a mix of encouragement and constructive criticism and are

  generally not offended or hurt by thoughtful suggestions for improvement.

In short, written feedback from teachers can play a significant role in improving L2 students' writing, but this role is complex and requires careful reflection to be used effectively.

1.2.3.2 Peer Feedback

Students receiving feedback on their writing from their peers is seen as one of the ESL writing teachers' most important tasks. It is considered as an important alternative to teacher-based forms of response in ESL contexts (Hyland, 2003, p. 198). LI Waishing (2000) argued that peer feedback shows some kind of cooperation among students. This can be advantageous in improving collaboration between students, as individuals belong to the same community. Moreover, peer response in ESL classes leads writers to make some use of peer's comments in their revisions.

Hyland (2003) claimed that "Students themselves are rather ambivalent about the quality of their peer suggestions and both mistrust them and fear ridicule due to their poor proficiency, generally preferring feedback from teachers"(p. 199). In other words, peer evaluation has been more accepted and welcomed by the side of teachers than students who prefer receiving feedback from teachers, and whose consider that their writing can be secure just due to their teachers' comments and they see that there is no factor that may help to have good writings just the received comments from their teachers. So, peer feedback can be effective in improving (L2) writing, although it is uncertain which the most effective forms are.

1.2.3.3 Teacher-Student Writing Conferences

Another important means of giving feedback and instruction to writing students is through one-to-one writing conferences. Over the past several decades, the writing conferences have achieved widespread popularity as a teaching tool for several reasons. One concerns the perception that writing conferences save teachers time and energy that would otherwise be spent marking student papers. Another is the immediacy and potential for interaction and negotiation that the conferencing event

offers, allowing for clarification of difficult issues (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999) and helping teachers to avoid appropriating student's texts. Finally, with the consideration given in recent years the students' learning styles, it is argued that writing conferences offer a more effective means for communicating with students who are auditory rather than visual learners.

1.2.4 Timing of Feedback

Feedback in writing is most valuable to students' writing development when it is given while they are in the process of writing drafts; comments on drafts of writing provide students with timely information about the clarity and impact of their writing. When students receive feedback while they are writing, they are more inclined to use it to revise and edit their drafts than they would be if they received the suggestions on a graded, polished copy (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). They also have an immediate opportunity to tryout the suggestions in their writing, allowing for meaningful application of what has been learned from the feedback. Focusing on individual students immediate writing needs, this ongoing feedback is a form of differentiated instruction that compliments the teaching of mini-lessons to small groups or to the whole class (Person, 2008).Frodsen and Holten (2003), claimed that "it is in the interest of L2 writers to attend to language issues consistently throughout the writing process" (p.145) but also emphasized that "the teacher may wish to use a range of strategies through a multi draft process to focus students appropriately on selected forms" (Ferris & hedgcock, 2005, p. 266). On the specific issues of written CF on various drafts of student papers, Ferris (2002) noted:

One argument for providing at least some grammar feedback on all marked student draft is that not so misses the opportunity to provide

feedback at a teachable moment. Since many L2 student writers have significant accuracy problems, they arguably need all the input they can get from their teachers. By refusing to provide such feedback until the very last draft, teachers can severely limit these opportunities for needed input. (p. 62)

1.2.5 Categories of Providing Written Feedback

Ellis (2009) claims that it is necessary to make a basic distinction between the ways involved in the teachers' provision of CF and the students' response to this feedback. His distinction can be summarized in the following table:

Table 01

Types of Teacher Written Corrective Feedback (Ellis, 2009, p. 98)

Type de CF	Description	Studies
A- Strategies for Providing CF		
1- Direct CF	The teacher provides the student with the correct form	e.g. Lalande (1982) and Robb et al. (1986).
2- Indirect CF **a** Indicating + locating the error	The teacher indicates that an error exists but does not provide the correction. This takes the form of underlining and use of cursors to show omissions in the student's text. This takes the form of an indication in	Various studies have employed indirect correction of this kind (e.g. Ferris and Roberts 2001; Chandler2003). Fewer studies have employed this method (e.g. Robb et al. 1986).

b Indication only	the margin that an error has taken place in a line of text.	
3 Metalinguistic CF	The teacher provides some kind of metalinguistic clue as to the nature of the error.	
a Use of error code	Teacher writes codes in the margin (e.g. ww = wrong word; art =article).	Various studies have examined the effects of using error codes (e.g. Lalande 1982; Ferris and Roberts 2001; Chandler 2003). Sheen (2007) compared the effects of direct CF and direct CF + metalinguistic CF.
b Brief grammatical descriptions	Teacher numbers errors in text and writes a grammatical description for each numbered error at the bottom of the text.	
4- the focus of the feedback	This concerns whether the teacher attempts to correct all (or most) of the students' errors or selects one or two specific types of errors to correct. This distinction can be applied to each of the above options.	Most studies have investigated unfocused CF (e.g. Chandler 2003; Ferris 2006). Sheen (2007), drawing on traditions in SLA studies of CF, investigated focused CF.
a Unfocused CF	Unfocused CF is extensive.	
b Focused CF	Focused CF is intensive	
5 Electronic feedback	The teacher indicates an error and provides a hyperlink to a concordance file that	Milton (2006).

	provides examples of correct usage.	
6 Reformulation	This consists of a native speaker's reworking of the students' entire text to make the language seem as native-like as possible while keeping the content of the original intact.	Sachs and Polio (2007) compared the effects of direct correction and reformulation on students' revisions of their text.
B Students' response to feedback	For feedback to work for either redrafting or language learning, learners need to attend to the corrections. Various alternatives exist for achieving this.	
1 Revision required		A number of studies have examined the effect of requiring students to edit their errors (e.g. Ferris and Roberts 2001; Chandler 2003). Sheen (2007) asked students to study corrections.
2 No revisions required a Students asked to study corrections b Students just given back corrected text		A number of studies have examined what students do when just given back their text with revisions (e.g. Sachs and Polio 2007). No study has systematically investigated different approaches to revision.

From Ellis' table, teachers may use variety of strategies for providing written CF. The following are the basic strategies with a number of options associated with some of them.

1.2.5.1 Direct Corrective Feedback

Teachers offer the correct form for students in the case of direct feedback. This can appear in various forms – crossing out an unnecessary phrase, word, or, morpheme, and the correct form should be followed or near to erroneous form (Ferris, 2006). In few words, direct feedback DF is a technique of correcting students' error by giving an explicit written correction.

Example 1

> Over a   a   saw a
> When the dog was going ~~through~~∧bridge over ~~the~~ river he ~~found~~ dog in the river

(Ellis, 2009, p. 99)

Direct feedback offers explicit direction for learners to correct their errors. This is clearly desirable if learners do not know the correct form is (i.e. Are not capable of self-correcting the errors). Ferris and Roberts (2001) suggested that direct written corrective feedback is probably better than indirect written corrective feedback with writers of low levels of language proficiency. However, this strategy may not contribute to long-term learning because it requires minimal processing on the part of the learner.

1.2.5.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback

Generally, indirect CF involves indicating that there is no actual correction provided to the errors made by students. In this case, teachers can use many ways such as, underling the errors, using cursors to make omissions in the text of students.

Example 02

> When the dog was going X through XX bridge over X the X he found X dog in the river.
>
> X= missing word
>
> XX=wrong word.

(Ellis, 2009, p. 100)

Indirect feedback is often preferred to direct feedback on the ground that it caters to "guided learning and problem solving" (Lalande, 1982) and encourages learners to reflect on linguistic forms. For these reasons, it is considered more likely to lead to long-term learning (Ferris and Roberts, 2002). However, learners cannot correct their errors unless they know the correct form and even they are able to correct but they will not be certain that they are correct.

1.2.5.3 Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

Teachers are using metalinguistic CF in order to provide students with some forms of explicit comments to show them the nature of the errors that are found in their writings. This explicit comment may take two forms. The use of error codes is the most common one. These include abbreviations of labels of various types of errors. These labels can be found over the place of the error in the text or in the margin. In the latter, where the error is made (its place/location) may be shown or not. In the former,

the student needs to make the required correction from the provided clue while in the latter the students need to find the location of the error than try to correct it.

Example 03

Art	art	ww art prep
A dog stole bone form butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog was going through		
Art	art	
bridge over the river he found dog in the the river		

(Ellis, 2009, p. 101)

Example 04

Art. x 3;WW	A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone.
Prep.; art.	When the dog was going through bridge over the
Art.	River he found dog in the river.

(Ellis, 2009, p. 101)

Offering students with metalinguistic explanation of their errors, is the second type of metalinguistic CF. It is considered to be less common; may be this is much time consuming than the use of error codes . Furthermore, in metalinguistic explanations teachers have to process adequate metalinguistic knowledge in order to have the ability to write clear and accurate explanations.

Example 05

---

       (1)   (2)   (3)

A dog stole bone from butcher. He escaped with having bone. When the dog

       (4)   (5)   (6)

was going through bridge over the river he found dog in the river.

(1), (2), (5), and (6): you need 'a' before the noun when a person or thing is mentioned for the first time.

(3): you need 'the' before the noun when the person or thing has been mentioned previously.

(4): you need 'over' when you go across the surface of something; you use 'through' when you go inside something (e.g. 'go through the forest').

(Ellis, 2009, p. 202)

1.2.5.4. Focused Versus Unfocused Corrective Feedback

The focused-unfocused dichotomy refers to the comprehensiveness of correction methodologies. 'Unfocused correction' is a type of CF that is usually directed to correct all (or most) of the errors that students make during the writing process. It involves correction of all errors in a learner's text, irrespective of their error category. However, Focused correction is related to a specific, predetermined error that students may make in their writing. It targets a number of specific linguistic features. Errors outside the focused domain are left uncorrected. The distinction between focused and unfocused CF applies to all of the previously discussed options (Ellis, 2008).

Processing corrections is likely to be more difficult in unfocused CF as the learner is required to attend to a variety of errors, and thus, is unlikely to be able to reflect much on each error. In this respect, focused CF may prove more effective as

the learner is able to examine multiple corrections of a single error, and thus, obtain the rich evidence they need to both to understand why and what they wrote was erroneous, and to acquire the correct form. If learning is dependent on attention to form, then it is reasonable to assume that the more intensive the attention, the more likely the correction is to lead to learning. Focused metalinguistic CF may be especially helpful in this respect as it promotes not just attention but also understanding of the nature of the errors, so while it might not be as effective in assisting learners to acquire specific features as focused CF in the short term, it may prove superior in the long run (Ellis, 2009).

1.2.5.5 The Electronic Feedback

The development of technology has influenced many fields. Learning the English language for instance cannot rely only on the use of traditional references, the application of new discoveries as computer may pave the way for learn it. Moreover, electronic feedback is one of the widely implemented strategies used by teachers for the sake of correcting learners' mistakes. Thus, teachers provide the written feedback to their students by using the comment function, which allows feedback to be displayed in a separate window. Through this technique students may receive the feedback in their email box. Feedback on errors can also be linked to online explanations of grammar or to concordance lines from authentic texts to show students examples of features they may have problems using correctly. These new channels of written feedback offer teachers greater flexibility in their responding practices. (Hyland, 1990, p.183)

1.2.5.6 Reformulation Feedback

The final option we will consider is similar to the use of concordances in that it aims to provide learners with a resource that they can use to correct their errors, but places the responsibility for the final decision about whether and how to correct on the students themselves.

A standard procedure in error analysis is reconstruction. That is, in order to identify an error, the analyst (and the teacher) needs to construct a native speaker version of that part of the text containing an error. The idea for reformulation as a technique for providing feedback to learners grew out of this procedure. It involves a native-speaker rewriting the student's text in such a way as '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' (Cohen ,1989, p. 4). The writer then revises by deciding which of the native-speaker's reconstructions to accept. In essence, reformulation involves two options 'direct correction' + 'revision' but it differs from how these options are typically executed in that the whole of the student's text is reformulated thus laying the burden on the learner to identify the specific changes that have been made.

Sachs and Polio (2007) reported an interesting study that compared reformulation with direct error correction. The main difference between these two options was a matter of presentation and task demands and was not related to the kinds of errors that were corrected. The difference in presentation is illustrated in the example below.

Example 06

Original version: As he was jogging, his tummy was shacked.

Reformulation: As he was jogging, his tummy was shaking.

tummy   shaking

Error correction: As he was jogging his ~~tammy~~ was ~~shacked~~.

(Ellis, 2009, p. 104)

The students were shown their reformulated/corrected stories and asked to study them for 20 minutes and take notes if they wanted. Then, one day later, they were given a clean sheet of paper and asked to revise their stories but without access to either the reformulated/corrected texts or the notes they had taken. Both the groups that received reformulation and corrections outperformed the control group. However, the corrections group produced more accurate revisions than the reformulation group. As Sachs and Polio (2007) pointed out, reformulation is a technique that is not restricted to assisting students with their surface level linguistic errors; it is also designed to draw attention to higher order stylistic and organizational errors. Thus, their study should not be used to dismiss the use of reformulation as a technique for teaching written composition. Nevertheless, it would seem from this study that it does not constitute the most effective way of assisting students to eliminate linguistic errors when they revise.

1.3   Section Three: Novice versus Experienced Teachers

This section mainly focuses on novice and experienced teachers. The two concepts of novice and experienced teachers are dealt with from different perspectives, starting with various definitions of novice and experienced teachers moving to the characteristics of novice and experienced teachers then to comparison studies on teaching experience. Another concern of this section is the problems faced by novice teachers as well as teachers' beliefs and practices regarding written corrective feedback.

1.3.1 Definition of Novice and Experienced Teachers

The definition of what constitutes teacher experience varies greatly across the scant literature. Novice teachers are relatively easily defined as those with little or no classroom experience. They are often student teachers or teachers who have less than two years of teaching experience (Gatbonton, 2008). In other words, novice teachers are teachers who have not yet completed three years of teaching after receiving initial teacher certification. They are fresh in the teaching profession. Identifying the experienced teachers, however, is more complex. Teachers and administrators might define experienced teachers as those who have taught for many years who are able to motivate students and hold their attention, know how to manage their classroom, and can change course at the middle of a lesson to take advantage of unforeseen opportunities to enhance students' learning. In the literature, the definition of experienced teachers seems to hinge principally on the number of years; time related criteria can range from two years or three years (Bastick, 2002) to nine or more (Atay,2008; Bivona, 2000). Most commonly, studies identify experienced teachers as

those who have approximately five years or more of classroom experience (Tsui, 2003, 2005).

However, the number of teaching years does not guarantee expertise for a teacher. Some experienced teachers may be considered experts while others remain 'experienced non- experts' (Tsui, 2003, p. 3). While little research has been done on expertise in teaching ESL, programs have used combination of more than five years of teaching experience, recognition from administrators, and high student's achievement to identify their own expert ESL teachers (Tsui, 2003).

1.3.2 Characteristics of Novice and Experienced Teachers

The cognitive processes in which teachers are engaged when planning a lesson or a unit have been considered to be most important because they reflect how teachers translate syllabus guidelines, institutional expectations and their own beliefs into pedagogical actions (Calderhead, 1984). Therefore, most of the studies of teacher thinking have focused on lesson planning. The findings have yielded four main characteristics which make experienced teachers differ from novices.

The first characteristic is that experienced teachers exercise more autonomy. However, Novice teachers' planning is guided by procedures and rules which are devoid of context. Experienced-novice comparisons found that typically novice teachers' lesson planning followed closely the procedures that were laid down by planning models whereas experienced teachers seldom followed such models. They were much more ready to take responsibility for their own decisions and to make modifications to suit the needs of their students and their own goals (Borko and Linvingston, 1989; Westerman, 1991). Novice teachers also tended to follow closely the instructional objectives stated in the curriculum guides, even when they felt that

other alternatives might be better, whereas experienced teachers exercised their own judgment about the coherence of the activities and were more concerned about what could be achieved over time (Clark and Peterson, 1986; Brown and McIntyre, 1992).

The second characteristic is that experienced teachers are much more efficient in lesson planning. Experienced teachers were found to spend much less time on lesson planning and yet their plans are much more effective. This was because they were able to draw on well-established routines based on their past experience and they rarely had to design classroom activities from scratch (Leinhardt and Greeno, 1986). They could recall similar lessons that they had taught before and make amendments, if necessary. Because of this, experienced teachers demonstrated automaticity and effortlessness in lesson planning. By contrast, novice teachers spent an inordinate amount of time on planning each and every lesson. Their lesson plans were very detailed and included the questions that they would ask and the answers that they would provide. Consequently, they had little spare capacity to engage in longer term planning (see Borko and Livingston, 1989). Unlike experienced teachers, novice teachers cannot rely on 'what normally works' in their own classrooms and they have no routines to rely on. What is interesting, however, is that experienced teachers' mental planning is continuous and their planning thoughts are very rich (McCutcheon, 1980).

The third characteristic is that experienced teachers are much more flexible and they are much more ready to depart from their plans in response to the contextual variations. These variations include students' responses, availability of resources, and disruptions. They are sensitive to the constraints and possibilities presented by the specific contexts. Because of their rich experience, they are often able to anticipate

possible situations and they have contingency plans to deal with them. Novice teachers, by contrast, are much less able to anticipate problems and much less flexible in their planning (Borko and Livingston, 1989). The flexibility of experienced teachers is perhaps a manifestation of a more profound difference. Experienced teachers see context as very much part of the teaching act whereas novice teachers tend to see context as external and can be ignored.

The fourth characteristic is that experienced teachers' planning thought reflect a much more integrated base than those of novice teachers. The findings showed that experienced teachers were capable of relating individual lessons to the entire curriculum, to integrate each lesson with previous ones, and with other curriculum contents. Novice teachers, on the other hand, had difficulty making sense of how the curriculum was organized and consequently they planned lessons as discrete units. Experienced teachers were also able to draw on knowledge in a wide range of domains when they plan. Studies of teachers' planning thoughts have found that experienced teachers always started their planning with statements about their students' prior learning whereas novice teachers seldom did (Leinhardt, 1989).

1.3.3 Teaching Experience and Teaching Effectiveness

Teaching experience matters in teacher effectiveness and student achievement, at least to a certain point. Experienced teachers differ from novice teachers because they have attained expertise through real-life experiences, classroom practice, and time. These teachers typically have a greater repertoire of ways to monitor students and create flowing, meaningful lessons. Teachers who are both experienced and effective are experts; they know the content and the students they teach, use efficient planning strategies, practice interactive decision making, and embody effective

classroom management skills. These experienced and effective teachers are efficient-they can do more in less time than novice teachers (McCutcheon, 1980).

Researchers indicated that teachers develop from novices to experienced ones at different rate, taking from five to eight years to master the art, science, and craft of teaching (Darling-Hammoud, 2000; Education Review Office, 1998). Therefore, the number of years in front of a classroom may not necessarily indicate whether a teacher is an expert. One study suggested that for a teacher to be considered experienced the ability to apply 'the book knowledge' from preservice training to both common and exceptional classroom situations should be observable. Through experience and awareness, teachers are able to improvise. Flexibility and adaptability are sometimes more desirable than a well-written lesson plan, because classrooms are dynamic. Novice teachers often hesitate to deviate from a plan, but effective teachers can do it with ease, capitalizing on a table moment or accommodating a schedule change. The ability to improvise is a characteristic that is more common to experienced teachers than to novices.

1.3.4 Comparison Studies on Teaching Experience

It has been pointed out by a number of researchers that the characteristics of expert teachers mostly take the form of novice-experienced or experience-expert comparisons.

1.3.4.1 Novice / Experienced Teachers

Nunan (1992) found that experienced language teachers' decisions show greater attention to language issues than novice teachers, who were more concerned with classroom management. This suggests that experienced teachers learn to

automatize the routines associated with managing the class, and can thus focus more attention on issues of content. Richard (1998) stated that experienced teachers engaged in more improvisational teaching than novice teachers. This means that "as teachers develop their teaching skills, they are able to drew less on preactive decision making (the type of planning that occurs prior to teaching) and make greater use of interactive decision-making as a source of their improvisational performance" (pp117-118). In comparing novice and experienced teachers' approaches of teaching, Richard and Tang (1998) identified four areas of language teaching which novice teachers were less skilled at: (a) thinking about the subject matter from the learner's perspective, (b) having a deep understanding of the subject matter, (c) knowing how to present subject matter in appropriate ways, and (d) knowing how to integrate language learning with broader curricular goals.

1.3.4.2. Experienced/Expert Teachers

In many studies, years of experience is the only criterion used, and the term "experienced teacher" and "expert teacher" where used interchangeably. However, as many researchers have noted, experience and expertise are not synonymous (Tsui, 2005). In fact, an experienced practitioner could become complacent about their existing practice and allow their skills to become out-of-date (see Eraut, 1994; Ericsson, 2002). Specifically, what distinguishes the expert from experienced non-expert is that the former re-invest their mental resources freed up by the use of routines to tackle more difficult problems and to problematize what appears to be routines or unproblematic. In the process of doing this, they "work at their edge of the competence" (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1993, p34) and develop expertise in their own domain. By contrast, as experienced non-experts establish more and more routines

over time, they rely more and more on these routines and they minimize their opportunities for growth**.**

1.3.5 Problems Faced by Novice Teachers

Novice teachers face many problems which hinder their achievement of intended goals. Veenman (1984) analyzed eighty-three international empirical studies to identify the most serious problems of novice teachers. He culled fifteen of the most serious problems and classified and rank ordered them according to their importance. The eight most serious problems that new teachers reported in order of importance were as follows: classroom discipline, motivating pupils, dealing with individual differences, assessing pupils' work, relations with parents, organization of class work, insufficient materials and supplies, and dealing with problems of individual pupils. The next seven in rank order were as follows: heavy teaching load resulting in insufficient preparation time, relations with colleagues, planning of lessons and schooldays, effective use of different teaching methods, awareness of school policies and rules, determining learning level of students, and tied for fifteenth, knowledge of subject matter, burden of clerical work, and relations with principals/administrators.

Kagan (1992) examined forty "learning to teach" studies published between 1987 and 1991. All forty studies were naturalistic and qualitative in methodology. First, this group of studies confirmed that novice teachers enter teacher education programs with personal beliefs about images of good teachers, images of themselves as teachers, and memories of themselves as students. These personal beliefs and images of novice teachers remain unchanged by their teacher certification programs and follow them into classroom. Thus, new teachers approach the classroom with pre-conceived personal beliefs about teaching and students. This lack of change in

attitudes and beliefs translates to a classroom reality that does not meet their expectations. The second important finding from these forty studies was that novice teachers do not have the requisite knowledge of classroom procedures to understand the complex interrelationship among management, behavior, and academic tasks. This lack of knowledge prevents novice teachers from focusing on student learning; instead, they are preoccupied with their own behavior as they try different workable procedures.

1.3.6 Teacher Beliefs and Practices Regarding Written Feedback

Teachers bring their beliefs and attitudes to the classrooms, and what they believe and expect either from themselves or their environment affects their teaching practices to a great extent. As Fleer (1999) pointed out "the way the learning context is structured is a direct result of teachers' pedagogical content knowledge and philosophy about how children think and learn" (p272). This highlights the importance of teachers' beliefs and the impact of pre-service education on practices. Moreover, Smith (1971) further supported Fleer (1999) claiming that:

> There is little doubt that the attitudes a teacher has towards himself influence his behavior in the classroom. And there are strong reasons for believing that the teacher's attitudes towards his pupils-e.g., his expectations of them—will influence their achievement. (p. 8)

Teachers' beliefs and perspectives regarding providing feedback have been analyzed to a limited extent, while these beliefs and attitudes actually play a crucial role as they determine application or termination of the practice (e.g. Evans et al., 2010; Ferris, 2011, Lee, 2003; Orsmond & Merry, 2011). That is, what teachers prioritize and regard as necessary are highly significant and their opinions affect the

students' attitudes to writing to a large extent (Lee, 2003). Considering teachers' beliefs and practices about written feedback, Orsmond and Merry (2011) carried out a study at a British university. They investigated six biological sciences tutors' intentions when providing feedback, whether there is a correlation between what they believe and practice and how their practices are understood. Data were collected through interview and document analysis of written feedback. The findings indicated that teachers used praising and corrective feedback a lot, which matched their beliefs. However, 'identifying errors', 'correcting errors' and 'explaining misunderstandings' were more focused than those aspects that guide students in future assignments and engage them in thinking, which contradicts teachers' beliefs that feedback should be given to improve student work.

Evans (2010) aimed to answer the questions to what extent current L2 writing teachers provide written corrective feedback (WCF) and what determines whether or not practitioners choose to provide WCF. They conducted an international online survey to reach many writing teachers from all over the world. The findings suggested that "WCF is commonly practiced in L2 pedagogy by experienced and well-educated L2 practitioners for sound pedagogical reasons" (p. 47). The teachers had an average of 16 years' experience and stated that "personal teaching experience, academic training, and research and conferences were influential in their practices" (p. 64). Together with appreciating WCF in writing, they thought "it may be ineffective if the students are not motivated enough to take adequate advantage of the WCF they receive" (64). In short, as Ferris (2011) stated, teachers do want their students' writing to "improve to its fullest potential and they do not want their time and effort to be spent in vain as providing feedback is a time-consuming and rigorous job" (p. 61).

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter started with an overview about the writing skill and how it is taught in language classrooms. Light was casted on the importance that this skill has in EFL classes. As a second step, we moved towards the explanation of the important aspects that should be followed while providing written corrective feedback strategies. Lastly, focus was tightened up on the major issues that might distinguish between novice and experienced teachers.

The next chapter will be devoted to presenting the methodology to be employed for the investigation of the topic at hand, data presentation and analysis, as well as data interpretation.

Chapter Two

Chapter Two: Research Methodology and Data Analysis and Interpretation

Introduction

2.1 Section One: Research Methodology

2.1.1 Research Methods

2.1.1.1 The Classroom Observation

2.1.1.2 The Questionnaire

2.1.2 Setting

2.1.3 Population and Sampling

2.1.4 Writing in the Second Year Secondary school Text book

2.1.5 Limitations of the Study

2.2 Section two: Data Presentation and Analysis

2.2.1 Presentation and Analysis of the Classroom Observation Scheme

2.2.2 Presentation and Analysis of the Questionnaire

2.3 Section three: Data Discussion and Interpretation

2.3.1 Discussion of the Results Obtained From Classroom Observation Scheme and Teachers'

Questionnaire

2.3.1.1 Novice and Experienced Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

2.3.1.1.1 Novice Teachers Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

2.3.1.1.2 Experienced Teachers Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Conclusion

Chapter Two: Research Methodology and Data Analysis and Interpretation

Introduction

This chapter presents the practical framework of the present study which aims at investigating the corrective feedback strategies in writing used by novice and experienced teachers in secondary schools. It consists of three major sections. The first section discusses the research methodology employed to inquire about the research issue at hand, and it includes: The research methods, the setting, the population, the description of the second year textbook, and the research limitations. The second section is devoted for data presentation and analysis of the two instruments. It includes presentation and analysis of the classroom observation scheme and teachers' questionnaire. At last, the third section is concerned with data discussion and interpretation. It mainly focuses on the discussion of the results obtained from the classroom observation scheme and teachers' questionnaire.

2.1 Section one: Research Methodology

In this section, research methodology and the items used in data collection are introduced. It mainly addresses the research methods, the setting and participants chosen to inform the study, the description of the second year textbook as well as the research limitations.

2.1.1 Research Methods

As long as the aim of the present research is to check out the corrective feedback strategies in writing used by novice and experienced teachers in secondary schools, and to show the extent to which the teaching experience affects the use of

these corrective feedback strategies in secondary school classrooms, the most suitable method is the descriptive one. Glass and Hopkins (1984) argued that descriptive research involves gathering data that describes events and then organizes, tabulates, depicts, and disrobes the data collection. Hence, this method seems to be appropriate for this piece of research because it gains authentic and accurate data that can be handled easily by a first time researcher. Thus, both the questionnaire and the classroom observation are considered as appropriate tools used to gather the adequate data for the current study in a limited time. In addition, these two instruments appeared to be reinforcing each other, in the sense that, the authentic data gathered from the classroom observation makes the results obtained from the questionnaire more valid. The current research combined two research instruments. That is, both a classroom observation and a questionnaire were adopted to fulfill the required objectives of this study.

2.1.1.1 Classroom Observation

As an attempt to probe into the various strategies that novice and experienced teachers are actually adhering to when correcting students' errors in Laanani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar, and Kiamouch Farhat secondary schools in Taher, we adopted a classroom observation which is considered as a convenient means to attain that end. Classroom observation carried out in the current research is a systematic one. McIntyre and Macleod (1986) defined systematic observation as one in which the researcher analyzes the different aspects of classroom activities drawing good reliance on predetermined categories (such as observation scheme).

In this study classroom observation involved observing the writing sessions with eight different teachers, and documenting the writing instructions and the written

corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers, which are already categorized in an observation scheme (appendix A).

As far as the number of teachers being observed, each teacher of the selected sample was observed in the writing sessions during the third term, april2017.That is, a number of four novice teachers and four experienced teachers were observed sequentially aiming to attain the purpose of the study.

The classroom observation scheme consisted of (05) writing instructions which are sequenced in the continuum along which the writing process should take place: explaining the purpose of the writing task, raising students' awareness of the writing form, explaining the key words, and using creative techniques while explaining the content. Besides, (06) written corrective feedback strategies are displayed in the same scheme: positive feedback, negative feedback with correction, peer feedback, self-correction, content-based, and form focused feedback. These written corrective feedback strategies are the criteria in observing the sample under study.

2.1.1.2 Teachers' Questionnaire

The Questionnaire is a very popular research tool that can be used to investigate a limited number of research items by a relatively large number of subjects (Nunan, 1992). Besides, the Questionnaire can yield precise data amenable to statistical calculations and easy for analysis. As the current study seeks to gather additional information about the written corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers in Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli moukhtar, and Kiamouch Farhat Secondary schools, the questionnaire seems the most relevant research tool.

The questionnaire is divided into three sections where each section has its own objective. In total, the questionnaire includes 14 questions (see Appendix B). The first section is devoted to general information concerning the respondents. It is intended firstly to know the teachers' gender, their teaching qualifications as well as their years of experience in teaching English. The second section of the questionnaire composed of two questions, seeks to know how often teachers in secondary schools teach the writing skill and if they follow specific approach while teaching it or not. Then in the third section, we shifted our attention to another concern with an attempt to have clear image about how teachers of English make use of WCF strategies with their students. In other words, we intended to verify the hypothesis in accordance to their views as well as their awareness of corrective feedback strategies. This section includes questions like: "Do you believe that feedback is a vital element to enhance students' writing level?", when you are correcting students' works, which aspects do you give more importance?" We ended this section with requesting teachers to rank the extent to which the teaching experience affects the use of WCF strategies in a language classroom.

Finally, the forth section permitted us to have further suggestions on the topic under investigation. That is, teachers were asked one more time to give their own views concerning the most constructive WCF strategies. The reason behind this question is to disclose the corrective feedback strategies novice and experienced teachers in Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Moukhtar and Kiamouch FarhatSecondary Schools deem to be effective.

2.1.2 Setting

To shed light on the corrective feedback strategies in writing used by novice and experienced teachers in secondary schools, a classroom observation and a questionnaire are designed to obtain the data needed. Firstly, the classroom observation is carried out during the third term starting on 09 April 2017. The classroom observation takes place in Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar, and Kiamouch Farhat Secondary Schools in Taher during the academic year 2016-2017. It has taken around three weeks to be accomplished. Researchers first took the permission from the administration of the three secondary schools to have a look on the timetable of the population so as to attend their classes in the writing sessions. Then, most of the sessions were observed normally apart from the last ones where students started skipping classes. The researchers sat at the end of the class. Each time the observed teacher utilizes a predetermined instruction, it was coded in the classroom observation scheme.

Secondly, just after the classroom observation has been finished a questionnaire was handed out to those eight EFL teachers being observed in addition to the other teachers of English in the three secondary schools, namely Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar and Kiamouch Farhat Secondary Schools in Taher. The questionnaire was administered on April 30th, 2017 and was returned back on May 08th, 2016 for the following reason:

• The questionnaire was administered in circumstances where most teachers were busy with a teaching contest and evidently barely had time to respond quickly to the questionnaires. Thereby, researchers had to wait for a considerable period of time until respondents returned back the questionnaires.

The total number of questionnaires that have been administered was 18 copies, due to the following reasons:

• The number of EFL teachers is limited in comparison to other modules.

• The short period of the third term and students' remarkable absences have

prevented us from distributing more questionnaires to other secondary schools.

2.1.3 Population and Sampling

For the purpose of achieving the aim of the current study, a population consisted of eight (08) EFL teachers (four novice teachers and four experienced teachers) from Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli moukhtar, and Kiamouch Farhat Secondary schools were selected. This population has been specifically chosen by the researchers taking into account that they have different years of experience in teaching English so that the population under study will be balanced and thus research objectives will be met. In this study, the definition of (Atay 2008; Bivona, 2000) who characterized experienced teachers as those with many years of teaching behind them, as at list 9 years has been adopted. Hence, if the teacher possesses less than 9 years of experience in teaching English then he/she is considered as novice teacher.

These eight EFL teachers were purposefully observed only within the writing sessions because of the nature of our study "A comparative study of written corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers". In addition these teachers were observed only with second year students because if the selected sample is observed with different levels then the corrective feedback strategies may vary according to the current level of students, and thus results might be biased. Furthermore, students of second year are of an acceptable level in comparison to

students of the first year. Hence, teachers may use various WCF strategies. However, concerning students of the third level we were informed that they do not attend their classes regularly in the third trimester. Thus, we were obliged to conduct the classroom observation with students of the second year.

To have a clear idea about how writing is presented in the second year syllabus, an examination of the textbook is needed.

2.1.4 Writing in the Second Year Secondary school Text book

The syllabus of second year students "Getting through" is based on competency-based language teaching. It contains eight units, but second year students are only concerned with six units. Each unit deals with a specific theme.

Unite 1: Signs of the time   Unite 5: News and tales

Unite 2: Make peace   Unite 6: No man is an island

Unite 3: Waste not, want not   Unite 7: Science or fiction?

Unite 4: Budding scientist   Unite 8: Business is business

The writing tasks within each unit are demonstrated in the following table.

Table 02

The Main Writing Tasks in the second Year Secondary School Syllabus (Getting Through)

	Write it right	**Write it up**	**Write it out**
Unit 1	Writing a biography	Writing a letter	Writing a newspaper article
Unit 2	Writing a poem	Writing a class charter/an acrostic	Writing a poem
Unit 3	Writing a press release	Writing about a solar home	Writing sentences using passive form
Unit 4	Writing a transcription about water properties	Writing a letter seeking/giving advice	Writing a letter about a contingency plan
Unit 5	Writing a story about a disaster	Writing a short tale	Writing an accident report
Unit 6	Writing a report	Writing an announcement	Writing a letter of opinion

The writing tasks in this syllabus vary in terms of: topic, aim, function, and structure. In addition to individual work, students are required to carry out the writing tasks either in pairs or groups. Hence, this latter helps in raising students' awareness of their writing errors through peer correction. The writing tasks are facilitated by splitting up the instructions in order to ensure that students are following gradually the writing stages. Also, they are illustrated by many tools such as: pie charts, pictures,

and spider maps to help the student brainstorm and select more relevant ideas. In order to enhance students writing skill, this syllabus takes into account the main characteristics of effective writing (grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, organization, coherence, cohesion) while presenting the writing tasks. Students are encouraged in their writing to use the grammar points and vocabulary words that they have been taught in the related unit (p. 63). Besides, some writing tasks are provided with useful language.

In general, both the writing process and the correction of the students' writing were designed to be taught only in one session. In addition, most writing tasks are controlled such as writing a letter, seeking/giving advice, writing a report about Bill Gates. But unfortunately, they don't present real life situations. Thus, such topics of writing tasks may not be useful for student

2.1.5 Limitations of the Study

In carrying out this piece of research, some difficulties and limitations have been encountered. First of all, there were some limitations inherent to the research context. That is, another research tool which is the analysis of the students' written assignments was designed to be used in addition to the mentioned tools above. Unfortunately, the researchers were surprised by the fact that all second year secondary school teachers do not correct the students' works because both the written session and the correction session are integrated together in one session.

Secondly, the total number of the selected sample was only eight teachers because the task of observing those eight (08) EFL teachers only in the writing sessions takes a lot of time. Actually, it happened that when we went to the secondary schools, we found that teachers have already dealt with the writing session. This is, in

turn, has wasted our time while waiting for the next session to observe the selected sample. The number of the writing sessions that we have observed is not sufficient to check out the written corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers of secondary schools. The yielded data from the sample of the present work is not meant to be generalized, yet, if time had been sufficient the population would have been more than the one covered in this piece of research.

2.2 Section Two: Data Analysis and Presentation

This section presents the findings obtained from the two research instruments employed to investigate the topic under study "a comparative study of corrective feedback strategies in writing used by novice and experienced teachers in secondary schools". These research tools are the classroom observation, and teachers' questionnaire.

2.2.1 Presentation and Analysis of the Classroom Observation

The results obtained are presented in the following statistical tables.

Table 03

The First Novice Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Writing and corrective feedback strategies		
A-the writing process	**Yes**	**No**
1- **Explaining the purpose of the writing task**		✓
2- **Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	✓	
3- **Explaining the key words**		✓
4- **Using creative techniques while explaining the content**		✓
B- strategies for providing corrective feedback	**Frequency**	
1- **Positive Feedback**	7	
2- **Negative feedback**	1	

3- **Peer feedback**	0
4- **Self-correction**	2
Feedback focus	
5- **Form focused feedback**	8
6- **Content-based feedback**	2

The results obtained from the classroom observation scheme displayed in table (3) show that the first novice teacher does not focus on implementing the instructions stated in the table above, she only informed the students about the writing form they have to follow. Possibly, it is due to the teacher's lesson plan that followed closely procedures and rules which are devoid of context.

With regard to the feedback strategies that are provided in this session, the table above mostly shows that the observed teacher overused positive feedback (7times in one session) in comparison to negative feedback with correction (only 1 time), self-correction (2 times), and the absence of peer feedback. This can be proved by the acceptable level of second year scientific stream students. Concerning the feedback focus, the teacher while providing feedback tended to focus more on form (8 times in one session) rather than content (2 times); this is due to the fact that the writing approach followed in the second year textbook is the controlled-to-free writing, in which students are already provided with the helpful notes that assist them in their writing task.

Table 04

The Second Novice Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Written corrective feedback strategies		
A- **The Writing Process**	**Yes**	**No**
1- **Explaining the purpose of the writing task**		✓
2- **Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	✓	
3- **Explaining the key words**		✓
4- **Using creative techniques while explaining the content**		✓
B- **Strategies for Providing Corrective Feedback**	**Frequency**	
1- **Teacher's Positive Feedback**	3	
2- **Teacher's Negative feedback with correction**	0	
3- **Peer feedback**	0	
4- **Self-correction**	0	
Feedback focus		
5- **Form focused feedback**	3	
6- **Content-based feedback**	0	

A look at table (4) shows that the only step followed by the second novice teacher is the second one (raising students awareness of the writing form). She neglected the remaining steps. Probably, she considered that the task is fully explained in the textbook "p127". Another possibility is that this novice teacher is unaware of

the importance of following such steps in making students interested in the writing task.

The results above, also, show that this novice teacher rarely uses corrective feedback strategies under study. This can be noticed by the absence of the second strategy (negative feedback with correction), the third strategy (peer feedback), and the fourth strategy (self-correction). However, she used positive feedback three times, all of which are form-focused. Possibly, this was because the teacher faced difficulties in managing her class. Actually, when we observed this session, we noticed that students did not take part in the lesson seriously.

Table 05

The Third Novice Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Written corrective feedback strategies		
A- The Writing Process	**Yes**	**No**
1- **Explaining the purpose of the writing task**	✓	
2- **Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	✓	
3- **Explaining the key words**	✓	
4- **Using creative techniques while explaining the content**		✓
B- Strategies for Providing Corrective Feedback	**Frequency**	
1- **Teacher's Positive Feedback**	0	
2- **Teacher's Negative feedback with correction**	4	

3- **Peer feedback**	0
4- **Self-correction**	2
Feedback focus	
5- **Form focused feedback**	5
6- **Content-based feedback**	1

Table (05) reveals that the third novice teacher followed the first three steps of the writing process stated in the table above. She started by explaining the purpose of the writing task, moving to informing students about the writing form they should follow, and then explaining the key words of the task. However, this novice teacher failed in applying the last step (using creative techniques while explaining the content). Perhaps her freshness in the field of teaching deprived her from adapting and modifying the materials in the textbook to suit the learners' needs.

Concerning the corrective feedback strategies used by this teacher, the table above illustrates that this novice teacher relied mostly on the third strategy (negative feedback with correction) as a major strategy to correct students' errors with a frequency of 4 times. Similarly, when it comes to the fourth corrective feedback strategy namely self-correction, she made use of it 2 times. May be this teacher wanted her students to be aware about their errors, or to encourage them to take part in the lesson. However, the two remaining corrective feedback strategies (positive feedback and peer feedback with correction) are completely absent in this lesson. Possibly, this is because of the students' actual level which is beyond the average that they cannot respond to such corrective feedback strategies. The table above shows again that this teacher focuses mostly on form (5 times) rather than content (1 time). As mentioned before, this is due to the fact that the content of the writing task is already provided the

textbook.

Table 06

The Forth Novice Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Written corrective feedback strategies		
A- **The Writing Process**	**Yes**	**No**
1- **Explaining the purpose of the writing task**		✓
2- **Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	✓	
3- **Explaining the key words**	✓	
4- **Using creative techniques while explaining the content**		✓
B- **Strategies for Providing Corrective Feedback**	**Frequency**	
1- **Teacher's Positive Feedback**	3	
2- **Teacher's Negative feedback with correction**	4	
3- **Peer feedback**	0	
4- **Self-correction**	0	
Feedback focus		
5- **Form focused feedback**	7	
6- **Content-based feedback**	0	

Table (6) indicates that this novice teacher did not explain the purpose of the

writing task; instead she only drew the student's attention to its form. Similarly, when it comes to the explanation of the content, she explained some key words without using any creative techniques that may help students respond easily to the task. Actually, these remarks seem to be the same among all the novice teachers under study. Possibly, their freshness in teaching makes them follow closely the instructional objectives stated in the curriculum guides, even when they felt that other alternatives might be better.

With regard to the corrective feedback strategies, this teacher relied on positive feedback (3 times) and negative feedback with correction (4 times) while correcting students' errors. The latters are provided on form (7 times). However, this novice teacher deprived her students' of the chance to correct their errors. This can be noticed in the absence of the last two corrective feedback strategies (peer feedback and self-correction).

Table 07

The First Experienced Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Written corrective feedback strategies		
A- The Writing Process	**Yes**	**No**
1- **Explaining the purpose of the writing task**	✓	
2- **Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	✓	
3- **Explaining the key words**	✓	
4- **Using creative techniques while explaining the content**	✓	

B- Strategies for Providing Corrective Feedback	Frequency
1- Teacher's Positive Feedback	2
2- Teacher's Negative feedback with correction	1
3- Peer feedback	1
4- Self-correction	3
Feedback focus	
5- Form focused feedback	7
6- Content-based feedback	1

According to the table (7) above, the first experienced teacher started the writing session with a warm-up in which he introduced the topic; he explained the purpose of the writing task and made students aware of its form "writing a report about Bill Gates" (p. 123 of the textbook). In addition, the teacher provided some information about the content through explaining the key words, for example: self-made man, donated, etc. Simultaneously, he used creative techniques to explain the content, for instance: he made students answer some questions about the pie chart which is given in the textbook. In doing so, the teacher lead the students to the supporting ideas of the paragraphs unconsciously. One can notice that this experienced teacher provided students with helpful instructions during the writing process. Possibly, his years of experience in teaching English have permitted him to be efficient and ready to make modifications that suit the needs of the students.

Moreover, this table illustrates the frequency of corrective feedback strategies used by the same teacher in this writing session. The results show that learner self-correction (3 times) and positive feedback (2 times), scored the highest frequencies of

all the corrective feedback strategies. The least occurrence goes for teacher's negative feedback with correction and peer feedback. Probably, this experienced teacher considered positive feedback and self-correction as personal teaching strategies that increase the learners' self-confident and allow them discover their errors and weaknesses. Concerning the feedback focus, this teacher as all teachers, focuses more on form (8 times) rather than content (only 2times).

Table 08

The Second Experienced Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Written corrective feedback strategies		
A- The Writing Process	**Yes**	**No**
1- **Explaining the purpose of the writing task**	✓	
2- **Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	✓	
3- **Explaining the key words**		✓
4- **Using creative techniques while explaining the content**	✓	
B- Strategies for Providing Corrective Feedback	**Frequency**	
1- **Teacher's Positive Feedback**	3	
2- **Teacher's Negative feedback with correction**	2	
3- **Peer feedback**	4	
4- **Self-correction**	4	
Feedback focus		

5-	**Form focused feedback**	12
6-	**Content-based feedback**	1

It is clear from the table (08) above that this experienced teacher followed almost all the steps of the writing process. The teacher drew the students' attention to the purpose of the task which is the appropriate use of the link words that goes with giving advice. In addition, she provided students with a fully explanation about the writing form they should follow "announcement advertising the precautions that people should take before, during, and after an earthquake" (p.128). Then she moved to the explanation of the content. One can notice that this teacher skipped the third step (explaining the key words). Probably, she found the content easy to understand. Instead, this teacher tended to be creative in explaining the content; she tried to engage the students in a pre-discussion of the topic in order to generate more points of view. Indeed, the students react to the teachers' explanation by giving their opinions and commenting on their classmates.

As far as the written corrective feedback strategies are concerned, the results show that the frequencies of the four corrective feedback strategies used by this teacher are nearly the same. Yet, the first and the second corrective feedback strategies (positive feedback and negative feedback with correction) appeared to be of the least occurrence in comparison to the third and the forth ones (peer feedback and self-correction). These results reveal that students took part during the correction of the task. As usual, these corrective feedback strategies are mostly provided on form (12 times).

Tables (09)

The Third Experienced Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Written corrective feedback strategies

A- The Writing Process	Yes	No
1- Explaining the purpose of the writing task	✓	
2- Raising the students' awareness of the writing form	✓	
3- Explaining the key words	✓	
4- Using creative techniques while explaining the content		✓

B- Strategies for Providing Corrective Feedback	Frequency
1- Teacher's Positive Feedback	2
2- Teacher's Negative feedback with correction	4
3- Peer feedback	0
4- Self-correction	1
Feedback focus	
5- Form focused feedback	7
6- Content-based feedback	0

The results from this ninth table tend to show that this experienced teacher opened the lesson informing the students about the purpose behind doing this task. As well as, she provided them with the needed information that helps them to write a report. In addition, this teacher implemented the third instruction (explaining the key words) for example: "self-made man" who means "someone who relies on himself".

However, when it comes to the last instruction of the writing process (using creative techniques while explaining the content) this teacher did not make use of it. Possibly, she finds that the content is fully explained in the textbook "pie chart" (p.123). So that she didn't bother herself to give further explanation.

As concerns the written corrective feedback strategies used by the same teacher, this table shows that peer feedback and self-correction are almost absent in comparison to positive feedback and negative feedback with correction. Perhaps, the students' actual level has imposed on her to avoid using peer feedback and self-correction. Or the teacher has previously dealt with such corrective feedback strategies and found unwelcome responses. Again, the teacher focused on form and not on content.

Table (10)

The Forth Experienced Teacher Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Written corrective feedback strategies		
A- The Writing Process	**Yes**	**No**
1- **Explaining the purpose of the writing task**	✓	
2- **Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	✓	
3- **Explaining the key words**	✓	
4- **Using creative techniques while explaining the content**	✓	
B- Strategies for Providing Corrective Feedback	**Frequency**	

1- **Teacher's Positive Feedback**	3
2- **Teacher's Negative feedback with correction**	1
3- **Peer feedback**	3
4- **Self-correction**	4
Feedback focus	
5- **Form focused feedback**	10
6- **Content-based feedback**	1

Table (10) above uncovers that the forth experienced teacher tended to make use of all the instructions of the writing process. He explained the purpose of the task which is the ability to integrate the lessons of the units with each other. Simultaneously, he drew the students' attention to the form they follow "writing an argumentative paragraph" (p. 131). After that, the teacher explained the content through defining some difficult words for example: starvation, malnutrition, etc. Furthermore, he tended to use some creative techniques while explaining the content. Indeed, he is flexible and ready to depart from his plan in response the students' actual difficulties.

In addition, table (10) shows that the frequency of corrective feedback is highly salient. Just after the lesson started, we noticed that these students have an acceptable level. This can be proved by the valuable frequency concerning the first corrective feedback strategy (positive feedback). Besides, this teacher focused more on peer feedback (03 times) and self-correction (04 times in one session) in comparison to negative feedback with correction (only 01 time). This implies that this experienced is highly aware of the importance of such strategies in making students benefit from the meaningful application of what have been learned from the feedback. Just like all the

teachers under study, the tendency of focusing on form rather than content in providing these corrective feedback strategies is also noticed in this experienced teacher's class(10 times in one session).

2.2.2 Presentation and Analysis of the Questionnaire

The results obtained from the questionnaire are presented in the form of the following statistical tables.

Section One: General Information

Responses to Question 1: (Indicate your gender?)

Table 11

Teachers' Gender

Gender	N°
Male	3
Female	15

As it is shown in the table above, the majority of the participants are females (15 out of 18). Despite these results, the sex of the teacher does not affect directly the results of this study.

Responses to Question 2: (What is your educational training?)

Table12

Teachers' Training

Educational Training	N°
MA(Master)	4
BA(Bachelor of Art)	**11**
ENS	3

According to Q2 in the above table, most of teachers hold a license degree (11out of 8) while 4 teachers hold a master degree and only 3 teachers have carried their studies in the ENS. This question aims at finding out if teachers' education influences the teaching of writing as well as the usage of written corrective feedback strategies.

Responses to question 3: (How long have you been teaching English at the secondary school?)

Table 13

Teaching Experience at Secondary School

Options	N°
Less than 5 years	2
Between 5 to 10 years	7
More than 10 years	9

As seen above, teachers were required to give the number of years they have been teaching English at secondary school. The results reveal that half of teachers (9

out of 18) said that they have been teaching at this level for more than 10 years. A considerable number of teachers (7 out of 18) have been teaching English between 5 to 10 years. However, the remaining number of teachers (02) has been teaching in this field for less than 5 years. This implies that half of our sample is experienced teachers. Whereas the other half of it are considered to be novice teachers. This variation in years of experience of our population will render our study more reliable by combining opinions of both experienced and novice teachers

Responses to Question 4: (Do you update your knowledge? If yes, How?)

Table14

Teachers' Updating of Knowledge

Option	Novice Teachers	Experienced Teachers
Yes	8	9
No	1	0
	Explanation	**Frequency**
	-Through internet	**17**
	-Reading books	**12**
	-Making researches	1
	-Cooperating with experienced teachers	1
	-Exchange experiences	2

A glance on the table 14 above, one can notice that almost all teachers under study said that they update their knowledge. When asked to explain their answers,

nearly all of the informants responded that they update their knowledge through internet and reading books; possibly, these resources are the most available nowadays. Besides, some teachers make use of other techniques as making researches, cooperating with expert teachers, and exchanging experiences. This implies that these teachers are aware of the importance of experience in their teaching career.

Responses to Questions 5 and 6

Table 15

Teachers Training on Writing and Corrective Feedback Strategies

Questions	Novice Teachers		Experienced Teachers	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Q5- have you received any training on how to teach writing and providing CF to students within your university courses?	**5**	4	2	**7**
Q6- do you remember receiving training on how to teach writing and providing CF Within your work career?	2	**7**	**6**	3

According to Q5 in the above table, most of novice teachers said that they received training on how to teach writing and providing feedback within their university career. In contrast, the majority of experienced teachers (7out of 9) did not receive any training on how to teach writing and providing corrective feedback within their university career. Actually, these answers seem to contradict what have been

observed in the classroom in the sense that although novice teachers do receive the required training in the university, they were incapable of implementing them in class.

In Q6 teachers' answers seem to be different from what they actually stated in Q5. Thus, most of novice teachers indicated that they did not receive any training on how to teach writing and providing corrective feedback to students within their work career. But, the majority of experienced teachers do received this training within their work career. The eight teachers, who replied with a "yes" answer, mentioned the place where they have received their training. Three teachers who carried their studies in ENS said that they have received the training in Ahmed Bey secondary school, Constantine. Yet, one other teacher revealed that he once gets training in Berlitz Center in Algeria. However, the other teachers claimed that they have been trained on how to teach writing and providing corrective feedback strategies for students in seminars with their inspectors. Possibly, these training would increase their level of experience in the use of written corrective feedback strategies.

Section Two: Teaching Writing

Responses to Question 07: (How often do you ask your students to write?)

Table 16

Time devoted to writing practice

Option	N
Once a week	6
Once a month	**12**

Once a year	0
Never	0

This question seeks to find out whether the time provided by teachers to practice the writing skill to enhance the students' writing ability. According to their responses, the majority of teachers (12 out of 18) reported that they ask their students to write once a month. While other teachers said that they teach the writing skill once a week. As a matter of fact, these results seem to be different from the textbook requirements in which students are asked to write weekly.

Responses to Question 08: (Generally speaking, do you follow a specific approach in teaching the writing skill?)

Table 17

Teachers Approaches of Teaching Writing

Yes	No
13	5

Approach	Frequency
a-The controlled-to free approach	**7**
b-The free writing approach	3
c-The product approach	0
d-The process approach	3
e-The genre approach	0
f-None	0

The majority of the informants (13 out of 18) claimed that they follow a specific approach in teaching the writing skill. As seen in the table above, approximately all the teachers tend to follow the controlled-to- free writing, while the remaining teachers are divided between free writing and the process approach. From the obtained results we can infer that teachers in the secondary schools follow three approaches «the controlled-to- free writing, the free writing approach, and the process approach» to teach the writing skill.

Section three: Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Responses to question09: (Do you believe that feedback is a vital element to enhance students' writing level?)

Table 18

Teachers' Views on the Importance of Feedback

Option	N
Yes	18
No	0

Considering table (18) above, the whole informants consider that feedback is a vital element to improve the students' writing level. When they asked to explain their answers, teachers agree on the view that feedback is an important element to their students writing skill because they consider it as a direction and guidance for their students.

Responses to Question 10: (Do you provide your students with feedback on their assignments regularly?)

Table 19

Teachers' Provision of Feedback on Students' Assignment

Option	N
Yes	06
No	**12**

A look at table (19) shows that most teachers (12 out of 18) do not provide feedback on the students' assignments regularly. Once teachers were asked to justify their answers, most of them stated that this is due to the time limits and the large number of students within each class.

Responses to Question 11: (when you are correcting students' works which aspects do you give more importance?)

Table 20

The Teachers' Feedback Focus

Option	N
a-The surface level	6
b-The meaning level	0
c-Both	**12**

A glance on the table (20) above, one can notice that the majority of teachers went for option (c); both the surface and the meaning levels. May be this is due to the common belief that students can benefit from feedback, only if teachers mix the two types together.

Responses to Question 12: (As far as you remember, do you find that your way of providing correction to students' work change according to your teaching experience?)

Table 21

Written Corrective Feedback strategies Change According to the Teaching Experience

Option	N
Yes	17
No	01

The above table (21) clearly indicated that the great majority of the sampled population (17 out of 18) reckon that their WCF strategies do change according to their teaching experience. Based on the answers provided by teachers, it can be said that the WCF strategies are highly affected by the teaching experience.

Responses to question 13: (If your answer to question « 12 » is « yes » to what extent does the teaching experience affect the use of written corrective feedback strategies?

Table 22

Evaluation of the Teaching Experience effects on Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Option	N

a- To a large extent	**14**
b- To a moderate extent	3
c- To a limited extent	0

Once teachers were asked to evaluate the extent to which the teaching experience influences the use of WCF strategies, (14 out of 18) said that indeed the teaching experience do affect the use of written corrective feedback strategies to a large extent. They shared the belief that the more teaching experience you get the more your teaching strategies will develop.

Section four: Further Suggestions

Responses to Question 14: (What do you think are the most constructive feedback strategies that can be used to enhance the students' writing skill?)

This question has been introduced as an attempt to have a global view on the most constructive written corrective feedback strategies that teachers in Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli mokhtar, and kiamouch Farhat secondary schools consider as effective ones. Therefore, this open question is devoted for teachers to supply their views and opinions based on their teaching experience. Teachers' various views about the most constructive WCF strategies are listed below:

• Selective/focused feedback to enhance the students' writing skills.

• Making a collective correction between students.

• Encouraging the students to correct their errors themselves.

• Feedback needs to be timely, encouraging, and carefully tailored to the students.

- Establishing a climate of trust and respect.

- Teachers should not overwhelm the students (limiting the feedback to

the amount of information that students can absorb).

- Structuring the comments as questions or suggestions rather than as

criticism.

- Using questions to identify errors.

The forthcoming section will attempt to discuss the most important issues highlighted, make sense of the data, relate important findings to the literature review, and ultimately answer the research questions set up in the conceptual research plan.

2.3 Section Three: Data Discussion and Interpretation

After the presentation of the findings from the classroom observation and teachers 'questionnaire, the present section will attempt to interpret the results unveiled in the previous section.

2.3.1 Discussion and interpretation of the results obtained from classroom observation and teachers' questionnaire

The Presentation and analysis of the classroom observation, in which a scheme is used, has revealed many facts on the writing process and the corrective feedback strategies followed by novice and experienced teachers of Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mohktar, and Kiamouch Farhat secondary schools. On one hand, the first table is designed for the sake of comparing the different steps followed by novice and experienced teachers in the writing process. The second table, on the other hand, is an attempt to highlight the major corrective feedback strategies. That is, the total number of each corrective feedback strategy of both novice and experienced teachers is joined together and then the most employed ones will be compared in relation to novice and experienced teachers.

Table 23

Novice and Experienced Teachers Writing Process

	Novice Teachers		Experienced Teachers	
Option	Yes	No	Yes	NO
1-**Explaining the purpose of the**	**0**	4	**4**	0

writing task				
2-**Raising the students' awareness of the writing form**	4	0	4	0
3-**Explaining the key words**	2	2	3	1
4-**Using creative techniques while explaining the content**	**0**	4	**3**	1

On the basis of the results presented on the table above, one can notice a significant difference between novice and experienced teachers in teaching the writing process. This can be proved in the first step (explaining the purpose), and the last one (using creative techniques while explaining the content) in the sense that all novice teachers (04) have not implemented them. In contrast, the majority of the experienced teachers have followed these steps. Perhaps, the complexity of such steps needs someone who has long career in teaching English. With regard to the second and the third steps, (raising students' awareness of the writing form and explaining the key words) the majority of novice and experienced teachers have implemented them. Maybe, this is due to their easiness to be taught.

Table 24

Novice and Experienced Teachers Corrective Feedback Strategies

	Novice Teacher	Experienced Teacher
Option	**Frequency**	**Frequency**
1- **Teacher's Positive Feedback**	13	10
2- **Teacher's Negative feedback with correction**	9	8
	0	**8**

3- **Peer feedback**	**4**	**12**
4- **Self-correction**		
Feedback focus	20	36
5- **Form focused feedback**	3	3
6- **Content-based feedback**		

As can be seen in the table above, the two mostly used corrective feedback strategies among those novice and experienced teachers are those of positive feedback (total of 13 for novice teachers and 10 for experienced teachers), and negative feedback with correction (total of 9 for novice teachers and 8 for experienced teachers). It can be deduced that these two corrective feedback strategies have a constant relationship with the time limit in the sense that teaching the writing task, in the second year syllabus, should be completed only in one hour. Besides, findings from the table uncover a significant difference between novice and experienced teachers concerning the third and the fourth corrective feedback strategies. That is, both peer feedback and self-correction are rarely used among novice teachers (no use of peer feedback, and only 4 times for self-correction). By contrast, the total frequency of the same strategies is highly salient with regard to experienced teachers. Indeed, we scored valuable marks (8 times for peer feedback, and 12 times for self-correction). Probably, this is because experienced teachers are much more efficient in their teaching; they can do more in less time than novice teachers, or maybe because of class management, novice teachers are afraid of losing control if they use these strategies. With regard the feedback focus, all teachers under study tend to focus on form rather than content. As we have mentioned before, this is because the approach they follow in teaching second year students.

Moreover, the analysis of the results obtained from the teachers' questionnaire revealed that the majority of novice teachers under study received their training on how to teach writing and providing corrective feedback strategies within their university courses. While almost all experienced teachers have received their training during their work career. This, in turn, has influence the way they teach writing and their provision of corrective feedback strategies. The second section is devoted to the teachers' implementation of the writing skill in the classroom. As a matter of fact, most teachers do not provide students with enough time to practice the writing skill. Besides, among the mostly used approaches by secondary school teachers are: the controlled- to- free writing approach, the free writing approach, and the process approach.

Regarding the third section of the questionnaire which is devoted to the teachers' provision of written corrective feedback strategies; it is worth mentioning that the whole population considered feedback as a vital element to enhance students' writing level. However, the plurality of teachers said that they do not provide the students with feedback on their assignments regularly stating time limits and large classes as the two main reasons behind their answers. Moreover, results concerning the most important aspects teachers of secondary schools rely on while correcting students' errors showed that the surface and the meaning levels are considered to be focused on. Furthermore, it was concluded from the results obtained that the WCF strategies are constantly changing according to the teaching experience to a large extent. Lastly, teachers were asked once more to supply the literature with WCF strategies they think of to be constructive in a language classroom. Hence, the majority of teachers said that teachers' corrective feedback strategies should aim at enhancing students' writing skill through reinforcing students to correct their errors themselves

and establishing a climate of trust and respect while correcting students' errors. That is, feedback should be timely, encouraging, and carefully tailored to the students.

2.3.1.1 Novice and Experienced Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

The discussion of the results obtained from both the classroom observation and teachers' questionnaire revealed that both novice and experienced teachers make use of written corrective feedback strategies set up in the classroom observation scheme. However, the purpose of our research is actually to explore the mostly used written corrective feedback strategies by these teachers in the writing session. Thus, it is worthy to discuss both the writing instructions, and corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers.

2.3.1.1.1 Novice Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

The results assembled from the classroom observation scheme and the questionnaire revealed that novice teachers differ from experienced teachers in the teaching of the writing skill, as well as, in their provision of corrective feedback strategies. Starting with the writing process, the researchers noticed that although novice teachers have been trained on how to teach writing within their university courses, they failed in transmitting the purpose of the writing tasks to the students, as well as, in using creative techniques while explaining the content. Such contradiction might be due to the following reasons: the difference between theory and practice, the difficulties in managing the classroom, or because novice teachers tended to follow closely the instructional objectives stated in the curriculum guides.

In relation to the use of corrective feedback strategies, novice teachers seem to be skilled in providing students with direct corrective feedback. However, when novice teachers asked to state some of constructive feedback strategies, they indicated that self- correction and peer feedback (collective correction) are the most effective ones. This implies that novice teachers are aware about the importance of these corrective feedback strategies, and yet they do not implement them in class. As Nunan (1992) affirmed there is nearly always a discrepancy between what teachers are saying and what they are actually doing in classroom.

2.3.1.1.2 Experienced Teachers Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

The results obtained from both the classroom observation sessions and the teachers' questionnaire indicated that, in the writing process, experienced teachers tend to implement all the prescribed steps in the classroom observation scheme. For instance, none of the observed experienced have presented the lesson without providing, at least, one creative technique along the session. Indeed, experienced teachers played a primordial role in supplying both content and pedagogical knowledge to the students.

Regarding the written corrective feedback strategies, the classroom observation results indicated that experienced teachers were more disposed to the use of peer feedback and self-correction as their major corrective feedback strategies. These findings from the classroom observation agreed with the teachers responses to the questionnaire. Such symmetry permitted the researchers to draw a conclusive judgment on the effectiveness of these corrective feedback strategies in enhancing the students writing skill and that experienced teachers are aware of the importance of such corrective feedback strategies in a language classroom.

To sum up the whole, this section has been devoted to the discussion and the interpretation of the results; it showed that teaching the writing skill as well as providing corrective feedback strategies are firmly linked to the teaching experience to a large extent.

Conclusion

In summary, the content of this second chapter was divided into three sections. The first section corresponded to the presentation of the methodology used to investigate the topic under study; it presented the research methods, the setting, the population and the limitations of the research. In the second section, a shift was made to the presentation and the analysis of the findings obtained from the research instruments employed in the study. The last section was devised to the data discussion and interpretation.   The latter interpreted the most significant results that stemmed from the study, and answered the core research questions.

General Conclusion

General Conclusion

The fundamental goal of this research work has been, firstly to investigate the written corrective feedback strategies used by novice and experienced teachers in secondary schools, and secondly to determine the extent to which teaching experience affects the use of these corrective feedback strategies.

To achieve this research aim, two key quantitative research tools were employed, namely classroom observation and teachers questionnaire. First, the classroom observation was implemented with four novice teachers and four experienced teachers from Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar, and Kiamouch Farhat Secondary Schools in Taher. Second, in order to crosscheck results from classroom work and increase the validity of the data, a questionnaire was devised and administered to eighteen EFL teachers in the aforementioned secondary schools.

All in all, the analysis of the data obtained from these research tools has indicated that novice and experienced teachers differ in teaching the writing skill as well as in providing corrective feedback strategies. Plausible explanation to this major finding may be summarized in two major points. First, because of their autonomy, flexibility, and efficacy in the field of teaching, experienced teachers tend to teach writing in a creative way in comparison to novice teachers who tend to follow closely the instructional guidelines stated in the textbook. Second, experienced teachers are found to use the corrective feedback strategies investigated in the classroom observation scheme more efficiently than novice teachers. They rely on peer feedback and self-correction as two main constructive feedback strategies in their language classrooms. Finally, the results unveiled by this current study revealed that

constructive written corrective feedback strategies are firmly linked to the teaching experience.

Recommendations for Teachers on Constructive Written Corrective Feedback

In order to provide the writing instruction and the written corrective feedback pedagogy with simple insights and ideas that can be useful to enhance the students 'achievements regarding the learning of this language skill, some basic recommendations reformulated on the light of the findings of this present study. These recommendations can be summarized as follow:

- Teachers need to devote more time for teaching writing i.e. more than once a week in order to help students be more familiar with the nature of this skill.

- They should incorporate the feedback as a fundamental strategy in teaching the writing skill.

- Teachers should make their feedback as informative, accurate as they can.

- Teachers should know how to provide students with constructive corrective feedback strategies to because it has a great importance in enhancing the students writing level.

- Teachers should encourage students to correct their errors themselves and do not drop too quickly a student who seems unable to answer.

- Novice teachers require more training in teaching the writing skill in general and in corrective feedback pedagogy in particular.

Pedagogical Recommendations for Further Research

In the light of the obtained results, beneficial suggestions and recommendations are summarized in what follows:

• Conducting this research whereby the purpose is to answer the research questions concerning novice and experienced teachers written corrective feedback strategies demands the implementation of two research instruments. In this view, it is suggested to triangulate the data by analyzing a sample of students' assignments corrected by novice and experienced teachers to reach more reliable findings

• To make the sample representative in investigating the WCF strategies used by novice and experienced teachers, the number of teachers participating in the study should be raised.

• This study investigated the WCF strategies of novice and experienced teachers in secondary schools. Therefore, further studies may replicate the same research by exploring the WCF strategies of novice and experienced teachers in higher education.

References

References

Alamis, M.M.P., (2010). Evaluating students reactions and responses to teachers'

    written feedback. Philippine ESL Journal, 40-57.

Applebee, A. N.(1986). Problems in process approaches. Toward a

    reconceptualization of process interaction. In A.R. petrosky and

    D.Bartholomae (Eds.), the teaching of writing (pp.95.113). Chicago:

    National society for the study of education.

Arndt, v. (1993). Response to writing: using feedback to inform the writing process. In

    M.N. Brock & L. Walters (Eds.), teaching composition around the pacific

    rim: Politics and pedagogy (pp.90-116)). Clevedon, UK: Mulillingual

    Matters.

Atay, D. (2008). Teacher research for professional development. ELT Journal, 62(2).

Badger, R. & White, G. (2000). A process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing. ELT

    Journal 54:2:153-160 OUP.

Bastick, T. (2002, January). *Materialist culture and teacher attrition in the Caribbean:*

    Motivational differences between novice and experienced Jamaican teacher

    trainees. Paper presented at the Second Annual Conference on Caribbean

    Culture, Kingston, Jamaica.

Bereiter, C. and Scardamalia, M. (1993). Surpassing Ourselves: An Inquiry Into the

    anture and implications of expertise. La Salle, IL: Open Court.

Bitchener, J. & Ferris, D. R. (2012*). Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. London: Routledge.

Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 17*, 102-118.

Bivona, K. (2002). Teacher morale: The impact of teaching experience, workplace conditions, and workload. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED467760)

Borko, H., & Livingston, c. (1989).cognition and improvisation: differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 26 (4), 473-498.

Bouchair, Z. (2013). Writing skill: Types of writing tasks.

Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013).Feedback in higher and professional education. London: Routledge.   Retrieved   from https://books.google.dz/books?id=0N8R7DRwKf0C&printsec=frontcover&dq =feedback& hl=fr&sa=X&ei=I6Q4VZHWJMixaZjUgVA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=fee dback&f=fa lse.

Brice, C.(1995) ESL writers' reactions to teacher commentary: A case study. Paper presented at the 30th annual TESOL convention, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Britt, D. C. (1997). Perceptions of beginning experiences. Document Reproduction Services.

Brown, H.D. (2001). Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language

    pedagogy   (2nded).New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Brown, S. and McIntyre, D. (1992). Making Sense of Teaching. London: Open

Brutten, A. (2009). Designing research into the effect of error correction in L2 writing:

    not so straightforward. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 18(2), 136140.

Byrne, d. (1988). Teaching writing skills. Long Group UK Limited.

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and Knowledge. In D. C. Berliner and

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement

    in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second*

    Language Writing, 12(3), 267-296.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' Thought Processes. In M. C.

    Wittrock (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed., pp. 255−296).

    New York: Macmillan.

Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. L.

    Wenden & J. Rubin (Ed.), learner strategies in language learning. (pp. 57-69)

    Englewood cliffs, NJ: prentice-Hall.

Cohen,A., & Cavalcant, M. (1990). Feedback on written composition: teacher and

    student verbal reports.in B.Kroll (Ed.), Learner strategies in language writing:

    Research insights for the cladssroom. (pp.155-157). Cambredge University

    Press.

Conrad, S.M., & Goldstein, L.M. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher-written comments. Jornal of second language writing, 147-180.

Context: Balancing Product and Process in Writing Class at Teretiary Level. *Journal of NELTA*.Vol, 15. No, 1-2. December 2010.

Corder, S.P. (1973). Introducing applied linguistics. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Covino, E.A.,& Iwanicki,E.(1996).Experienced teachers: their constructs on effective teaching. Journal or personal evaluation in education, 11, 325-363.

Cruickshank, D.R., & Haefelo, D. (200, February). Good teachers, plural. Educational leadership, 58(5), 26-30.

Drown, R. & L. Bangert.(2009). Feedback in learning Educational Research Journal, 26(4): 473–98.

Elbow, p. (1973). Writing without teachers. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Ortion in grammar teaching. TESOL quarterly, 32, 39-60.

Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback. 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. System 36, 353–371.

Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback on EFL writing, 193-204.

Eraut, M. (1994). Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence. London: The

    Falmer Press.

Ericsson, K. A. (2002). Attaining Excellence Through Deliberate Practice: Insights

    from the Study of Expert Performance. In M. Ferrari (ed.), the Pursuit of

    Excellence Through Education, pp. 21–56. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

    Associates.

Farrell, T. S. C., & Lim, P. C. P. (2005). Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case

    study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices. TESL-EJ, 9(2). Retrieved

    from

Ferris, D. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Journal of*

    Second Language Writing, 8(1), 1-11.

Ferris, D. 2006. 'Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on short-

    and long-term effects of written error correction' in K. Hyland and F. Hyland

    (eds.). *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*.

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferris, D. R. and B. Roberts. 2001. 'Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit

    does it need to be?'. *Journal of Second LanguageWriting* 10: 161–84.

Ferris, D. R., & Hedgcock, J. S. (2005). Teaching ESL composition: purpose, process,

    and practice (2nd ed.). Mahwah, N J: Erlboaum.

Ferris, D.r. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. TESOL

    Quarterly, 315-339.

Ferris, D.R. (2002). Treatment of error in second language writing. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michingan press.

Frodsen, J. & Holten, C. (2003). Grammar and the ESL writing class. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Exploring the dynamic of second language writing. (141-161). Cambridge. : Cambridge University Press.

Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behavior: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. Language Teaching Research, 12(2), 161-182.

George, H.V. (1972). Common errors in language learning. *Rowley, MA*: Newbury House.

Goa, J. (2007). Teaching writing in chines universities: Finding an electronic approach. Asian EFL journal online, 20/2. [online] http: //www. Asian-efl-journal. Com/pta May 07 [August 2010].

Harmer, J: (2004). How to teach writing. Harlow: Longman. Hasan, M.K. & Moniruzzaman, A. (2010). Approaches in Writing in EFL/ ESL

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

Hyland, k. & F. Hyland. (2006). Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (1990). "Providing Productive Feedback". ELT Journal.44.4, pp 219-83.

Hyland, K. (2004). Second language writing. In Jack C. Richards Cambridge
　　　Educational Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. in Mathematics
　　　Instruction by Expert and Novice Teachers. American Insights from the
　　　Study of Expert Performance. In M. Ferrari (ed.), The Pursuit Journal of
　　　Applied Linguistics. Vol 1:2.

Kagan, D.M. (1992). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers.
　　　Review of Educational Research, 62(2),129-169.

-Kennedy, G. (1973). Conditions for language learning. *In J.W.* Oller, Jr. & J.
　　　Richards (Eds.), *Focus on the learner*: Pragmatic perspectives for the
　　　language teacher (pp. 66–82). New York: Newbury House.

Kroll, B. (1990). Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom.

Lalande, J. F. 1982. 'Reducing composition errors: An experiment'. *Modern
　　　Language Journal* 66: 140–9.

Leinhardt, G. and Smith, D. A. (1985). Expertise in Mathematics Instruction: Subject
　　　Matter Knowledge. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(3): 247–71.

Leinhardt, G., & Greeno, J. G. (1986). The Cognitive Skill of Teaching. Journal

Lin, J. & Hansen, J. (2002). Peer response in second language writing classrooms.
　　　USA: The University of Michingan press.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & B. K. Bahtia (Eds.), Handbook of second language acquisition (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic Press. M. C. Wittrock (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (3rd ed., pp. 255–296).

Maarek, S. (2009).The Effectiveness of Correction Symbols as Feedback in Enhancing Self-Correction in Writing (Master degree).Mentouri University of Constantine.

Macmillan.

Mandal, R.R. (2009). Coopertive Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skill. *The Modern journal of applied linguistics.* Vol 1: 2.

Mandal, R.R. (2009). Coopertive Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skill. The Modern J*ournal of Applied Linguistics*. Vol 1:2.

Matsuda, P. H. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. INB. Karoell. (Ed.), Exploring the dynamics of second language writing (15-34). Cambridge books online: Cambridge University Press.

McCutcheon, G. (1980). How Do Elementary School Teachers Plan? The Nature Nature of Planning and Influences On It. The Elementary School Journal, 81: 4–23.

Mkude, D.J. (1980). *Matching education with communicative skills in Kiswahili.* In: Changing language media ,Trapps- Lomax et al. (eds). University of Dar es Salaam.

Murry, D. (1974). International revision: A process of discovery. In cooper, C. & Odell, L. (Ed.). Research on composing, points of departure. National Council of Teachers of English: Illinois Nature and Implications of Expertise. Illinois: Open Court. New York: Macmillan

Nicol, D.J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in higher education, 31, 199-218.

Nunan, D (1991). Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers. Edinburgh, Harlow, England: Longman.

Nunan, D. (1992). The teacher as desion-maker. Inj. Flowerdew, percepectives on second language teacher education. Hong kong: city Polytechnic, pp135-65.

Nunan, D. (1999). Second language teaching and learning. USA: Heinl. of Educational Psychology, 78: 75–95. of Excellence Through Education, pp. 21–56. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum of Planning and Influences On It. The Elementary School Journal, 81: 4–23.of Teacher Education, 42(4): 292–305. Palgrave Macmillan.

Paltridge, B. (2004). Academic Writing Language Teaching, 37, 87-107.

Park, E. (2006). The effectiveness of teacher's written feedback on feedback L2 writing. Review article.

Peterson, S.S. (2008). Writing across the curriculum: All teachers teach writing (2 nd ed.). Winnipeg, M B: Portage & Main press

Raimes, A. (1983). Techniques in teaching writing. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reid, J.M (2001). The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages. In R.carter& D. Nunan (Ed). Writing (p.23-33). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richard,J.C. (1998)What is the use of lesson plan. Beyond training, pp.103-21. Combridge University press.

Richards, J. C. (1990). The language teaching matrix. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (1996). Reflective teaching in second language classrooms. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards,J.C., & Tang, A. (1998). Exploring pedagogical reasoning skills. Beyond training, pp86-102. Combridge University press.

Rivers, c. (1978). A practical guide to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language. Oxford: OUP.

Senior, R. M. (2006). The experience of language teaching. Cambridge. : Cambridge University Press.

Senior, R.M. (2006). *The experience of language teaching*. Cambridge: CUP.

Shelby, M. (2016). *Difficulties and problems in learning English*. Retrieved on March 14. From http://www.teach-this.com/ideas/problems-learning-english.

Silva, T. (1987). Second language composition instruction. Cmbridge: : Cambridge University Press.

Silva, T. Second language composition instruction: developments, issues, and directions (pp.11.23). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soven, M. I. (1999). Teaching writing in middle and secondary schools: Theory of research and practice. Boston: Ellyn and Bacon. Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 89. Adaptations for Special Populations, Subchapter B: Adult Basic and Secondary Education. Retrieved from Tribble, c. (1996). Writing. Oxford: OUP.

Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*(2), 327-369.

Tsui, A. B. (2003). Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of ESL teachers. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tsui, A. B. (2003). Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of ESL teachers. New

Tsui, A. B. (2005). Expertise in teaching: Perspectives and issues. In K. Johnson (Ed.), University Press.

Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. Review of Educational Research, 54 (2), 143-178.

Walker, L. (1993). Changing perceptions of efficacy: From Student teachers to first year teachers. Unpublished paper.

Weiner, B. (1990). History of motivational research in education. Journal of education psychology, 3-25.

Westerman, D. A. (1991). Expert and Novice Teacher Decision Making. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 42(4): 292–305.

Westwood, P. (2002). What teachers need to know about reading and writing difficulties?. Australia: Australian Council for Educational Research

White, L. (1988). Implications of learnability theories for second language learning and teaching. MacGill Working Papers in Linguistics = Cahiers Linguistiques de MacGill, 5, 148-162. York: Cambridge University Press.

Zamel,V.(1985). Responding to Writing.TESOL Quarterly, 19(1), 79- 101.

Zemelman, S., & Daniels, H. (1988). A community or writers: Teaching writing in junior and senior high school, NH: Heine mann.

Appendices

Appendix A: The Observation Scheme

Appendix B: The Questionnaire.

Appendix A

Observation scheme

Date _____

Teacher's name _____

School's name _____

Class _____

Writing and corrective feedback strategies	yes	No	Examples	Percentage

A- the writing process

1.Introducing the topic:

    a. The teacher explains the purpose of the writing task.
    b. The teacher raises the students' awareness of the writing form (letter, report, essay…)

2.Explaining the content:

    a. the teacher explains the key words
    b. the teacher uses his creativity while explaining the content

B Strategies for providing corrective feedback	Frequencies	Percentage

1. Teacher's positive feedback

2. Teacher's negative feedback with correction

3. Peer feedback

4. Self-correction

Feedback focus:

5. Form-focused feedback

6. Content-based feedback

Note:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear teachers,

This questionnaire is a part of a Master study aiming at investigating the various written corrective feedback strategies used by teachers in secondary schools. Your answers and personal opinions will be of great assistance in gathering data and they will be treated anonymously and confidentially. So, would you please tick (✔) the box that best corresponds with your opinions or write down your response when a blank space is provided. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Section One: General Information

1. Indicate your gender:

   a- Male ☐

   b- Female ☐

2. What is your educational training?

   a- MA (Master) ☐

   b- BA (Licence) ☐

   c- ENS ☐

3. How long have you been teaching English at the secondary school?

   a- Less than 5 years ☐

   b- Between 5 to 10 years ☐

   c- More than 10 years ☐

4. Do you update your knowledge?

   Yes ☐   No ☐

*If yes how?

……

……

5. Have you received any training on how to teach writing and providing corrective feedback to students within your university courses?

Yes ☐   No ☐

6. Have you received any training on how to teach writing within and providing corrective feedback to students your work career?

Yes ☐   No ☐

*If yes, where?

……

……

Section two: Teaching Writing

7. How often do you ask your students to write?

a- Once a week   ☐

b- Once a month ☐

c- Once a year   ☐

d- Never   ☐

- Please, justify your answer……………………………………………………………………………………..

……

8. Generally speaking, do you follow specific approach in teaching the writing skill?

Yes ☐   No ☐

*If your answer to the question « 8 » is« yes », which approach do you follow?

a. The controlled-to free approach ☐   d. The process approach ☐

b. The free writing approach ☐   e. The genre approach ☐

c. The product approach ☐   f. None ☐

Section Three: Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

9. Do you believe that feedback is a vital element to enhance students' writing level?

   Yes ☐   No ☐

   *If yes, how?

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

10. Do you provide your students with feedback on their assignments regularly?

    Yes ☐   No ☐

    *If you answer to the question « 10 » is« no », is it because of:

       a- Students level ☐

       b- Time limits ☐

       c- Others...

       ....

11. When you are correcting students' works, which aspects do you give more importance?

    a- The surface-level (grammar and mechanics) ☐

    b- The meaning level (content) ☐

    c- Both ☐

12. As far as you can remember, do you find that your way of providing correction to students'

    work change according to your teaching experience?

    Yes ☐   No ☐

13. If your answer to the question « 12 » is « yes » to what extent does the teaching experience

    affect the use of written corrective feedback strategies?

a- To a large extent ☐

b- To a moderate extent ☐

c- To a limited extent ☐

Section Four: Further Suggestions

14. What do you think are the most constructive feedback strategies that can be used to enhance students' writing skill?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

………………………………………………………………………………………………………

……………………………………………………………………………………………………….

Thank You in Advance for your Collaboration

ملخص

تصنف التغذية المرجعية (فيدباك) التي يطبقها المدرسين لتقييم التعابير الكتابية الخاصة بالطلاب ضمن اهم التقنيات الشائعة في اقسام تدريس اللغة الانجليزية كلغة اجنبية وذلك لأهميتها البارزة في تطوير كفاءة التلاميذ الكتابية. لهذه التقنية عدة استراتيجيات مختلفة اذ لكل واحدة منها مزايا تميزها عن الاخرى . استنادا على هذا الاعتبار ارتئينا ان نقوم بهذا البحث الذي يهدف الى تسليط الضوء على استراتيجيات التغذية المرجعية لتقييم التعبير الكتابي المستخدمة من قبل المعلمين المبتدئين والمعلمين ذوي الخبرة في كل من ثانوية لعبني احمد، دخلي مختار، و كيعموش فرحات بالطاهير، ولاية جيجل. و لتحقيق هذا الهدف تم اختيار منهج الملاحظة الفعلية للمدرسين المذكورين انفا خلال الفصل الدراسي الثالث، بالإضافة الى توزيع استبيان على جميع مدرسي اللغة انجليزية في هاته الثانويات الثلاث كطريقة بحثية للوصول الى هدفنا من الدراسة. وقد اظهرت النتائج المتحصل عليها من خلال تطبيق اساليب البحث المذكورة سابقا ان كلا من المعلمين المبتدئين والمعلمين ذوي الخبرة استخدموا استراتيجيات التغذية المرجعية لتقييم التعبير الكتابي داخل القسم بشكل مختلف. فالمدرسين ذوي الخبرة هم اكثر ميلا للأيديولوجية التربوية العصرية التي تنص على ان المدرس يلعب دور المحرك في القسم بحيث يعمل على توعية تلاميذه وتحفيزهم على تصحيح اخطائهم بأنفسهم للاستفادة منها لاحقا وذلك من خلال الاكثار من استخدام استراتيجي التصحيح الجماعي و التصحيح الذاتي. في حين ان المدرسين المبتدئين يكتفون بتصحيح الاخطاء مباشرة، اي بأنفسهم. اخيرا يمكننا القول ان اتقان استخدام استراتيجيات التغذية المرجعية لتقييم التعبير الكتابي متعلق الى حد كبير بالخبرة في التدريس.

Le résumé

Le feedback correctif est considéré comme une méthode commune qui joue un rôle essentiel dans l'amélioration des compétences d'écriture des élèves. Comme une vérité generale, certaines stratégies de feedback sont plus avantageuses que d'autres. De ce fait, cette étude que nous proposons vise à mettre l'accent sur les stratégies de feedback corrective on écrit fournies par les enseignants novices et expérimentés dans les écoles secondaires Laabani Ahmed, Dakhli Mokhtar et Kiamouch Farhat, à Taher, Wilaya de Jijel. Pour atteindre cet objectif, deux principaux outils de recherche à savoir de utilisation: une observation de classe et un questionnaire. Les résultats obtenus révèlent une différence entre les stratégies utilisées par les deux types d'enseignements novices et expérimentés. , les enseignants expérimentés sont plus disposés à utiliser l'idéologie pédagogique centrée sur l'élève, ou toutes les erreurs écrites sont corrigée par les élèves, que les novices enseignants. Enfin, on peut dire, par conséquent, que l'utilisation de stratégies de feedback correctives on écrit se rapporte dans une large mesure à l'expérience d'enseignement.