

Faculté de philosophie, arts et lettres

Written corrective feedback: an effective practice in the teaching and learning of an L2?

Auteur : Vermoeren Lucie
Promoteur(s) : Meunier Fanny
Année académique 2020-2021
GERM2MD - Master [120] en langues et lettres modernes, orientation germaniques, à finalité didactique

Table of Contents

1	Rationale	6
2	Introduction	7
3	Background	11
3.1	Definitions of written corrective feedback	11
3.2	Errors vs mistakes and correction vs feedback	13
3.3	Different types of written corrective feedback and their specificities	14
3.3.1	Evaluative and advisory feedback	14
3.3.2	Direct and indirect corrective feedback	15
3.3.2.1	Direct corrective feedback	15
3.3.2.2	Indirect corrective feedback	17
3.3.3	Unfocused feedback and focused feedback	18
3.3.3.1	Unfocused feedback	18
3.3.3.2	Focused feedback	19
3.3.4	WCF on global and local errors	20
3.3.4.1	WCF on global errors	20
3.3.4.2	WCF on local errors	21
3.3.4.3	Issues related to these two types of WCF	21
3.4	Conclusion	21
3.5	SLA and L2 researchers	22
3.5.1	Differences and similarities between the two types of researchers	22
4	Development of WCF	23
4.1	History of WCF from the early 20th century till 1980	24
4.2	History of WCF from Krashen's theories till Truscott's essay (1980 – 1996)	29
4.2.1	Krashen's hypothesis	29
4.2.2	Research following Krashen's in the eighties	31
4.2.2.1	Cognitive research	32
4.2.2.1.1	McLaughlin's model	32
4.2.2.1.2	Anderson's model	33
4.2.2.1.3	Pienemann's model	34
4.2.2.2	Social-cultural perspective	34
4.2.3	Research based on the efficacy and role of WCF	35
4.2.3.1	Scholars in favour of WCF before the nineties	35
4.2.3.1.1	Lalande's study in 1982	36
4.2.3.1.2	Connors and Lunsford in 1988	37
4.2.3.2	Scholars who saw no gain of WCF	38
4.2.3.2.1	Semke's studies in 1980 and 1984	38
4.2.3.2.2	Rob, Ross & Shortreed's study in 1996	39
4.3	Studies since 1996	39
4.3.1	Truscott's criticism of WCF	40
4.3.2	Dana Ferris' view	47
4.3.2.1	Ferris and Roberts in 2001 against Truscott	47
4.3.2.2	Ferris & Roberts' study	48
4.3.2.3	Dana Ferris and John Truscott	50
4.3.2.4	The Truscott vs Ferris debate	50
4.3.2.4.1	Truscott's and Ferris' points of view about WCF	50
4.3.2.4.2	Ferris' failures according to Truscott in 1999	55
4.3.2.5	Their final stance on WCF	56
4.3.2.5.1	Ferris' position	56
4.3.2.5.2	Truscott's position	56
4.3.2.6	Results of some recent studies in favour of WCF	57

4.3.2.6.1	Chandler (2003)	57
4.3.2.6.1.1	Chandler's first study in 2003	58
4.3.2.6.1.2	Chandler's second study in 2003	59
4.3.2.6.2	Bitchener, Young and Cameron (2005) and Bitchener (2008)	61
5	<i>Teacher's practice</i>	65
5.1	Teachers providing WCF	65
5.1.1	Introduction	65
5.1.2	How do teachers provide WCF?	65
5.1.3	Factors influencing teachers' practice in Lee's 2008 article.	67
5.1.4	The 'time' factor in Ferris' and Lee's articles	70
6	<i>Teachers' beliefs about WCF</i>	71
6.1	Definition of beliefs	71
6.2	Mismatch between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice	72
6.2.1	Focus on language form vs on focus content	72
6.2.2	Comprehensive WCF vs selective feedback	73
6.2.3	Direct WCF vs indirect WCF	74
6.2.4	Coded vs uncoded feedback	74
6.2.5	Giving grades	75
6.2.6	WCF on weaknesses	76
6.2.7	Students are not in control	77
6.2.8	One-shot writing	78
6.2.9	Teachers continue correcting errors that they know will recur later	79
6.2.10	Teachers' WCF strategies do not pay off	79
6.3	Teachers' workload	80
6.4	Teachers' fear	80
7	<i>What teachers could/should do</i>	81
7.1	Providing L1 learners with efficient WCF	81
7.1.1	How does the power of WCF work? The three questions (Hattie & Timperley's 2007 study)	81
7.1.1.1	The learning objectives related to a task (Where am I going?)	82
7.1.1.2	How to achieve those objectives? (How am I going?)	83
7.1.1.3	Impact of WCF and achieved objectives in the long term (Where to next?)	84
7.1.1.4	Conclusion of the analysis of these three crucial questions	85
7.1.2	Where to begin when providing WCF?	85
7.1.3	Where should/must WCF be located?	85
7.1.4	Should questions be used?	86
7.1.5	Which types of WCF should be applied and how?	87
7.1.6	What quantity?	90
7.2	Strategies to be taken into account and possibly applied when providing WCF	91
7.2.1	The goals must be clear	91
7.2.2	Provide them with opportunities of self-assessment	92
7.2.3	The given WCF should be of high quality.	93
7.2.4	WCF should be discussed with the L2 learners to ensure it is understood	93
7.2.5	Teachers should motivate their learners and boost their self-esteem through WCF	94
7.2.6	L2 learners must have opportunities to improve.	95
7.2.7	WCF helps teachers to improve their teaching	96
7.3	Conclusion on the suggested solutions.	96
8	<i>The present study</i>	97
8.1	Aim of this master's thesis: reminder	97

8.2	Methodology	97
8.2.1	The methodology used in this MA	97
8.2.2	Subjects	98
8.2.3	Procedure	98
8.2.3.1	Students' written tasks and teachers' written corrective feedback	98
8.2.3.2	Teachers' self-assessments	99
9	Analysis of the data	99
9.1	Analysis of the corrected written tasks	99
9.1.1	Introduction: focus on the analysis	99
9.1.1.1	Comparison and analysis of the writings with good marks	99
9.1.1.1.1	Grades and praise	99
9.1.1.1.2	Type of WCF used	101
9.1.1.2	Comparison and analysis of the writings with above average marks	103
9.1.1.2.1	Comparison and analysis of the papers with marks above average	103
9.1.1.3	Comparison and analysis of the papers with low marks	105
9.1.2	Differences between what is applied by those teachers and what is written in the literature	107
9.1.2.1	Strategies (7.2.1; 7.2.3; 7.2.5) applied and avoided by the four teachers	107
9.1.2.2	Teachers' goals and clarity of the prescribed criteria	107
9.1.2.3	Teachers' WCF must be of high quality	108
9.1.2.4	Teachers should motivate their learners	109
9.1.3	Conclusion	109
9.1.4	Analysis of the answers to the questionnaire	109
9.1.5	Discrepancies between WCF practice and beliefs emerging from the questionnaire.	110
9.1.5.1	Analysis of the shared discrepancies	110
9.1.5.1.1	Praise and encouragement	110
9.1.5.1.2	WCF location	110
9.1.5.1.3	Number of corrected errors	110
9.1.5.1.4	The level of the learners	111
9.1.5.1.5	Use of indirect WCF (codes and letters)	111
9.1.5.1.6	'Boîte à outils'	111
9.1.5.1.7	Type of feedback	112
9.1.5.1.8	Tasks without marks	112
9.1.5.2	Analysis of some interesting individual discrepancies	112
9.1.5.3	Shared feelings and opinions regarding WCF	113
9.1.5.4	Factors influencing their WCF	113
9.1.6	The retired teacher's answers	114
9.1.6.1	The retired teacher's practice and beliefs over his teaching career	115
10	Conclusion	115
11	Acknowledgements	117
12	Bibliography	118
13	Appendices: corrected written tasks	122
13.1	Appendix 1	122
13.2	Appendix 2	124
13.3	Appendix 3	126
13.4	Appendix 4	128
13.5	Appendix 5	130
13.6	Appendix 6	135
13.7	Appendix 7	137

13.8	Appendix 8	140
13.9	Appendix 9	143
13.10	Appendix 10	144
13.11	Appendix 11	145
13.12	Appendix 12	147
13.13	Appendix 13	150
13.14	Appendix 14	152
13.15	Appendix 15	155
13.16	Appendix 16	158
13.17	Appendix 17	159
13.18	Appendix 18	161
13.19	Appendix 19	163
13.20	Appendix 20	165
13.21	Appendix 21	168
13.22	Appendix 22	171
13.23	Appendix 23	174
14	<i>Appendices: answers to the questionnaire</i>	178
14.1	Teacher A's answers	178
14.2	Teacher B's answers	183
14.3	Teacher C's answers	188
14.4	Teacher D's answers	194
14.5	The retired teacher's answers	199
15	<i>Appendices: selected answers to the questionnaire</i>	204
15.1	Teacher A's selected answers	204
15.2	Teacher B's selected answers	205
15.3	Teacher C's selected answers	206
15.4	Teacher D's selected answers	207

1 Rationale

For several decades the number of studies on written corrective feedback has been growing, partly because of the questions raised by many researchers in this field. Although many scholars and researchers have addressed the issue to find out whether written corrective feedback is useful or even necessary in second language acquisition, the answers (or conclusions to some hypotheses) still remain unclear or unsettled, especially as far as WCF types and practices are concerned (Bitchener, Young & Cameron 2005; Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012).

Therefore, the main aim of this MA in the field of didactics is to find out more about the efficiency of WCF provided by language teachers while correcting written assignments. In the framework of this MA I will try to answer the following research questions: What do scholars mean by written corrective feedback? Is it seen as useful? Is there a difference between what is recommended in the literature and actual teachers' practices? Do teachers' beliefs have an impact on their correction? Are some strategies better than others?

In order to have a better understanding of WFC and its fundamental functions, several studies and books arguing for or against the use of corrective feedback and the relevance of different types/strategies of feedback will be reviewed.

2 Introduction

According to Ramaprasad, “Feedback is information about the gap between actual level and the reference level [...] which is used to alter the gap in some way” (Ramaprasad, 1983: 4). However, according to Winne and Butler, “feedback is information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta-cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies” (Winne & Butler, 1994 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 82).

Within the framework of my thesis, I will focus on a crucial aspect of the teachers’ job: providing feedback. Receiving written corrective feedback plays a key role in pupils’ learning process since well-structured feedback helps them to understand what they have done wrong and equips them for the following tasks. In other words, in this master dissertation I will try to find out more about different types of written feedback, about their efficacy in language teachers’ correction of written tasks and whether there is a difference between teacher’s beliefs and practice.

Despite the numerous existing studies aimed at finding out whether written corrective feedback plays any positive role in the second language acquisition process, it appears that no conclusive evidence has been provided so far.

The work of Bitchener and Ferris indicates that since the mid 20th century, many SLA theorists have looked at written corrective feedback and at “what can be done to help learners overcome the errors they make in the process of acquiring the target language” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 3). From the 1950s onwards, many theories on this subject have been produced, each bringing its share of criticisms, reflections and problems.

In the fifties and sixties, errors were particularly seen in a negative light (Ferris, 2012: 4). As Bitchener and Ferris pointed out in their book called *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing* published in 2012, from the behaviourists’ perspective errors were to be removed and everything had to be put in place so that these written mistakes would not be produced once again (*ibid.*). Pedagogically speaking, this theory based on “error prevention” and not on “error treatment” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4), led to what is called ‘drills’, a method involving repeating a structure several times (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4; Hendrickson, 1978: 387). However, Hendrickson’s research (1978) showed that this method did not help L2 learners build their communicative skills if they did not make an effort to use what they learned through the ‘audiolingual’ approach in communication situations (Hendrickson, 1978 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4). Bitchener and Ferris also argued that from

the early years of SLA research, many studies on WCF have attached importance to several questions related to the use of written corrective feedback “such as the reasons for correcting errors, which errors should be corrected and when, how they should be corrected, and who should do the correcting” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 6).

It was not until the 1980s and Krashen's first general SLA theory featuring five hypotheses that the helpfulness of WCF in the learning process was brought into question (*ibid.*, 9). Prior to the 1990s, empirical studies on the impact of written corrective feedback on L2 learners' accuracy were indeed scarce (Ferris, 2010: 184). Even though Krashen's five theories had a major impact on many following theories, they were also criticised (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 9). In Krashen's view, error correction was not only seen as a dispensable and ineffective strategy but also as a detrimental one (Ferris, 2010: 183). Each of his assumptions have had a considerable impact on the view of the effectiveness of WCF and on the way in which written errors were perceived (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 9).

However, since Truscott's essay *The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes* about the necessity or the usefulness of WCF in 1996, there have been countless papers and debates between researchers in this field, as to whether WCF helps students to progress significantly in their learning of a foreign language (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 192; Ferris, 2010: 185). Truscott states that WCF should be ignored, since it does not contribute to any improvement in L2 learners' writing accuracy (Truscott, 1996 in Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 192). Moreover, as pointed out by Bitchener Young & Cameron in their study carried out in 2005, Truscott called to attention a number of pedagogical problems related to the use of WCF in EFL classrooms: teachers are not always willing to compose WCF for each written task and the L2 learners do not always understand the corrective feedback provided by their language teachers (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 192). Truscott argued that teachers believe that if they correct learners' errors (i.e. thanks to theoretical explanations), they will not make the same error again but this theorist believes that this amounts to simplifying a complex process: “The acquisition of a grammatical structure is a gradual process, not a sudden discovery as the intuitive view of correction would imply” (Truscott, 1996 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 20). Nonetheless, in their 2008 article, Truscott & Hsu acknowledged that WCF could help learners to improve their written accuracy but only in the short-term (Truscott & Hsu, 2008: 299).

Since Truscott's essay in 1996 and his criticism levelled at researchers in written corrective feedback, many other studies have been carried out and the focus of research as well

as the definition of WCF have obviously evolved. The majority of researchers highlight the necessity to use WCF, the teacher's role and the need to define the kind of written corrective feedback that should be used, especially in the studies of Bitchener, Ferris, Ferris & Roberts, Hattie & Timperley, Hyland, Lalande, Montgomery and Guénette. The two latter were particularly interested in the teachers' beliefs, practices and their impact on WCF. This crucial aspect will be addressed in depth later in this MA.

Dana Ferris, whose view of WCF is totally different from Truscott's, argued that written corrective feedback is a teaching strategy aimed at enhancing L2 learners' writing accuracy (Ferris, 2010 in Kang & Han, 2015: 1). In many of her studies, notably in *Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA*, published in 2010, Ferris discussed the usefulness and efficacy of various types of WCF, notably direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback with/without codes, revision and reformulation and the difference between "treatable" (i.e. mistakes that can easily be resolved by consulting grammar rules and books (Ferris, 1999: 6)) and "untreatable errors" (i.e. "There is no handbook or set of rules students can consult to avoid or fix those types of errors" (Ferris, 1999: 6)) (Ferris, 2010: 188-197). As claimed by Ferris, since there is a wide range of strategies that can be used by teachers, it is crucial to help them differentiate the various forms of written corrective feedback and understand their specificities and advise them when they should be used in order to help their students revise their written texts (*ibid.*, 189). For instance, she states that indirect corrective feedback is favoured by L2 writing researchers and L2 students (Ferris & Roberts; Leki, 1991 in Ferris, 2010: 189-190) whereas SLA researchers support the use of direct corrective feedback (Bitchener, 2008; Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Ellis et al., 2008; Sheen, 2007 in Ferris, 2010: 189-190). Nonetheless, Ferris argues that direct feedback should be used with L2 learners to deal with untreatable errors, when "the teacher wishes to focus student attention on particular error patterns but not others" (Ferris, 2011: 95) and when they start learning a foreign language, since their knowledge of the language is not broad enough yet to interpret the indirect corrective feedback provided by their language teachers (*ibid.*).

In his article *Evidence in support of written corrective feedback* published in 2008, Bitchener expressed a similar view as Ferris regarding the necessity to use WCF in classrooms. The result of his study carried out in this article showed that there is a significant difference between L2 students who were granted WCF and those who were not (Bitchener, 2008: 102). In other words, Bitchener claimed that written corrective feedback improved the L2 learners' precision (Bitchener, 2008: 113). Furthermore, as pointed out by Bitchener, Young & Cameron

in their article published in 2005, the combination of feedback strategies can help L2 students to improve their ability to use correct grammatical forms in their new writing tasks (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 202). For instance, when the teacher deals with treatable errors, oral corrective feedback would be much more effective when combined with another type of feedback, namely direct written feedback (*ibid.*). However, his view will be challenged by Ferris in 2010.

It is also crucial to understand what is meant by WCF and how it works. Hattie and Timperley pointed out in *The power of feedback. Review of educational research* published in 2007, that feedback is effective when in line with a learning context, but feedback is only a part of the ‘teaching process’ and can be overlooked by the L2 learners (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 82). Moreover, both authors revealed that in order for WCF to be efficient and effective, the feedback has to be a response to a mistake, a misinterpretation of what has been taught by the teacher but if there is a lack of information, the feedback is of no use, because there has to be some learning before a correction (*ibid.*). While some researchers such as Ferris, Lalande and Bitchener specifically focus on the effects and uses of feedback types and subtypes, these two authors – Hattie and Timperley – focus on the process behind all corrective strategies, notably how to make it work, how to reduce the gap between the actual knowledge and the target (*ibid.*). Moreover, as discussed by the two authors, it is necessary to answer three different questions to understand how WCF works, notably “Where am I going (What are the goals?), How am I going? (What process is being made toward the goal?), Where to next? (What activities need to be undertaken to make better progress?)” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 86). Nevertheless, WFC in itself, its efficacy, the various strategies that should be used by teachers and the impact of the various teachers’ beliefs still remain inexplicit and unclear. Indeed, as Lee points out, relatively little research has focused on teachers’ beliefs but also the reasons why teachers react to writing tasks as they do today, and whether there are discrepancies between teachers’ practices and what theories have been putting forward for many years (Lee, 2008: 69).

In this master thesis dissertation, I will try to find out more about written corrective feedback that is provided by language teachers while correcting written assignments and I will try to understand why there is still a persistent gap between the literature on the subject matter and the practice of teachers in giving written corrective feedback to their pupils.

3 Background

3.1 Definitions of written corrective feedback

Written corrective feedback is a widespread teaching practice used by teachers to help their students improve their writing accuracy in a second language (Ng & Ishak, 2018: 95). However, before going into the details of the different types of feedback, their specificities and the development of WCF itself since the sixties, it is essential to define the notion of written corrective feedback. There seems, however, to be little consensus when it comes to defining the term: in the many existing books or academic articles on the subject, each author comes up with his/her own definition of WCF.

It seems legitimate to start with the definition of written corrective feedback provided by a leading name in this field of research, namely Dana Ferris. She defines WCF as an “instructional strategy, [...] to help second language (L2) learners improve their writing effectiveness” (Ferris, 2010 in Kang & Han, 2015: 1). In her view, this strategy cannot be underestimated, since it can lead to significant enhancement in L2 learners’ ability to use correct grammatical forms (Ferris, 1999; Ferris, 2003 in Kang & Han, 2015: 2). According to Mao and Crosthwaite, “Written corrective feedback (WCF) refers to the feedback provided by writing teachers on students’ writing” (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 46). As for Ramaprasad, he states that “Feedback is information about the gap between actual level and the reference level [...] which is used to alter that gap in some way” (Ramaprasad, 1983: 4). However, according to Winne and Butler, feedback is “information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta-cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies” (Winne & Butler, 1984 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 82).

If a closer look is to be taken at the definition given by two other leading researchers in the field, namely Bitchener and Knoch, it also slightly differs from the others mentioned above: “Bitchener and Knoch (2010) have defined feedback as the information provided by teachers that boosts students’ understanding and performance, helping students to recognise their errors and correct them accordingly.” (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 46).

Yet, as it can be seen, these WCF definitions have many things in common but each of them emphasizes one particular feature (e.g. the teachers’ role, the pupils’ responsibility or the efficacy of the procedure).

Burke and Pieterick, the authors of *Giving Students Effective Written Feedback*, implicitly argue that each individual can have his/her own definition of written corrective

feedback (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 3). They also offer several definitions and explain that these definitions (i.e. in particular those they propose in the book) can “offer anything to your own definition” (*ibid.*). In spite of the fact that the definition of WCF seems to be a personal matter to a certain extent, it can be noticed that the above-mentioned book as well as the one written by Hyland and Hyland *Feedback in Second Language Writing*, stress an important characteristic of WCF, notably the fact that providing feedback is more than just a matter of “marking or assessing” (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 3). Hyland and Hyland make that clear by writing that: “The substantial comments that many teachers write on student papers [...] do more than simply justify a grade. They provide a reader reaction and offer targeted instruction.” (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 165).

Furthermore, written corrective feedback can be described as a pedagogical practice or as a guidance system (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 4) that has often been seen as nothing more than “purely informational” (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 165). However, it is a way to help the learners improve their writing accuracy thanks to the teacher, whose feedback and advice “provide a reader reaction and offer targeted instruction” (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 165). To quote Hyland and Hyland:

But while the information in feedback is a key factor in learning to write, it is only effective if it engages with the writer and gives him or her a sense that this a response to a *person* rather than a script. (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 165).

Vygotsky notes that the information provided by the language teacher “offers the assistance of an expert, guiding the learner through the ‘zone of proximal development’” (Vygotsky, 1978 in Hyland and Hyland, 2019; 165). This definition agrees with the idea put forward by Burke and Pieterick that through written corrective feedback, the teacher informs the student where he or she is in the acquisition of the second language, the progress he/she has made and what remains to be done (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 4).

Moreover, Majer, in Pawlak’s book, entitled *Error Correction in The Language Classroom*, expresses a view similar to Hyland & Hyland’s and Burke & Pieterick’s concerning the exchange between a pupil and a tutor. He writes that “feedback belongs in the domain of interaction” (Majer, 2003 in Pawlak, 2013: 5).

It would therefore appear impossible to have one single definition for WCF. As Burke and Pieterick argue, everyone can have their own definition and enrich it with other definitions from other authors or researchers focusing on written corrective feedback (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 3). The idea of interaction between a tutor/teacher - who uses a pedagogical system that

helps the pupils improve their writing accuracy - and his pupils is a characteristic that recurs in several definitions provided by different scholars.

3.2 Errors vs mistakes and correction vs feedback

Before getting to the heart of the matter, it is crucial to make a clear distinction between what specialists mean by 'error' and 'mistake'. Be it in English or in another language such as French (i.e. *erreur et faute*), these two terms can be confusing. However, as Pawlak argues, even specialists in this field cannot agree among themselves on how to define the notion of error and the definitions that have been proposed over the years are hardly adequate (Pawlak, 2013: 3).

At the very beginning of WCF studies (i.e. in the 1960s) Corder had already made a distinction between these two terms: errors "are systematic inaccuracies that indicate gaps in learners' interlanguage system" (Corder, 1967 in Lee, 2013: 112) whereas mistakes "are unsystematic inaccuracies such as slips and memory failures" (Corder, 1967 in Lee, 2013: 112). Later towards the end of the 20th century Lennon tried to put forward a new definition of error. He stated that an error is "[a] linguistic form or a combination of forms, which, in the same context and under similar conditions of production, would, in all likelihood, not be produced by the speakers' native speaker counterparts" (Lennon, 1991 in Pawlak, 2013: 3).

Three decades after Lennon's definition and from a more practical point of view, Bitchener and Ferris argue that it is important that the teachers identify whether the pupils are making a mistake or an error before they start correcting and choosing which type of feedback to use (depending on various factors such as the language level) (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 130). How teachers respond to and deal with errors made by students will be discussed in Part 6 of this master thesis.

According to many scholars, it would be wise to define and contrast error correction and corrective feedback (Pawlak, 2013: 5). Written corrective feedback is a much wider term than error correction (*ibid.*). Majer argues that "Error correction is part of language teaching, whereas feedback belongs in the domain of interaction. (...) Therefore every error correction is feedback, much as its actual realization may depend on a particular pedagogic goal (...)" (Majer, 2003 in Pawlak, 2013: 5). Larsen-Freeman shares the same point of view (i.e., WCF is a generic term) and draws attention to the fact that corrective feedback has "a less punitive connotation" than error correction (Larsen-Freeman, 2003 in Pawlak, 2013: 5).

Even though this distinction between error correction and corrective feedback might be important to some scholars and might have its importance in some research context, it might be considered as superfluous to language teachers (Pawlak, 2013: 5). When reading and correcting

the learners' writing texts, teachers appear to be more interested in the way they approach the correction of the writing tasks, in other words, the errors made, than in these terminological terms and ideas about WCF, which do not necessarily reflect the reality of the classroom (*ibid.*).

3.3 Different types of written corrective feedback and their specificities

Written corrective feedback has been described as a response, a system, useful information given by the teacher about the writing performance and writing accuracy of L2 learners (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 3-4). More precisely, according to Wiggins, feedback “describes what the learner did and did not in relation to her goals” (Wiggins, 1997 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 27).

On the basis of the different definitions and points of view mentioned earlier, WCF serves to help the pupil to progress, to improve in the acquisition of the second language and through the feedback, the teacher tells the pupil how to do this (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 4, 14, 23). Nevertheless, to achieve this, different kinds of feedback can be used, each with its own functions, issues and limitations.

3.3.1 Evaluative and advisory feedback

As Burke & Pieterick point out in their book, the distinction between evaluative and advisory feedback boils down to the fact that the first is essentially centred on the teacher's perception of the student's written production and it generally goes hand in hand with a mark (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 27-28). It is principally given to make sure that the pupil understands the justification of the grade given by the person in charge (i.e. the teacher) (*ibid.*, 27). Moreover, it often describes the pupils' production with judgemental words such as ‘poor’, ‘good’, ‘unclear’, etc (*ibid.*, 27-28). Unlike evaluative feedback, advisory (corrective) feedback tells the pupils what should be done in order to meet the teacher's expectations and what needs to be improved in his or her written production (*ibid.*, 27-28). Burke and Pieterick state that according to Wiggins, advisory feedback is not used to pass judgement on the work carried out but is practised to remind the learner of what the context and the goal of the task were, and which steps the learner should follow to achieve the goal (*ibid.*, 28). In other words, if teachers use evaluative feedback, their comments will assess the quality of the work and if it is negative, it could discourage the learners (*ibid.*, 27-28). However, if the teacher decides to make use of advisory feedback, it will help the learners to understand where they are in their training process and it enables them to progress step by step in their learning of a second language (*ibid.*).

3.3.2 Direct and indirect corrective feedback

For many decades and until very recently, many studies have looked at the effectiveness and usefulness of two main types of feedback, namely direct and indirect feedback. The first subsection (i.e. 3.3.2.1) focuses on direct corrective feedback and the following on indirect corrective feedback (i.e. 3.3.2.2).

3.3.2.1 Direct corrective feedback

This type of feedback has been the subject of numerous studies and debates. Indeed, some scholars argue that it is better to use it when students are at the beginning of their learning process, which results in their inability to correct their written tasks themselves (Brown, 1994 in Kang & Han, 2015: 10, Ferris, 2002 in Kang & Han, 2015: 10; Ellis, 2009: 99). Others claim that it is better to use indirect corrective feedback (Lalande, 1982 in Ellis, 2009: 100). But before analysing the different points of view on this subject matter, it is essential to understand the notion of direct corrective feedback.

Ellis (2008) argues that

direct feedback occurs when a teacher indicates an error and provides students with the correct form. Direct feedback can be represented in a range of formats, including crossing out an unnecessary word, sentence, or morpheme, adding the missing content and writing the correct form above or near to the incorrect form. (Ellis, 2008 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47)

In the same vein, Bitchener and Ferris qualified direct feedback as

that which provides some form of explicit correction of linguistic form or structure above or near the linguistic error and usually involves the crossing out of an unnecessary word/phrase/morpheme, the insertion of a missing word/phrase/morpheme, and/or the provision of the correct form or structure. (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 65)

The study carried out by Ferris and Roberts in 2001 reveals that direct feedback is deemed helpful to learners, since it allows a better insight into language use and prevents any misinterpretation (Ferris & Roberts, 2001 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47-48).

However, from one publication to the next, researchers can highlight one or the other aspect of a type of corrective feedback. For instance, Ferris et al. showed in a study published a year earlier that “indirect WCF worked effectively on students’ accuracy gain in subsequent writing and direct WCF improved students’ accuracy in revisions” (Ferris & al.; 2000 in Ng & Ishak, 2018: 98).

Similarly, Chandler (2003) argues that the pupils’ substantial improvements in writing accuracy were observed with the “direct correction and underlining treatment, while the other

two treatments – codes and underlining with codes – did not show positive effects.” (Chandler, 2003 in Gu nette, 2007: 47). In his 2003 study entitled *The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing*, he points out that even learners favour direct feedback over indirect feedback, since it is more on-the-spot and easier for them to correct and understand their errors (Chandler, 2003: 267).

Nevertheless, in Chandler’s study, some learners express a different opinion: some of them prefer indirect feedback, since it encourages them to be more independent in their learning having to search for the correct answers by themselves (Chandler, 2003: 267, 287-289). This is also expressed by other scholars in Lee’s article: they claim that L2 learners prefer coded, thus indirect corrective feedback to direct corrective feedback (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Komura, 1999; Roberts, 1999 in Lee, 2008: 71).

As far as effectiveness is concerned, the study conducted by Bitchener & Knoch and van Beuningen in 2008 shows that the effect of direct written feedback is greater and more prolonged in time than the other type of WCF, namely indirect WCF (Bitchener & Knoch, 2010b; van Beuningen and al., 2008 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 67). This opinion on long-term positive impact on L2 learners’ grammatical correctness has also been expressed by Ellis et al. in 2008 (Ellis et al., 2008 in Kang & Han, 2015: 2).

Nonetheless, not all scholars agree. For instance, “Lalande (1982) and James (1998) explained that indirect feedback requires learners to engage in guided learning and problem solving and, therefore, promotes the type of reflection that is more likely to foster long-term acquisition.” (Lalande, 1982; James 1998 in Bitchener, 2008, 105).

However, it is important to point out that five studies (Chandler in 2003; Ferris in 2006; Lalande in 1982; Robb & al. in 1986 and finally Semke in 1984) reviewed by Bitchener & Knoch have led to a completely different result: two studies indeed showed that there was no difference between direct and indirect feedback, two others showed a preference for indirect feedback and only one for direct feedback (Hashemnezhad & Mohammadnejad, 2012: 231). According to Ellis, these mixed results can be explained by the fact that direct and indirect feedback were not conducted in the same way (Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima, 2008: 355).

Nonetheless, not every researcher shares the same view. Unlike Chandler, Lalande discovered in 1982 that indirect WCF was more effective than direct WCF (Lalande, 1982, Chandler, 2003 in Gu nette, 2007: 48). Robb et al. in 1986 and Ferris and Roberts in a more recent study (2001) concluded that all L2 learners made progress in their writing accuracy no

matter which type of corrective feedback was actually applied (Robb et al., 1986; Ferris & Roberts, 2001 in Gu nette, 2007: 48).

To summarize, Bitchener and Ferris argue that those who support the use and efficacy of direct corrective feedback claim that this type is more beneficial to L2 learners, arguing that it will prevent them from getting into a muddle if they do not understand indirect forms of feedback (e.g. the codes that are actually practised by the language teachers) and also “provides them with information to help them resolve more complex errors (e.g. syntactic structure and idiomatic usage); it also offers more explicit feedback on hypotheses that may have been tested” and finally, it is much more straightforward than indirect WCF (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 65).

3.3.2.2 *Indirect corrective feedback*

As was the case for the previous direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback still divides many scholars to this day.

Indirect corrective feedback is defined as a type of feedback used by language teachers to indicate to the learners that one or more errors have been made but without giving the correction directly to the learner (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 163-164). The L2 learners thus have to understand the feedback and correct the errors they have made (*ibid.*, 164).

In the book written by Bitchener and Ferris, the definition of indirect corrective feedback though more precise seems to remain the same; indeed, when the language teacher gives this type of feedback, it is not accompanied by so-called ‘metalinguistic explanations’ (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 65). Moreover, it can generally be provided in four different ways:

- (1) underlining or circling the error;
- (2) recording in the margin the number of mistakes on a given line;
- (3) using a code to illustrate where the error has occurred, and
- (4) using a code to indicate what type of error is marked. (Ferris & Roberts, 2001; Robb et al., 1986; Syu et al., 2014 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47)

In addition, many researchers point out that it is important for language teachers to communicate the meaning of their codes if they use coded corrective indirect feedback (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 76). Lee’s work reveals that teachers must do that, especially when it comes to new elements that L2 learners have not successfully picked up yet (Ferris, 2002; Lee, 1997 in Lee, 2013: 111). As it can be seen in Ng’s & Ishak’s study, if this is not communicated, students may be confused and fail to understand the feedback provided and subsequently to correct their errors (Ng & Ishak, 2018: 104).

Lalande argues that indirect feedback is much more effective for L2 learners in terms of writing accuracy (Lalande, 1982 in Gu nette, 2007: 48). This conclusion reached by Lalande

in his 1982 study will be confirmed by Ferris and Roberts in 2001; in their study conducted twenty years ago, Ferris and Roberts strongly advised teachers to favour indirect feedback because it forces the learner to become intensely involved in the development of his or her learning of a second language (Ferris & Roberts, 2001 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47).

In another study, Rob et al. discovered that this type of WCF, which is less time-consuming for the teachers, might effectively help learners to correct their mistakes (Roberts & al., 1986 in Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 164).

Lastly, the use of one type or the other (i.e. direct or indirect feedback) will depend on many factors which will be discussed later in this MA (e.g. level of the learner, teachers' beliefs, or school policy).

3.3.3 Unfocused feedback and focused feedback

Since the eighties, several studies have looked at the differences between the two types, and their specificities (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 96). Furthermore, while writing this master thesis and reading certain sources, in particular Lee's 2013 article on *Research into practice: Written corrective feedback*, I noticed that it was crucial to consider these two opposing types of feedback because they are consciously or unconsciously often used by language teachers. Moreover, it is impossible to discuss this type of feedback without mentioning Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima, who in 2008 published a study on focused and unfocused corrective feedback.

3.3.3.1 Unfocused feedback

Unfocused feedback, which can be direct or indirect, is described as comprehensive feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 96), which means that it is provided on an unlimited number of errors. (Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima, 2008: 356; Ellis, 2009: 102; Fazilatfar, Damavandi, Sani, & Heirati, 2014 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

While it seems that the use of this type of feedback is widespread among teachers, several studies show its ineffectiveness in improving the learners' writing accuracy and other studies such as Bitchener in 2008, Bitchener and Knoch in 2008 and 2010, Ellis et al. in 2008 among others demonstrated that focused feedback can actually be helpful to L2 learners (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 96).

Furthermore, Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima implicitly stress in their 2008 study that L2 learners might be less inclined to pay attention to the teacher's correction when he or she makes use of unfocused feedback, since it might be difficult to "develop a clearer understanding of the nature of the error" (Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima, 2008: 356).

3.3.3.2 Focused feedback

Focused feedback also referred to as ‘selective feedback’ or as ‘targeted feedback’ is provided by the language teachers when they correct “one or a few preselected error types” (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). Within this type of feedback, there are two subtypes, namely highly focused WCF and less focused WCF (Ellis & al., 2008 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 57). The former refers to the correction of only one error type and the latter means that the language teachers correct errors in a limited number of categories (*ibid.*).

In contrast to unfocused feedback, focused/selective written feedback is greatly favoured and recommended by many scholars (e.g. Ferris, Ellis, Mao and Crosthwaite and Lee among others). The work of Ferris clearly indicates that, for practical reasons, it is better to opt for this type and to give up ‘comprehensive feedback’ because the latter is time consuming, thus teachers are more likely to be quickly swamped and their L2 learners can easily be frustrated by the large amount of provided information (Ferris, 2007: 170). In the same vein, Storch & Wigglesworth argue that

selective and focused WCF is also better for students, as their papers are no longer inundated with red ink, which is likely to hurt their ego and damage their confidence in writing, and may in turn affect the uptake of feedback. (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010 in Lee, 2013: 109)

From a pedagogical perspective, it should also be emphasised that the long-term aim of the teachers is to help the learners to progress, to become better writers in a second language, to be more autonomous in the revision of their written texts, therefore the long-term progress is more important than short-term progress (i.e. correcting everything in the texts that have just been produced, thinking that thanks to a single work, the learners will become better overnight) (Lee, 2013: 109-110). In other words, it is more useful and efficient to correct in a “focused manner” than correcting every error in “an unfocused manner” (Ferris, 2002 in Lee, 2013: 109).

However, it would not be wise to jump to a quick conclusion; even if some studies prove that unfocused feedback is effective, they do not say that this type is more effective than focused feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2019: 97). As Bitchener and Ferris pointed out in their book, the conflicting findings on the effectiveness of unfocused WCF mean that additional investigation about the benefits of this type of WCF is required (Bitchener & Ferris, 2013: 57). Although this was confirmed by Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima in 2008, it would appear that Ferris and Bitchener failed to mention the results of Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima’s study, whose main subject was focused and unfocused feedback (Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima, 2008) where they argue that “There were no statistically significant differences

between the focused and unfocused CF groups (...). Both types of CF were equally effective. There is, however, some evidence to suggest that focused CF may be more effective in the long run” (Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima, 2008: 366-367).

3.3.4 WCF on global and local errors

These sub-sections deal with global and local corrective feedback. It seems important to highlight the fact that there are important differences in the definitions of these two terms.

3.3.4.1 WCF on global errors

In 2007 Montgomery and Baker asserted that ‘global written corrective feedback’ focuses on ‘global’ errors of the L2 learners such as the written ideas, the structure of the written text and the coherence of the contents (Montgomery & Baker, 2007 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). But according to Lee and Ferris, global errors are errors that impede the comprehension of the written text (Ferris, 2003 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 145; Lee, 2013: 112). Although Lee and Ferris agree on the definition of global errors, Lee provides a more accurate definition arguing that global errors are lexical or syntactical ones which can disrupt the proper communication of ideas if they are not corrected and then mastered (Lee, 2013: 112).

For practical reasons, Ferris’ definition will be used in my questionnaire. Indeed, her notion of ‘global’ and ‘local’ seems to me to be the most unambiguous and least confusing.

Moreover, as it has already been noticed with the other types of WCF, it is difficult for scholars to reach a consensus about which type of error should be corrected first. On the one hand, Burt claimed in 1975 that only global errors had to be identified by the teachers and corrected (Burt, 1975 in Lee, 2013: 112) while Cohen (1987) and Ferris (1995) pointed out that even second language learners preferred feedback to be given on the so-called local errors and not on global ones (Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995 in Montgomery & Baker, 2007: 83).

It is worth noting that Ferris does not use the same terminology as Burt. This scholar uses the term treatable errors (i.e. errors that can easily be resolved by consulting grammar books (Ferris, 2011: 36)) and untreatable errors (i.e. “errors that are not amenable to self-correction, such as word choice and word order” (Ferris, 2011: 36)) (Ferris, 2001 in Lee, 2013: 111) and she also disagrees with Burt asserting treatable errors should be corrected but not untreatable ones (Ferris, 1999, 2002 in Van Beuningen, 2010 in Lee, 2013: 112).

3.3.4.2 WCF on local errors

Lee states in his article *Research into practice: Written corrective feedback* that “Local errors are those that do not impede communication (i.e. morphological errors)” (Lee, 2013: 112). These errors are also regarded by Ferris as “minor” and therefore do not alter understandability of the learners’ written compositions (Ferris, 2003 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 145). On the other hand, Bitchener and Ferris argue that the concept of local feedback is synonym of “grammar or mechanics feedback”, even though it is not common to use these two terms (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 98).

Interestingly, Montgomery and Baker do not define local errors using the same terms as the previous mentioned scholars: from their perspective “Written feedback on local issues focuses on spelling, syntax and punctuation” (Montgomery & Baker, 2003 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

3.3.4.3 Issues related to these two types of WCF

Although Ferris expressed in her 2002 and 2003 studies that the distinction between these two kinds of errors (i.e. global and local) seems somewhat problematic, it is actually easy for an experienced teacher to decide which type of error deserves to be tackled and corrected. (Ferris, 2002, 2003 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 145-146). However, second language teachers have to be very careful when they choose which kind of errors they want to correct because, as argued by Storch & Wigglesworth (2010) “that students’ uptake of WCF depends on the depth of their processing of WCF, and that uptake is possible only when students notice and understand the reasons for the WCF provided by their teacher” (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010 in Lee, 2013: 112). In other words, teachers have to make sure that the pupils can understand what is actually wrong or missing (*ibid.*).

Unfortunately, what is put forward by specialists such as Ferris, Bitchener, Lee is hardly ever applied in the classroom: teachers tend to correct everything without making any distinction between the different types of errors (*ibid.*). This problem will be discussed in more detail in part 6 of this master’s thesis.

3.4 Conclusion

Obviously, it is not always easy to find a single definition of each WCF type. This is especially striking with the last two types (i.e. WCF on global and local errors). On the one hand, Lee states that global errors refer to “syntax and lexical errors” (Lee, 2013: 112) whereas Montgomery and Baker argue that not so much global as local feedback refers to ‘punctuation’, ‘spelling’ and syntactical errors (Montgomery & Baker, 2003 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 49).

This issue is not unknown to specialists in the field. As mentioned above, Ferris already stated nineteen years ago that it was not easy to distinguish between certain WCF types such as the ones mentioned above (Ferris, 2003 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 145). Unfortunately, this lack of consensus on the terminology can have consequences for the teachers' practice: which type of WCF should be used? Direct or indirect corrective feedback? Should teacher correct global or local errors?

All these problems will be dealt with in the following part, namely in the 'Development of WCF' and in 'Teachers' practice' sections.

3.5 SLA and L2 researchers

3.5.1 Differences and similarities between the two types of researchers

Before focusing on the development of WCF from the early 2010's till today, one last point remains to be addressed: the difference between SLA researchers and L2 researchers. Unlike in Ferris' 2010 study entitled *Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA*, the question of difference between the two types of researchers is not explicitly addressed in the many books and scientific articles used in this MA.

Ferris argued in 2012 that scholars regard themselves either as L2 writing researchers (e.g. Chandler, Ferris, Roberts, etc.) or as SLA researchers (e.g. Bitchener, Ellis, Sheen, etc.) (Ferris, 2010: 185). The former concentrate "on what happens in composition classes and what is published in journals that focus primarily on writing issues" (Ferris, 2010: 185) while the latter focus on "written CF research for language classrooms and extended paradigms related to focus-on-form instruction and oral CF to new research on the effects of written CF on SLA" (*ibid.*).

In terms of methodology, studies of L2 writing tend to be carried out in "writing classrooms" (*ibid.*, 186): these researchers may or may not include a control group in their studies and may make use of so-called "pre- and post-tests" (*ibid.*). In such studies WCF is provided either by the teacher or by the researcher(s) and may or may not be precise (*ibid.*). Some of their studies do not specify the types of written errors that will be corrected (*ibid.*, 186). Indeed, as claimed by Ferris, even though those scholars value the writing progress of the learners, they are quite unlikely to concentrate on "the long-term acquisition of a specific linguistic characteristic" (Ferris, 2010: 188). By contrast, in their surveys/studies SLA researchers use control groups and "one or more treatment groups" (*ibid.*, 186) and look at what happens before and after the test, sometimes a long time after the test has been made (*ibid.*). Unlike L2 researchers, they focus on a few chosen types of error and WCF is consistently

delivered either by the researcher(s) or by the teacher(s) in the so-called “classroom studies” (*ibid.*).

Although both groups of researchers focus on WCF, their research questions are not the same. SLA researchers examine whether WCF actually paves the way for semipermanent acquisition of specific linguistic characteristics and, if so, they try to discover how, how many and which types (*ibid.*, 188). They also try to know if WCF should be implicit or explicit, and in the latter case they also try to find out how many metalinguistic explanations are required (*ibid.*).

By contrast, L2 researchers more specifically examine whether WCF, which they regard as a tool among others to help the learners progress in a foreign language, helps L2 learners improve their writing exactness and if it helps them become better writers (*ibid.*). In Ferris’ article, L2 researchers are said to believe that in order to help learners improve their linguistic proficiency in a foreign language, more precisely in their written tasks, teachers should not only use written corrective feedback but also various teaching methods “such as explicit instruction, strategy training and peer- and self-editing activities, among others” (Ferris, 2010: 188).

On the basis of this information, Ferris argues that one can come to the conclusion that only SLA researchers’ studies should be taken into consideration but L2 researchers’ studies should not, since “the SLA studies are conducted under far more controlled experimental conditions” (Ferris, 2010: 186) She claims though that this conclusion would be too simplistic (*ibid.*, 191). That is why she claims that SLA and L2 researchers are not rivals but can be collaborators and plug the existing gap between the literature about written correction and actual teachers’ practice in classrooms (*ibid.*, 182; 191). To quote Ferris: “L2 writing researchers and SLA researchers who investigate written CF—although they pose somewhat different questions— can and should learn from each other and build on one another’s work” (Ferris, 2010: 191).

4 Development of WCF

The research on written corrective feedback goes back more than a century ago. Since the beginning of the 20th century, theories and studies on WCF have been published but even today, there are still controversies on key questions such as ‘is feedback effective in mastering the writing skills in a second language?’, ‘what methods can help learners?’, ‘what is the role of teachers and how can they help their students to improve?’

In this fourth theoretical part of the master’s thesis, close attention will be drawn to the development of written corrective feedback, starting from 1910 up to now, and encompassing,

among other aspects, Krashen's theories to Truscott's essay, which turned many theories upside down or prompted Ferris to react. The last part will be devoted to the most recent theories and to the new light they throw on the matter. Lastly, a conclusion will be drawn, and some questions will be answered or remain unanswered.

4.1 History of WCF from the early 20th century till 1980

Although many articles and books on the development of WCF focus on research from the 1960s onwards, it is essential to pay some attention to the early days of the development of WCF, which started with Thorndike's theories in 1911 (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 12).

As early as in 1911, there was this idea that feedback was indeed used to make L2 learners progress in a foreign language; there was hardly any discussion on the different ways in which it could be used to help them progress. For instance, according to the earliest study about feedback written by Thorndike (i.e. "*Law of Effect*" (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 12)) corrective feedback is actually "knowledge of the result and reinforcement of the right answer" (McKeachie, 1974 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 12). The second part of the quotation is interesting because it provides a behaviourist interpretation that will remain central in the perception of WCF for a long time, namely during the fifties and sixties.

In the fifties and sixties, errors were particularly seen in a negative light and only the right answer mattered (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4). From the behaviourists' perspective, errors could lead to bad language habits - they were even compared to 'sins' by Brooks in 1960 - and were therefore to be removed and everything had to be put in place to prevent them (Brook, 1960 in Hendrickson, 1978: 387; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4). Pedagogically speaking, this theory based on error prevention and not on error treatment, led to what we call today 'drills', a method involving repeating a structure several times (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4). This theory obviously had an effect in the classroom as teachers began to adopt the so-called 'audiolingual /drill method' (i.e. "a technique of foreign-language instruction that emphasizes audio-lingual skills over reading and writing and is characterized by extensive use of pattern practice") (Dictionary.com, n.d.), since the aim of the teachers at that time was to make their L2 learners repeat certain patterns, structures again and again so that they end up memorising the right shapes/structures (Bitchener & Ferris 2012: 4; Brooks, 1960 in Hendrickson, 1978: 387). With this method, there was indeed no question of understanding where the errors came from or of helping pupils understand and correct them: it only aimed at preventing pupils from making the same errors.

However, studies such as Hendrickson's 1978 showed that this method did not help learners build their communicative skills (Hendrickson, 1978: 387). Despite this observation, many teachers have continued to use this method regardless of its ineffectiveness (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4), which will also be the case for other methods such as unfocused/comprehensive correction. The reasons why teachers keep on adopting ineffective methods will be discussed in the last part of this theoretical section.

After these theories and studies pinpointing the necessity to avoid errors at all costs, scholars switched to “The Contrastive Analysis” approach (*ibid.*). This approach no longer focuses on what is called error prevention but on error treatment (*ibid.*). Second language teachers were advised to use this theory in order to help learners understand why they are making errors (*ibid.*). According to Ferris and Bitchener as well as Lardière, who published an article in 2009 entitled *Some thoughts on the contrastive analysis of features in second language acquisition*, this error prevention theory stipulates that the learners - with the help of the teacher - have to contrast structures and features used in their L1 and L2 and spot characteristics common to both languages (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4; Lardière, 2009: 173-175). This approach enables scholars and teachers to explain why certain errors are made in written productions. At that time, the differences between the L1 and L2 was believed to be the main source of errors and that is why many linguists claimed it was essential to tackle this problem by highlighting the dissimilarities between L1 and L2 and their respective specific features (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4; Hendrickson, 1978: 388). In the late sixties and early seventies, this approach was widely criticized, since many researchers and scholars managed to demonstrate that the interferences were not the only source of errors and this approach could not forecast which types of errors would actually be produced by L2 learners (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 4-5).

After this questioning of ‘The Contrastive Approach’, feedback seen as a “reinforcement view” also began to be strongly challenged (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 12). As a result, errors were not seen in a negative light anymore but rather in a more positive way, since it helped the teachers to know what the learners have progressed in (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 6). Furthermore, WCF scholars started to analyse what its primary functions were in order to understand what was “actually happening” when it was used in written productions and to what extent it could have an impact on L2 learners’ cognitive process (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 12).

As soon as studies of foreign language acquisition (SLA) emerged, many practical/pedagogical WCF-related issues were raised “such as the reasons for correcting errors,

which errors should be corrected and when, how they should be corrected, and who should do the correcting” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 6). However, at that time too little empirical research on the subject was conducted and no linguistic criteria nor standards were established in connection with these questions (Robinson, 1971; Burt, 1975 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7). Moreover, as claimed by Ferris in 2010 and Bitchener & Ferris in 2012, studies prior to the 1990s about WCF did not specify the impact of the written feedback (Ferris, 2010: 184) and did not show if WCF could actually help L2 learners develop their knowledge in a second language (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 6).

Even if there won't be any big debate and discoveries about the efficiency of WCF until Krashen's theories and more importantly, the nineties with Truscott's and Ferris' studies, it is worthwhile paying attention to Hendrickson's 1978 article on the importance of further research into the role of WCF in foreign language learning (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7). The first pedagogical question raised by Hendrickson is the following one: “Should Learners' Errors Be Corrected?” (Hendrickson, 1978: 389). As highlighted by Gorbet in 1974, before correcting their learners' errors, language teachers should ask themselves if they should do that and why they should do it (Gorbet, 1974 in Hendrickson, 1978: 389). In other words, the first question was more about the reason to correct errors rather than find out if it really works and helps pupils progress in their learning process (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7). According to Kennedy (1973), written corrective feedback is important, since it helps learners pinpoint their errors, understand the “functions and limitations of syntactical and lexical forms of the target language” (Kennedy, 1973 in Hendrickson, 1978: 389).

The second question is what type of error teachers should or must correct (Hendrickson, 1978: 389; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7). In that respect, Bitchener and Ferris say that this problem took some time to be fully addressed (i.e. as it was poorly documented) in the studies concerning WCF (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7). By contrast, Hendrickson claims that the literature of the seventies revealed that many “language educators” rejected what is now called ‘behaviourists' approach’: they accept that producing errors was actually essential to progress in a second language acquisition (Hendrickson, 1978: 389-390). To quote Hendrickson: “The literature on error correction reveals clearly that many foreign language educators have rejected the obsessive concern with error avoidance that generally characterizes audiolingually-oriented language instruction” (Hendrickson, 1978: 389).

Moreover, already at that time, Walker and Georges both conducted studies which implied that the behaviourists' perspective was not beneficial to the students (Georges, 1972; Walker, 1973 in Hendrickson, 1978: 390), since it is a time-consuming process (Georges, 1972

in Hendrickson, 1978: 390). Even though researchers have recommended for a long time that language teachers should not long for or expect perfection in the writing tasks, it seems that unfocused feedback is still widely used in language teachers' practice today. Very recent studies such as Ferris' (2007) and Lee's (2009) indeed show that this is still embedded in the practice and beliefs of many teachers. Ferris argues that:

To the degree teachers can let go of the idea that if their students' papers are not perfect, it is the failure of their teaching and especially their between-draft feedback, they can have more realistic and less compulsive expectations of their own efforts and student outcomes. (Ferris, 2007: 167)

Lee too discussed this problem in his 2009 study entitled *Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice* but in a more implicit way than in Ferris' article.

The third question concerns the types of errors learners are likely to make in their written production. In the 70s, three different categories had to be taken into account by language teachers: the ones which obscure the understandability of the written text, those that can offend the reader or listener and recurrent errors that teachers should stop from occurring in texts or speeches (Hendrickson, 1978: 396; Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7). However, this question was only approached from a theoretical point of view, thus experimental research is necessary to prove the claims of the various scholars on that subject matter (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7-8).

The fourth question put forward by Hendrickson was "How Should Learners' Errors Be Corrected?" (Hendrickson, 1978: 392). This question focuses strongly on teachers' practices and the different methods that can be used to help students improve. For instance, language teachers must be aware of their own personal practices, of the type of WCF they choose when correcting errors, otherwise it could have harmful effects on their students such as vexation, despondency, etc. (Holley & King, 1971 in Hendrickson, 1978: 392).

This question has led to a lot of studies to find out how to correct errors, whether orally or through writing (Hendrickson, 1978: 393). Some of them will be discussed here.

Allwright raised the issue of teacher practice: by his reckoning, far too many teachers correct errors without following a certain procedure, without a certain logic (Allwright, 1975 in Hendrickson, 1978: 393). Students can be discouraged when some teachers make no difference between serious and minor errors while correcting, thus they do not know which problems they should solve first to progress in their learning (Allwright, 1975 in Hendrickson, 1978: 393). For their part, Cohen and Robbins in 1976 set forth the idea that teachers should correct consistently rather than randomly (Cohen & Robbins, 1976 in Hendrickson, 1978: 393). However, a year later Dulay and Burt did not concur with this hypothesis saying that teachers

should adopt a ‘selective approach’ and should take the learners’ level into account (Dulay & Burt, 1997 in Hendrickson, 1978: 393). This last argument put forward by Dulay and Burt is still mentioned and discussed in much more recent research such as those conducted by Ellis, Sheen, Murakami, & Takashima in 2008, Lee in 2013 or Mao & Crosthwaite in 2019.

Several scholars have also made many suggestions (i.e. guidelines) to help teachers correct their pupils’ errors (Hendrickson, 1978: 394). For instance, George suggests that each teacher should identify and catalogue every frequent written error (George, 1972 in Hendrickson, 1978: 394). For their part, Burt and Kipansky suggest using different colours depending on the type of error that has been made (Burt & Kipansky, 1977 in Hendrickson, 1978: 394).

In 1975 Allwright came up with yet another procedure to be followed by the teachers when they correct errors:

[I]ndication that an error was committed, identification of the type of error, location of error, mention of who made the error, [...], provision of a correct model, the furnishing of an opportunity for a new attempt, indication of improvement (if applicable), and the offering of praise. (Allwright, 1975 in Hendrickson, 1978: 395)

Finally, one last question was raised by Hendrickson; “Who Should Correct Learners’ Errors?” (Hendrickson, 1978: 395). This question raises many issues such as the teacher’s corrections, peer correction or self-correction (*ibid.*, 395-396). However, as argued by Hendrickson, all these methods are mainly “based on intuition than on experimental research” (Hendrickson, 1978: 396). He even argues that before asking or recommending teachers to use specific correcting methods or to follow certain steps while correcting learners’ written errors, all the impacts of the above-mentioned methods should be “substantiated or refuted by conducting a series of carefully controlled experiments” (Hendrickson, 1978: 396).

Ferris and Bitchener in their book *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing* share the same view; the five pedagogical questions are more based on intuition or theories than on experimental studies and the literature about WCF was at that time quite scarce (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 7-8). However, that does not mean that Hendrickson and other scholars (e.g. Georges, Burt, Cohen, Robbins, etc.) did not help many language teachers/educators but many of studies lacked empirical results (*ibid.*, 8). What emerges from his article is that he and many other scholars believe that errors are worth correcting, since they think that this practice can really help L2 learners progress in their second language acquisition, improve their written proficiency and accuracy (Hendrickson, 1978). Nevertheless, in the early

80s, Krashen and his adherents minimised the role of error and its treatment in the L2 learning process (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 9). In the 80s, he created a landmark theory called “the first comprehensive theory and model of SLA—the Monitor Model” (*ibid.*).

These theories and visions of Krashen and other scholars, which are in total opposition to the previous pedagogical approach, will be discussed in the following section.

4.2 History of WCF from Krashen’s theories till Truscott’s essay (1980 – 1996)

4.2.1 Krashen’s hypothesis

It was not until the 1980s and Krashen’s first general SLA theory featuring five hypotheses that the usefulness of written corrective feedback in the learning process was brought into question (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 9). At that time, Krashen claimed that providing L2 learners with WCF should be abandoned because it was not necessary and it could even have a negative impact on learners (Ferris, 2010: 183). Consequently, Krashen regarded WCF as a method having a rather negligible role in SLA (*ibid.*, 184).

The first theory is the “Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 9). In this theory, Krashen claims that it is essential to make a distinction between ‘acquisition’, which is compared to a subconscious process (e.g. similar to the acquisition of the mother tongue) and ‘learning’, which is described by Krashen as a conscious process (*ibid.*). Krashen explains that ‘acquisition’ is actually the consequence of the need to get information across and ‘learning’ is nothing more than the outcome of classroom exercises and teaching sessions (*ibid.*). Krashen argues that the second language knowledge that is acquired through these two different pathways must be considered as two distinct processes (*ibid.*, 9). Since the knowledge of a foreign language can be “acquired” or “learned”, Krashen does not acknowledge the learning value and importance of WCF (*ibid.*). Therefore, Krashen goes against the theories and studies in favour of WCF, which have been carried out so far. However, his first theory, just like the four others, was widely criticized by some scholars in the 80s’, since many scholars believed that what is actually learned could be transformed in what he called “acquired knowledge” (*ibid.*).

Moreover, it could be argued that still today, many researchers/scholars in favour of WCF such as Ferris, Bitchener, Ellis, Knoch among others go against Krashen’ opinions about WCF.

With his second hypothesis, which is entitled “Monitor Hypothesis”, Krashen pursues the in-depth analysis of the learning process. Krashen and McLaughlin both believe that the only role of the learning process is “thought to alter the output of the acquired system before or

after the utterance is actually written or spoken, but the utterance is initiated entirely by the acquired system” (McLaughlin, 1987 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 10). For this model to work there are several factors to take into account. Firstly, a certain amount of time is needed (i.e. for instance, for the L2 learners to write) (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 10). Secondly, the L2 learners need to focus on correctness and thirdly, “when the learner has linguistic knowledge relevant to the form or structure in question” (*ibid.*).

In this second hypothesis, Krashen does not entirely reject the use of written corrective feedback but only if the linguistic structure in which the error is found has already been learned and acquired, otherwise Krashen does not see the need for recourse to WCF (*ibid.*).

Despite all this, this hypothesis has had to face two major criticisms. First of all, his theory has empirically never led to concluding results. Secondly, the ‘Monitor Model’ does not say whether L2 learners are consciously using a rule that comes from the learned system or if they actually apply the linguistic unconsciously (i.e. linguistic rules coming from the acquired system) (*ibid.*).

In his third hypothesis (i.e. “The Natural Order Hypothesis”), Krashen claims that linguistic rules are acquired in a foreseeable order: in other words, some of these rules must be taught by the language teacher in the first place and others must be addressed once the former are completely acquired (*ibid.*, 10). However, when discussing this order, it is crucial to point out that it does not only depend on the so-called “formal simplicity” (i.e. the simplicity of the formal structure) and that the order of the acquisition of language rules is not parallel to what is actually taught by the language teacher in class (*ibid.*). Therefore, Krashen claims that if only the so-called subconscious acquisition of the input is taken into consideration, then the “classroom instructions” (*ibid.*) as well as written corrective feedback are not worthless nor completely unnecessary (*ibid.*). To quote Bitchener and Ferris: “This [...] implies that a focus on error and its treatment in the classroom is not going to aid the acquisition process so should be regarded as unnecessary.” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 10).

The fourth hypothesis (i.e. ‘The Input Hypothesis’) is an extension of the third one, since it focuses on the acquisition of the input of a second language (*ibid.*). In this theory, Krashen argues that if the L2 learners are provided with enough ‘comprehensible input’ (i.e. “input about the target language that is just a little beyond the learner’s current level of syntactic complexity”) (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 10), then they will progress in their learning of a second language (*ibid.*, 10-11). Therefore, thanks to this type of input, WCF is unnecessary, since “the necessary grammar is automatically provided” (Krashen, 1985 in Bitchener & Ferris,

2012: 10-11) but this is only true when the input that is received is present in great quantity and is intelligible (*ibid.*).

As has been shown previously, this theory has also had to face many criticisms expressed by scholars who believed in the role of classrooms instructions and WCF. The first two criticisms are related to Krashen's vagueness: this scholar is indeed far too imprecise about the learners' initial level and he does not say to what extent the input plays a significant part in the acquisition of a second language or if the understandable input can only be provided once the so-called 'acquisition' has taken place (*ibid.*, 11). Moreover, defenders of WCF claim that it is impossible to test his hypothesis, since he does not clearly define what 'comprehensible input' is and "how it might relate to acquisition" (*ibid.*). Finally, when focusing on the L2 learners' acquisition, Krashen fails to pay attention to "the internal workings of the Language Acquisition Device (LAD)" (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 11), which is the part of the brain where the acquisition actually happens (*ibid.*).

In his fifth and last hypothesis (i.e. "The Affective Filter Hypothesis"), the learner is the main focus of attention; he tries to find out when the learners are inclined to learn a second language (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 11). Krashen states that in order for them to learn a second language, their affective filter must be low enough so that it cannot be an obstacle to the input (*ibid.*). Bitchener and Ferris quote Krashen as saying that if this filter is too high, all the classroom instructions/WCF given by teachers will not be stored in the so-called LAD (i.e. "Language Acquisition Device") (*ibid.*). Some factors, namely emotions such as anxiety and low self-confidence can obviously cause the learner to have a high emotional filter (*ibid.*). However, this last hypothesis was criticised on several aspects. On the one hand, it is not because a learner tends to be easily stressed or not mentally well that he or she will necessarily perform badly and likewise self-confident learners do not automatically perform better in the target language (*ibid.*).

Although Krashen's theories were strongly criticised, they have remained quite influential in the history of WCF: some scholars have taken these remarks concerning the uselessness of WCF into consideration (e.g. Truscott) and others used his research to have a more positive approach of the L2 learner's written errors and to find out how to make language learning easier (*ibid.*).

4.2.2 Research following Krashen's in the eighties

After Krashen's theories, many researchers became more and more interested in WCF. On the one hand, some researchers analysed WCF using the so-called 'cognitive approach' (Bitchener

& Ferris, 2012: 12). On the other hand, in the same period other researchers like Semke in 1980 and 1984, Hendrickson 1981, Lalande 1982, Rob and al. 1986, Connor & Lunsford 1988 and Kepner in 1992 paid attention to the use of WCF and its effectiveness and the way the errors were handled by language teachers (this is notably the case for the study of Connor & Lunsford in 1988).

In the two following subsections, some theories and hypotheses put forward by the different researchers mentioned above will be discussed.

4.2.2.1 Cognitive research

As early as the 1980s, some cognition specialists began to stress the importance of the autonomy of the learner, i.e. they considered the learner to be an independent person who can determine his or her own progress in the target language even though his or her social background can be an obstacle sometimes (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 12).

Before getting to the heart of the matter, it is important to discuss models that had a huge impact on the McLaughlin' (1987) and Anderson's (1993) own models, namely the Information processing models (*ibid.*). According to Bitchener and Ferris, "These models see SLA as a building up of knowledge systems that can eventually be called on automatically by learners" (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 12).

4.2.2.1.1 McLaughlin's model

McLaughlin's model is based on the principle that information is first processed in a controlled way and that the learner, through exercises and practice of the target language, then moves towards automatization (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 13). The controlled stage is to be found in or connected to what he called the "*short-term memory (STM)*" while the 'automatized stage' is to be linked to the "*long-term memory (LTM)*" (*ibid.*). It seems quite logical because when L2 learners are learning new items of the target language, it first implies control from the learners, who momentarily have to mobilize some information nodes that are in their memory for the new items/structure they are learning (*ibid.*). Then, the new structures/items, which were originally in the short-term memory, can progressively be stored as new configurations in the long-term memory through repeated exercises and practice, which will therefore make them available very quickly whenever the learners need them without great control from them (*ibid.*). In other words, "*learning is seen as the movement from controlled to automatic processing via practice*" (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 13).

However, McLaughlin argues that learners must first start with simple sub-skills before more complex ones become automatized in their so-called long-term memory (*ibid.*).

Unlike his predecessor (i.e. Krashen), McLaughlin states that written corrective feedback has a real function/role in the ‘controlled system’: thanks to WCF and through practice of the target language, the L2 learners will be able to use correct structures and forms in a more automatic manner (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 13).

4.2.2.1.2 Anderson’s model

Anderson's model (i.e. “Adaptative Control of Thought”), published in 1993 is of the same vein as his predecessor’s (i.e. McLaughlin) as he also believes that there is a shift from ‘control’ to ‘automatization’ (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 13). However, his model differs somewhat from McLaughlin's in that he uses two different terms, namely “*declarative knowledge* (knowledge that)” instead of the so-called ‘control stage’ and “*procedural knowledge* (knowledge how)” instead of ‘the automatized stage’ (*ibid.*).

As with McLaughlin, the overriding question is whether the shift from “declarative” to “procedural knowledge” in L2 learners’ cognitive system is possible (*ibid.*, 13-14). This question is paramount for both McLaughlin and Anderson, because if this shift is not possible, then the role of the teachers’ instructions and WCF is undermined and will therefore prove Krashen’s point (*ibid.*, 13-14).

Anderson claimed in 1993 that this shift was obviously possible thanks to the three steps that he developed in the late 20th century: “the cognitive stage” (i.e. descriptions, explanations of a phenomenon are taught and learned), “the associative stage” (i.e. a technic for the application of the competence is developed) and lastly, “the autonomous stage” (i.e. the competence is acquired and can easily be put into practice by the learners) (*ibid.*, 14).

Many scholars from the eighties and nineties supported Anderson’s model and even claimed that “controlled activities, including instruction and corrective feedback, can facilitate the conversion of declarative knowledge into automatized procedural knowledge” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 14). Nevertheless, DeKeyser claimed in 1997 that little empirical research confirmed that repeated practice of a second language could actually have a gradual impact on the learners’ knowledge of the target language (DeKeyser, 2003 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 14).

4.2.2.1.3 Pienemann's model

Pienemann's model differs from that of the two theorists mentioned above. Pienemann was mainly interested in the issues that L2 learners are confronted with during the transition from 'control/declarative knowledge' to 'automatism/procedural knowledge' (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 15).

In much of his research, he developed what he called the "teachability hypothesis" (*ibid.*), which is based on the idea that teachers must actually be aware of their learners' current level and of where they are in the acquisition process so that language teachers can be "confident in their decisions based on their knowledge about learners' readiness in acquiring specific linguistic features" (Ziafar & Namaziandost, 2019: 14). According to Pienemann, the teachability of language is restricted by what the L2 learners are willing and prepared to acquire (Pienemann, 1989 in Ziafar & Namaziandost, 2019: 12). In other words, as expressed in Bitchener and Ferris' book:

In his teachability hypothesis, Pienemann (1981, 1987, 1989, 1998) explained that grammar instruction can only be effective if it is provided when the learner is at a stage in his/her interlanguage that is close to the point when it could be acquired naturally. He adds that an L2 learner cannot progress if one stage is missing and that teaching can be constrained by the stage a learner is at. (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 15)

We can notice that both McLaughlin's and Anderson's models explain that learning and acquisition of a second language can take place when enough input and WCF are provided in the controlled declarative knowledge phase (*ibid.*, 15) and only then is this passage from declarative knowledge to procedural knowledge possible, which is then automated through many tools such as practice (*ibid.*). However, as Pienemann explains, information forms and structures can be moved from the first system to the other if the learners are cognitively ready (*ibid.*).

Finally, it would seem that McLaughlin, Anderson and Pienemann claim that practice and written corrective feedback are essential in this progress/transition between the two systems but all of them are quite implicit about the role and usefulness of WCF in the learners' progress.

4.2.2.2 Social-cultural perspective

Before reviewing various research on the role and effectiveness of WCF, there is one last important point to be covered in the further development of cognitive research, namely the socio-cultural aspect.

The social-cultural theory based on the studies of the Russian psychologist Vygotsky mainly focuses on the role of communication between two speakers in the acquisition of a second language (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 18). It is based on the fact that any ‘cognitive development’ - and hence language progress of the learners - is actually the outcome of their conversations with more advanced learners (*ibid.*). Many researchers will exploit Vygotsky’s theories in the 21st century.

What emerged in the years 80-90 in connection with the socio-cultural perspective is called the “*Activity theory*” (Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Leontiev, 1981 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 19). In this theory, scholars pay attention to the individual objectives that the learners set themselves when undertaking individual tasks: some learners focus on accuracy while others pay more attention to fluency (*ibid.*). Moreover, the level of knowledge of the L2 learners can also have an impact on the success of the task (*ibid.*).

However, as argued by Bitchener and Ferris, studies on the socio-cultural approach is quite limited at this stage but they may at one point help scholars to understand the role of feedback (*ibid.*).

The essential functions and the role of WCF will be taken into account by other scholars such as Hendrickson 1981, Lalande 1982, Semke 1980, 1984, Rob and al. 1986 and Connor & Lunsford 1988. The analysis of their different research is part of the following section.

4.2.3 Research based on the efficacy and role of WCF

Before the nineties and especially before Truscott's essay and Ferris' research were published, there were already a number of studies on the effectiveness of WCF and on the use of corrective feedback provided by teachers. Although the number of studies on WCF will rise after 1996, it seems important to analyse the few studies dating from the late 20th century in order to understand how this method was seen by theorists and researchers at that time.

4.2.3.1 Scholars in favour of WCF before the nineties

Be it in the 70's, 80's, 90's or in the 21st century, it can be noticed that regardless of the decade, it has always been very difficult to find a consensus concerning the usefulness of WCF. This sub-section will first deal with some specialists’ studies whose results show that the use of corrective feedback should be maintained.

4.2.3.1.1 Lalande's study in 1982

Like two other research works which will be discussed later, namely Connors' and Lunsford's, Lalande's study on crucial theories about WCF was described by Ferris in 2015 as ahead of those of his colleagues and had an important impact on many subsequent research and on written corrective feedback given to L2 learners (Ferris, 2015: 538).

In 1982, Lalande argued that to be able to progress in the second language acquisition and to be more accurate in their writings, L2 learners need to be provided with WCF (*ibid.*, 539). He even claimed that in order to be useful, the corrections must be given regularly, and they cannot be made in an unplanned manner (*ibid.*). Furthermore, learners must also be active in their writing progress and therefore, take part in the correction process (*ibid.*). To quote Lalande: "Making students aware, in an ongoing manner, of the written errors they make also facilitates this guided learning process." (Lalande, 1982 in Ferris, 2015: 539).

As a result of his study conducted in the early 1980s, he found out that the learners who received indirect feedback combined with only direct feedback for 'lexical errors' and an "Error Awareness Sheet" (i.e. "a chart that tallied the errors in the various categories across all writing assignments." (Ferris, 2015: 539)) produced significantly fewer errors than the controlled group that was just provided with a direct correction (*ibid.*). Moreover, it did not observe a short-term difference but a long-term one, as the improvement in writing was confirmed over a whole semester for L2 learners who received indirect written corrective feedback (*ibid.*). In addition, only the L2 learners who received indirect WCF and who used the list, understood the purpose of rewriting activities (*ibid.*, 539-540).

According to Ferris, Lalande's study is worth discussing, since it foregrounds various types of written corrective feedback, namely focused corrective feedback, direct and indirect WCF, the latter having his preference (*ibid.*, 540). Furthermore, learners are more engaged in the correction (Leki 1991; Ferris & Roberts 2001; Ferris 2006; Ferris et al. 2013 in Ferris, 2015: 540). Moreover, one of the stages of his study (i.e. asking the L2 learners to rewrite their texts after the teacher's correction) was analysed by other researchers who regarded it as "an important step to ensuring both immediate uptake and long-term retention of CF" (Ferris, 2015: 540). In addition, Ferris claims that "Finally, Lalande's inclusion of the error awareness chart to give students further information about their progress laid the groundwork for future studies of the effects of error logs on students' writing development" (Roberts 1999; Ferris 2006 in Ferris, 2015: 540).

However, as will be noted in this MA, these somewhat crucial aspects of WCF will only be fully analysed and debated many years after Lalande's study, in particular by Ellis in 2009

and by Ellis, Sheen, Murakami & Takashima in 2008. As far as the revision of the written texts is concerned, it will be dealt with by Chandler as well as Ferris and Roberts in the beginning of the 21st century.

4.2.3.1.2 Connors and Lunsford in 1988

We should not consider looking into WCF such as it was seen in the eighties without dwelling on two renowned scholars, namely Connors and Lunsford. These two scholars were published in several journals (i.e. *College Composition, Communication* and *The Modern Language Journal*) in the late eighties and their contribution to the research on WCF is substantial “in their respective fields of composition studies and applied linguistics.” (Ferris, 2015: 531). Their research was based on what is called 'composition studies' (i.e. studies where researchers typically collect a “large corpus of student writing and examine, categorise and quantify patterns of writing error found in these texts” (Ferris, 2015: 532).

As argued by Ferris in 2015, these two scholars were ahead of their time with this type of research, since the resources available in the fields of “corpus linguistics and computational linguistics” were very limited and not very accessible (*ibid.*, 535).

While analysing written errors produced by students in their written tasks, the two specialists showed an interest in the teachers' way of correcting these errors, in the way they give feedback because this aspect had been sorely lacking in this field of research for many years (*ibid.*, 532-534).

We became interested in error-frequency research as a result of our historical studies, when we realized that no major nationwide analysis of actual college essays had been conducted, to our knowledge, since the late 1930s... we determined to collect a large number of college student essays from the 1980s, analysed them, and determine what the major patterns of formal and mechanical error in current student writing might be. (Connors & Lunsford, 1988 in Ferris, 2015: 534)

The primary goal of these researchers was to understand the types of errors that students made in the United States in the 1980s (*ibid.*, 534). They did not want to rely on their intuitions but on a database, they developed from 21.500 documents received by a very large number of language teachers and from which they subsequently created “a stratified random sample of 3000 student papers” (Connors & Lunsford, 1988 in Ferris, 2015: 534). Thanks to this sample, they were able to carry out their research and to develop their own “taxonomy” of the most frequent written errors (based on 300 articles from their large corpus) (*ibid.*).

At the end of their so-called compositional research, they reported interesting findings. Firstly, the teachers' criteria for correction were very unstable and sometimes contradictory: on the one hand, they seemed to correct on the one hand errors labelled as serious and on the other hand, errors that were considered easy to correct and to explain (*ibid.*, 534-535). As far as the L2 learners' performance is concerned, they observed a difference in the nature of the written errors (i.e. more spelling errors were made than in the beginning of the 20th century) (*ibid.*, 535). Nevertheless, the frequency of the number of errors remained unchanged (*ibid.*).

As Ferris pointed out in her article, Connors and Lunsford's study deserves attention (*ibid.*, 536). She claims that their findings can be used by language teachers among others, since it can help to recognize structures and items which need to be mastered (*ibid.*).

4.2.3.2 *Scholars who saw no gain of WCF*

Subsequent research shows that written corrective feedback does not help learners to improve their writing accuracy. These studies were notably used by Truscott in 2007 in his study entitled *The effect of error correction on learners' ability to write accurately* to prove that what he claimed in 1996 (i.e. abandonment of WCF) had already been demonstrated previously.

4.2.3.2.1 *Semke's studies in 1980 and 1984*

In 1980 and 1984, Semke conducted a 10-week research about the effectiveness of feedback (Truscott, 2007: 260). In order to investigate its efficacy, this scholar used several types of corrective feedback (i.e. "direct correction, coded feedback with self-correction by students, comments on content only, and a combination of direct correction and comments on content") (Truscott, 2007: 260) to see whether any of them led to greater gains in terms of writing accuracy than no correction at all (i.e. in Semke's study, for what is called 'control group' comments on content was not considered as a type of corrective feedback) (*ibid.*). The results of this research showed that there was no difference in writing accuracy between L2 learners who received one of the three types and those who were only provided with comments (*ibid.*). In other words, on the basis of this study, written corrective feedback is seen as useless (*ibid.*). Semke's research is used by Truscott in one of his published articles to underline the necessity to give up the use of WCF: "I suggest that these results actually understate the failure of correction" (Truscott, 2007: 260).

Moreover, in a following study published in 1984, Semke discovered that direct correction had a negative impact "on both quality of the subsequent compositions and on the

student attitudes towards writing in the foreign language” (Semke, 1984 in Robb, Ross & Shortreed, 1986: 84-85).

4.2.3.2.2 Rob, Ross & Shortreed’s study in 1996

Like Semke’s research, a study carried out by Rob, Ross and Shortreed showed that there was actually no difference in writing accuracy following four types of correction; namely, indirect corrective feedback with code, direct corrective feedback, correction highlighting the written errors and writing in the margins the number of errors in each line, which incidentally was not considered as a real type of feedback (i.e. the group of students who was provided with this latter information was for that reason called the control group) (Truscott, 2007: 261).

In other words, as the three scholars claim in their article “an examination of the mean scores for each of the feedback groups suggests that the assumption underlying overt correction—that more correction results in more accuracy—was not convincingly demonstrated” (Robb, Ross & Shortreed, 1986: 88).

Moreover, these researchers also claim in their study, entitled *Saliency of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality*, that foreign language teachers spend too much time correcting L2 learners’ errors but, since whatever the type of feedback used, there is no significant difference in writing accuracy improvement, L2 teachers should actually make use of less time-consuming feedback or methods when it comes to correcting surface errors and use this spared time to tackle more important writing issues in the L2 learners’ productions (*ibid.*, 91).

4.3 Studies since 1996

Before the publication of Truscott in 1996, many specialists had already looked at the errors made by the L2 learners and WCF, more precisely at the different types of feedback and their usefulness in helping learners of a second language to progress. Some scholars were in favour of WCF and others did not believe that it could actually help the learners to understand their errors and to become better writers. However, it was not until Truscott's attempt in 1996 that WCF as a whole was called into question.

As noted by Ferris in the article entitled *Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA*, the publication of Truscott's essay on the total abandonment of WCF gave rise to more questions and more debate about its use and efficacy (Ferris, 2010: 185).

4.3.1 Truscott's criticism of WCF

For many decades (from 1911 to 1996) WCF was considered as a practice to be used by language teachers who wanted to help their students to improve their writing accuracy. As argued by Truscott “Teachers and researchers hold a widespread, deeply entrenched belief that grammar correction should, even must, be part of writing courses.” (Truscott, 1996: 327).

Although until then WCF had hardly ever been questioned or seen in a very negative way either explicitly or implicitly, Truscott's essay published in 1996 turned many theories, research and conclusions upside down.

In his essay published in the late 20th century, Truscott highlighted a number of aspects that led him to publish an article outlining his quite negative vision of written corrective feedback. According to him, grammar correction cannot be handled in a trivial way and whether this method is necessary or not, it is the responsibility of the teacher/researcher to do some research and prove whether or not it can be used (*ibid.*, 328).

He has observed that most teachers/researchers feel that they should not question articles that promote the use of WCF and that they should ignore academic articles, studies and research that doubt its effectiveness or its damaging effects on L2 learners (*ibid.*, 327-328).

Truscott seems aware that it is not easy for language teachers to question and go against researchers in favour of WCF and to accept the fact that ‘grammar correction’ should be abandoned; an overwhelming majority of them (i.e. language teachers) seems to believe that it helps L2 learners, which Truscott endeavours to refute. (Truscott, 1996: 341). He argued in his 1996 publication and subsequent articles, i.e. in 2007 and 2008, that not only was the academic literature on that subject matter lacking in critical studies highlighting issues caused by this type of correction, but it also showed a tendency to avoid considering its negative aspects on the learners' progress and teachers' correction methods (i.e. it is time-consuming, it takes a lot of energy) (*ibid.*, 328). To quote Truscott: “They [researchers] (my addition) assume that grammar correction must be used in writing classes, regardless of the problems it creates; this assumption is very rarely discussed seriously” (Truscott, 1996: 328).

This does not mean that studies proving the usefulness of the correction or favouring it should be forgotten or dismissed (*ibid.*, 329). According to Truscott, the problem is that they do not try to prove that the arguments put forward by researchers opposed to WCF are wrong (i.e. researchers in favour of grammar correction do not provide any compelling evidence that WCF makes L2 learners better writers.) (*ibid.*, 338). For instance, in his essay, he highlights the fact that some previous studies take the efficacy of WCF as given (e.g. Higgs in 1979 and Gaudiani in 1981) (*ibid.*).

As Bitchener wrote in his article *Evidence in support of written corrective feedback* in 2008, Truscott was not the sole scholar to express suspicions about the efficacy of WCF (Bitchener, 2008: 102). Indeed, Bitchener mentioned Ferris (1999) who - just like Truscott - highlighted the fact that very little research really looked at the question of its effectiveness (*ibid.*).

Before analysing Truscott's argument and study, it seems important to understand what he actually means by grammar correction. To quote Truscott:

I mean correction of grammatical errors for the purpose of improving a student's ability to write accurately. This correction comes in many forms but for present purposes such distinctions have little significance, simply because there is no reason to think any of the variations should be used in writing classes. (Truscott, 1996: 329)

In his article published 2007, he specified that grammar correction did not include errors that are considered as spelling errors which can be easily corrected (Truscott, 2001 in Truscott, 2007: 258). Moreover, he stated that the purpose of grammar correction is "to improve a student's ability to write accurately" (*ibid.*, 329).

Even though he claims on several grounds that grammar correction is counterproductive and only leads to pseudolearning (*ibid.*, 345-347), that it has no place in foreign language courses and should therefore be abandoned, he makes it clear that he does not reject the importance of what he calls grammatical accuracy and that he does not totally dismiss feedback as a teaching practice (*ibid.*, 329). This is also reflected in its 2007 and 2008 studies.

In order to prove that foreign language teachers should stop using WCF and believing that correction is somehow indispensable in the teaching of a language, the author relied on several studies and researchers' findings (Truscott, 1996).

Initially, Truscott focused on a few studies whose main focus was the so-called grammar correction in the mother tongue (L1) (*ibid.*, 329-330). In the 1980s, researchers such as Knoblauch & Brannon in 1981 and Hillocks, 1986 made a point that correction had a negligible impact on the writing progress of learners in their mother tongue (*ibid.*, 329-330). Truscott made it clear in his essay that one cannot arguably conclude that what is applicable or proven to be true for L1 is necessarily true for L2 and vice versa (*ibid.*, 330). However, thanks to further research (i.e. on foreign language) he was able to prove that for both L1 and L2, grammatical correction is of no use (*ibid.*, 333-334).

In an article published in 2005, Bitchener Young and Cameron wrote that Truscott used a number of studies that at the time were already going against the use of correction/feedback

(Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 192). Later in 2007, Truscott will once again refer to the same studies to back his new arguments (Truscott, 2007: 259-263). For instance, Semke in 1980 and 1984 found out “no significant differences in accuracy between the three correction groups and the comments group” (Semke, 1980, 1984 in Truscott, 2007: 260). Rob, Ross and Shortreed in 1986 did not find any difference between the diverse types of correction and no correction at all (*ibid*: 261).

It can be noticed that although he often used the same researchers to prove his drop-out theory of WCF, he picked out some biased studies proving his points. For instance, in his 1996 essay, Truscott used Frantzen & Rissel’s 1987 study, in which they concluded that with direct corrective feedback, some L2 learners could not always understand the teacher’s explanations (Truscott, 1996: 332). In his 2007 essay, he made use of Frantzen’s 1995 research, in which this scholar declared that there was “no significant differences between the groups on accuracy in their essays, despite the dramatic differences in grammar treatments, and concluded that a content course, without grammar, is sufficient for accuracy in writing, at least in this case.” (Frantzen, 1995 in Truscott, 2007: 263).

Among Truscott’s many studies questioning WCF, two seem to have received more attention, which Bitchener also observed in 2008, namely Kepner’s and Sheppard’s (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 192; Truscott, 1996: 331-334). Like Sheppard in 1992, Kepner found no reason to keep on using WCF, since according to them, it does not help to improve the L2 learners’ writing accuracy (*ibid.*).

It seems that Truscott knew from the start that his essay was going to be criticized in one way or another by researchers in favour of WCF notably by Roberts, Bitchener, Ellis a few years later but more importantly by Ferris in 1999. That is why Truscott decided in his 1996 essay to demonstrate that some studies in favour of WCF should be challenged, since many factors “could have influenced the results of the experiments” and therefore the likelihood that the feedback is useful (*ibid.*, 334). These factors are, among others, the existence of different learners groups having different levels (Spanish, German learners among others), the use different types of feedback (i.e. direct, indirect, focused, unfocused feedback), the examination of the long term effect (i.e. what happened after the studies), the use of authentic texts (i.e. real written texts in contrast to Cardelle and Corno’s 1981 study, in which exercises, questions about grammar were used), the use of several linguistic items (i.e. lexical errors, verbal errors), the inclusion of complex forms, etc. (Truscott, 1996: 334-340). However, the scholar also explained that some aspects affecting WCF efficiency “such as gender, age, educational

background, aptitude, field-independence, tolerance for ambiguity, anxiety” (Truscott, 1996: 336) are more difficult to be controlled in both pro and against WCF studies (*ibid.*).

However, it should be noted that Truscott admits that attention must always be paid to the level of the learner and to the stage of learning he/she is (Truscott, 1996: 337, 353). He argues that some scholars found WCF unnecessary because they did not take the learner’s level into consideration (*ibid.*). To quote Truscott:

This raises the possibility that the corrections used in the research described above failed because they did not respect these sequences (i.e. taking the L2 learners’ level into consideration when providing WCF) [my addition]: Teachers corrected students on grammar points for which they were not yet ready. (Truscott, 1996: 337)

If the teacher corrects a form or any linguistic aspect that has not yet been taught or fully understood and assimilated by the student, then the feedback is useless and one might conclude too quickly that the feedback should therefore be abandoned (Truscott, 1996: 337). As he argues in his essay: “Thus, the failure of grammar correction in the research could be due to lack of concern with timing. However, the significance of this possibility is limited” (*ibid.*). Nonetheless, there is no proof that actually shows that “timed correction” is efficient (*ibid.*).

Truscott also argues that acquiring a language or certain linguistic forms is an extremely complex process (*ibid.*, 342). As Krashen, McLaughlin and Pienemann have already shown, there are many theories about language learning from a cognitive perspective, so according to Truscott, teachers find themselves somewhat helpless in the face of all these theories and tend to believe and follow their (primary false) intuitions that the acquisition of any linguistic item takes place mainly through the correction of errors, thus through a “transfer of knowledge from teacher to student” (*ibid.*). This is an observation that had already been made not only by the above-mentioned researchers but also by Long in 1977 and 1991; “The acquisition of a grammatical structure is a gradual process, not a sudden discovery as the intuitive view of correction would imply” (Long, 1977; 1991 in Truscott, 1996: 342). Moreover, according to Schwartz’s hypothesis, depending on the error that has been made, different methods could actually be used by the language teacher during correction (Schwartz, 1993 in Truscott, 1996: 343).

After proving at length that grammatical correction is not useful (i.e. no difference between students who received feedback and those who did not; students who did not receive feedback outperformed those who did), Truscott states that it only leads to pseudolearning, that is counterproductive creating many practical problems (Truscott, 1996; 345-347).

According to Truscott, correction is a real burden for teachers, since they have to follow a series of criteria in order for the correction to be fully understood by the pupils (*ibid.*, 349). Furthermore, the language teachers have to spot the error, which is not necessarily easy for every teacher (i.e. Cohen and Cavalcanti's 1990 study) (Truscott, 1996: 349-350). Then, they have to make out why this error has been made and how to correct it properly, which implies a very good comprehension of the linguistic theories of the target language (*ibid.*, 349-350). If they cannot do that, they might provide their L2 learners with unclear and maybe incorrect explanations (*ibid.*, 350). Furthermore, it takes a lot of time, motivation and patience from the teachers to go through all these steps for each copy (*ibid.*). This aspect of time is also stressed in other scientific articles such as Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick's studies. They argue that:

For these researchers (e.g. Freeman and Lewis in 1998) [my addition], the way forward is to ensure that feedback is provided in a timely manner (close to the act of learning production), that it focuses not just on strengths and weaknesses but also on offering corrective advice, that it directs students to higher order learning goals and that it involves some praise alongside constructive criticism. (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 9)

Furthermore, for a grammatical correction to be effective, not only the teachers must be consistent, take the level and the progress of each learner into account but the pupils must also be motivated and involved in their learning, which is unfortunately not always the case (Truscott, 1996: 351-352). On the other hand, some of the pupils might not understand the correction or might not be willing to look closely at it (Radecki & Swales, 1988 in Truscott, 1996: 352) and their enthusiasm generally might not last very long (Truscott, 1996: 352).

One of the solutions to the above-mentioned problems that has often been put forward by researchers in favour of WCF is the so-called "focused WCF" (*ibid.*). In contrast to the unfocused WCF, the focused/selective written feedback is greatly favoured and recommended by many scholars (e.g. Ferris, Ellis, Mao and Crosthwaite, Lee among others). The work of Ferris clearly indicates that, for practical reasons, it is better to opt for this particular type and to give up 'comprehensive feedback' because the latter is time consuming, thus teachers are more likely to be quickly swamped with work (Ferris, 2007: 170). Besides, their L2 learners can easily be frustrated by the large amount of information provided (*ibid.*).

However, according to Truscott, 'focused feedback' does not help, since even if teachers use it, they are still facing many other issues such as knowing the "developmental stages" of each learner, being able to pinpoint each crucial, relevant error, explain the correct use, being consistent, etc. (Truscott, 1996: 353).

In many articles (i.e. Chandler in 2003, Bitchener, Young & Cameron in 2005 and Bitchener in 2008 and Ferris in 2010 among others), it is said that Truscott defines feedback as damaging without really telling why. That is why it is necessary to pick up on to Truscott's essay to understand what he means by 'damaging'.

Truscott points out that learners are more likely to learn and progress when they are morally happy (Truscott, 1996: 354). Indeed, it is never easy to realise that what you have produced is wrong, incorrect without being discouraged (*ibid.*). This effect of red ink that covers a large part of the written production was highlighted not only by Truscott but also by Storch & Wigglesworth (2010) in Lee's article in 2013. Although several years separate the two publications and even though these researchers do not share the same vision of correction/corrective feedback, they all agree that too much red can totally demoralise and dishearten students (Truscott, 1996: 354; Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010 in Lee 2013: 109). However, Storch & Wigglesworth made that point in order to highlight the value of selective feedback (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2010 in Lee 2013: 109).

As claimed by Truscott in 1996, 'grammar correction' can have perverse effects. Truscott argues that if language teachers continue to use this method of correction, L2 learners might start shirking some complicated structures likely to lead to errors in order to avoid being disheartened once again by red comments on their written texts (Truscott, 1996: 355). As argued by Truscott in 1996 and 2007, pupils or students may end up writing shorter and straightforward sentences (Truscott, 1996: 355). This was demonstrated nineteen years ago by Skehan and Foster, who showed that learners tend to favour elements that they know and master over more complex or new elements of the target language (Skehan & Foster, 2001 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 63). In 2007, Truscott reinforced his opinion by citing several studies backing his theory (e.g. Schachter, 1974; Kepner, 1991; Semke, 1980 and Sheppard, 1992) and by stating that learners use linguistic items and forms with which they are familiar and only use more complex ones when they are compelled to do so or when they feel more trustful (Truscott, 2007: 268).

According to him, WCF forces the learners to mask the gaps in their writing skills in their next written tasks (Truscott, 2007: 268). As he claims: "Writers who come to use such strategies (i.e. paraphrasing) [my addition] are no doubt learning to avoid some error types, but this does not mean they are becoming better writers, in any sense" (Truscott, 2007: 269).

This vision about avoidance and WCF will be challenged by Bitchener & Ferris' book in 2012. Many studies published in the first decade of the 21st century reveal that corrective

feedback, more specifically oral feedback, might actually help to acquire more specific forms of the target language (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 63).

Truscott claim that WCF is a waste of time not only for the teachers (i.e. it is unnecessary and this time should be devoted to more useful aspects of a foreign language), but also for the L2 learners (Truscott, 1996: 355). The scholar argued in 1996 that learners who are actively involved in their learning and who take their teacher's feedback into account will spend too much time on the correction for no particular gain (*ibid.*).

Another point of similarity between teachers and students is that like teachers, students believe that being corrected and receiving feedback is essential to progress in the acquisition of written language (*ibid.*). Learners may not like receiving corrected texts, but they still ask their language teachers to provide feedback, since they believe it is helpful (*ibid.*, 359). This was notably discussed by Ferris and Roberts in 2001. They claimed that many previous researchers proved that L2 learners want and as for corrective feedback (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 166). Furthermore, thanks to their survey, Ferris and Roberts demonstrated that "No student said that they did not want errors corrected by their teacher." (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 177).

Other factors such as tradition (i.e. WCF has always been used in the teachers' practice), teachers' beliefs and countless studies in favour of written correction have come into play, prompting Truscott to state that the idea of 'fossilization' can account for the use of grammar correction (Truscott, 1996: 358).

Regarding the learners, Truscott claims that the best way to help them is to cease making use of correction and change their beliefs about it (*ibid.*, 359-360). In his essay, he argues that it is not easy because of the countless reasons mentioned above, but teachers have to show the learners that they do not need WCF to progress in their writing accuracy (*ibid.*). He even proves this by referring to some studies (e.g. Semke's, Kepner's, Sheppard's studies) in which the control groups were at first baffled and troubled by the privation of any types of correction, however, this feeling did not last very long and they even went on learning the second language and making progress (*ibid.*, 359).

Notwithstanding his position set out in his 1996 publication, in 2007 Truscott summarized studies that proved the usefulness of WCF. However, according to him, these studies are rather limited because they do not contain what are commonly called 'control groups' (Truscott, 2007: 263). He argues that only research including control groups demonstrates the effectiveness of WCF:

Some studies have not included control groups, instead looking only at absolute gains made by groups receiving correction. The limits of such evidence are clear: in the absence of a control

group, one cannot determine whether observed gains resulted from correction or from other factors. Thus, even if corrected students consistently showed significant improvement in their accuracy, this finding in itself would tell us nothing about the value of correction. (Truscott, 2007: 263)

He concludes his 2007 article by re-affirming that studies with control groups prove that WCF does not help and is even damaging (*ibid.*, 270). He also states that even though some studies have tried to demonstrate its effectiveness, there are very few of them. Therefore, teachers should stop utilizing WCF (*ibid.*).

It is only one year later, in 2008, that together with Yi-ping Hsu, they conducted a study with forty-seven participants, separated in two distinct groups (i.e. one ‘experimental group’ and one ‘control group’) to find out whether WCF could actually help learners to reduce errors when editing their corrected written texts and so, become better writers (Truscott & Yi-ping Hsu, 2008, 292).

As result of their study, they discovered that L2 learners benefit from WCF when they are rewriting the corrected texts and that the positive impact is quite consequential (*ibid.*, 299).

Nonetheless, they also demonstrated that this positive effect was only temporary; there was no difference between students who reviewed their texts and those who did not one week later (*ibid.*). Truscott argues that: “These findings, in themselves, do not constitute evidence against the effectiveness of error correction” (Truscott & Yi-ping Hsu, 2008, 299). However, he does not go as far as to recommend the use of WCF (*ibid.*).

4.3.2 Dana Ferris’ view

As Truscott was making a name for himself and his vision (i.e. the uselessness of WCF) in the late nineties with his famous essay, another protagonist in the field of WCF, Dana Ferris, promoted the use of WCF in teaching. Through several studies, sometimes in collaboration, she tried to prove that WCF should be used while clarifying some important points and making out which type of WCF teachers should make use of according to the teaching conditions and the type of learners they are dealing with.

4.3.2.1 Ferris and Roberts in 2001 against Truscott

In contrast to Truscott, who tried to show in numerous studies that WCF should be abandoned for many reasons, Ferris and Roberts stated in 2001 that many studies showed that WCF helped L2 learners to enhance their written accuracy during the so-called self-editing task (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 161).

Truscott stressed the fact that “Researchers (favouring WCF) [my addition] have similarly failed to look critically at the nature of the correction process” (Truscott, 1996: 328). Ever since, other scholars seem to have acknowledged the existence of this issue. For instance, Ferris and Roberts agreed in *Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be?* that there was still some debate about its efficacy and they claimed that some research based on ‘control groups’ (e.g. among others Semke in 1984, Fathman & Whalley in 1990, Kepner in 1991) yielded rather contradictory results (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 162).

However, they also pointed out in 2001 that some studies focusing on the learner’s progress in writing accuracy over a long period of time had showed that students who had been provided with WCF scored better than those who had not and they even argued that the results were quite positive and noteworthy in some of the surveys (*ibid.*).

Even though Truscott, Ferris and Roberts do not share the same vision of WCF, all three agree that feedback can help learners to edit their first written text (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 162-163; Truscott & Yi-ping Hsu, 2008: 299). Ferris and Roberts even quoted studies prior to the publication of Truscott’s study in 2008: “Finally, in our previous study (Ferris et al., 2000; see also Chaney, 1999; Komura, 1999), we found that students were able to successfully edit about 80% of the errors marked by their teachers” (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 163).

Moreover, Truscott claimed in 1996 that teachers mostly failed to make any distinction between several types/categories of errors when correcting (Truscott, 1996: 343). Here again, Ferris and Roberts disagree and prove that language teachers’ reaction tend to differ according to the type of error they encounter:

[I]n the study which preceded this one, we examined the larger subcategories of “treatable” and “untreatable” error, as discussed in Ferris (1999a), finding that teachers were more likely to give indirect feedback to treatable errors and direct feedback to untreatable errors, and that these patterns affected both short- and long-term student progress. (Ferris et al., 2000 in Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 166)

4.3.2.2 Ferris & Roberts’ study

The main aspect of the study, which seems to be missing in many scientific papers, is the clarity/specificity/degree of details of the correction; to what extent must WCF provide detailed information about the error? (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 162). This is an important issue because according to the type of WCF that is used, the impact of WCF on the teacher’s time and energy will be different (*ibid.*). If they provide more information specifying the nature of the error, it takes much more time and as highlighted in many articles such as in Truscott’s in 1996, 2007

or Ferris' in 2007, time is an important factor to take into consideration when correcting writing tasks and providing WCF.

At the end of their study, they stress several findings. Firstly, it is crucial to provide WCF in order for the students to be able to edit their corrected copy (i.e. this finding corroborates Truscott's & Hsu's results in 2008) (*ibid.*, 176). Secondly, the different types of indirect feedback led to some issues. Students had more difficulty in correcting the so-called untreatable errors, even though the participants in their study more easily managed to deal with the word choice than the false structure of their sentences (*ibid.*).

Regarding the time aspect, they demonstrated that if the language teachers' goal is to help their learners to be able to edit their copies, then just indicating the errors is actually sufficient (*ibid.*,177). Consequently, teachers will save time and therefore, as Truscott explained in 1996, they will be able to spend this amount of time dealing with other aspects of the language, which Truscott considered important (Truscott, 1996: 355). However, as noted by Ferris and Hedgcock in 1998, "When giving feedback on student errors, teachers also need to take into account their students' backgrounds, especially their previous English language instruction" (Ferris and Hedgcock in 1998: 206 in Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 167). In other words, the learners' level matters when correcting and providing WCF.

In addition to this crucial aspect (i.e. the level), Ferris and Roberts also argue that a teacher ought sometimes to give ground for the choice of the type of feedback which he or she decides to make use of; "If teachers choose to give students less explicit feedback on their errors, they may need to be prepared to explain and defend this strategy" (Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 178).

The two researchers also add what will mainly be explored by Bitchener: corrective feedback and metalinguistic explanations, also called mini lesson (*ibid.*, 177). They argue that this combination could have long-term effect on the learners' writing exactness (*ibid.*).

At the end of their study, both scholars raise an important point that will be discussed in the 'Teacher's practice' section; providing WCF and improving L2 learner's written accuracy remain major issues, not only for language teachers but also for learners. Bitchener and Ferris claim that identifying issues related to providing WCF is pivotal, as is developing different methods that can be used to help students to make the most of it and eventually progress in the acquisition of a second language (*ibid.*, 179).

4.3.2.3 Dana Ferris and John Truscott

As mentioned earlier in this MA, Ferris and Truscott are two major protagonists in the field of WCF research. The first one demonstrates the efficacy of WCF through numerous studies (which will be amply analysed in the 'Teachers' practice' section) and the second one pleads for the complete abandonment of written correction: “The literature was full of confident assertions-and assumptions-that grammar correction is beneficial and that it must be a part of second-language writing classes.” (Truscott, 1999: 111). “It was simply taken for granted that language teachers correct grammar errors.” (Truscott, 1999: 111).

Unsurprisingly, these two researchers analysed each other's' studies. Ferris decided in 1999 to publish an article showing that Truscott's 1996 essay has many shortcomings. The same year Truscott responded to Ferris' attacks in a new article. Both points of view will be highlighted and analysed.

4.3.2.4 The Truscott vs Ferris debate

4.3.2.4.1 Truscott's and Ferris' points of view about WCF

The first point made by Ferris in 1999 – incidentally, also present in Truscott's 1996 essay– is that the issue of correction of written errors has often divided many researchers (Ferris, 1999: 1; Truscott, 1996: 327-328). In their respective articles, they implicitly argue that despite confusing debates and contradictory articles on WCF, language teachers try to help their students to progress and become better writers (Truscott, 1996; Ferris, 1999). These teachers might find it difficult to provide helpful written correction/written feedback, all the more so as it is time-consuming (Ferris, 1999: 1 Truscott, 1996: 349-352, 355). Although these points are shared by both researchers, it stops there. Indeed, they do not agree on many other meaningful points in the research on WCF.

Even if Ferris is in favour of WCF, she would have hoped to agree with Truscott when analysing his essay (Ferris, 1999: 2) because the correction takes time and energy (*ibid.*). If what Truscott says proves right, then teachers could exploit this precious time differently (Truscott, 1996: 355). Unfortunately, according to Ferris, Truscott is too hasty in his essay (Ferris, 1999: 2). To quote Ferris:

If nothing else, reading Truscott's essay and reviewing the primary sources he cites has highlighted for me the urgent need for new research efforts which utilize a variety of paradigms to examine a range of questions that arise around this important topic. (Ferris, 1999: 2)

Firstly, Ferris points out that he did not clearly define the term error correction (Ferris, 1999: 3-4) Besides, she does not agree with his definition of grammar correction (i.e. “correction of

grammatical errors for the purpose of improving a student's ability to write accurately" (Ferris, 1999: 4) and his claim that WCF is irrelevant whatever its type (Truscott, 1996 in Ferris, 1999: 4). Ferris and other defenders of WCF argue that its efficacy may vary considerably according to the type of correction used (*ibid.*, 4). Obviously, if the teacher makes the wrong choice providing the wrong type of feedback, this will not help learners to progress in written competence at all whereas appropriate written correction will be very useful to the L2 learners (*ibid.*). She even argues that many researchers already demonstrated that "effective error correction" is undoubtedly helpful to some L2 learners (*ibid.*). In order to know whether grammar correction is efficient (e.g. clear 'focused feedback') or not (e.g. 'unfocused feedback'), it is crucial to find out what type of error has been made, which Truscott did not do in his essay (*ibid.*).

To this (i.e. issues regarding the definitions of error and grammar correction) Truscott replies that he has never used the term error correction and moreover, Ferris' criticism on what he calls grammar correction does not concern the definition of this term as such but the fact that he declares that all corrections should be abandoned (Truscott, 1999: 112). However, he agrees that some types of feedback are more troublesome and problematic than others (*ibid.*). To quote Truscott:

Being clear, for example, is inherently better than being misleading, so in this sense clear correction is better than misleading correction. But the strong claim that students benefit from correction when it is clear, consistent, intelligent [...] is another matter. (Truscott, 1999: 112)

Truscott also disagrees with Ferris when she argues that there is plenty of evidence showing that adequate written error correction is helpful (Ferris, 1999: 4 in Truscott, 1999: 112). According to him, some of the mentioned studies (e.g. Ferris, 1995; Ellis, 1998 and Bates & al., 1993) do not clearly prove Ferris' statement, since these studies do not prove the effectiveness of WCF but could instead constitute evidence questioning it (Truscott, 1999: 113). Moreover, Truscott spotted many issues in her published study against his essay: Ferris contradicts herself, some of the cited studies do not prove that WCF is efficient; one study focuses on oral and not on written feedback (i.e. Doughty & Varela in 1998) but "with a strong emphasis on the former" (Truscott, 1999: 113).

Secondly, Ferris argues on various grounds that Truscott cannot draw any firm conclusion or make any form of generalisation about WCF on the basis of his essay (Ferris, 1999: 5). For instance, she raises concerns about the studies cited by Truscott to support his claims: he referred to studies whose subjects are not comparable and in which there is a big

variation among “The research and instructional paradigms” (Ferris, 1999: 5) as well as in the duration of the surveys, the teaching methods, the types of WCF used and also the profiles of the participants (*ibid.*, 4-5). Here, Truscott is in total disagreement with Ferris’. According to him, it makes sense to draw a conclusion or to universalize “when similar results appear in widely differing circumstances, no such explanation is available; the phenomenon is a general one” (Truscott, 1999: 114).

Further in her published article, Ferris also states that when Truscott accuses some researchers of only putting forward studies asserting the usefulness of WCF, he seems to fail to see his own bias; to quote Ferris: “Truscott overstates negative evidence while disregarding research results that contradict his thesis” (Ferris, 1999: 4), “Truscott also overstates research findings that support his thesis (e.g. Kepner in 1991) [my addition] and dismisses out of hand the studies which contradict him” (Ferris, 1999: 5). Here again Truscott disagrees. In his defence, he claims that Ferris in her criticism refers to only one of the many studies he relied on in his essay, namely Kepner’s in 1991 (Truscott, 1999: 114). However, Truscott admits that Kepner’s study is crucial in the debate as to grammar correction is useful for the L2 learners (*ibid.*, 115).

In response to Ferris’ claim that he rejects studies going against his essay, Truscott criticised her for not explaining why he decided to do that in his famous essay (*ibid.*). He did not use Fathman and Whalley’s study published in 1990 because their study was not about the usefulness of WCF (*ibid.*). Moreover, he did not make use of Lalande’s study on the grounds that his results were not correct; in his 1982 study, Lalande states that without grammar correction “the scores of both groups would have gone down because the grammatical complexity of the students’ writing appeared to increase” (Lalande, 1982 in Truscott, 1999: 115). Truscott argues that Lalande’s claim cannot be taken into account when searching for evidence of the usefulness and efficacy of WCF. To quote Truscott:

But there is no reason to accept this assertion, and there is some basis to believe the opposite, that being, without correction, the scores would have gone up as a result of the additional language experience students obtained during the course of the study. (Truscott, 1999: 115)

Thirdly, both scholars do not agree on the efficacy of ‘focused/selective feedback’. While Ferris argues that thanks to this type of feedback, teachers are less overwhelmed and consequently more precise in their feedback (Ferris, 1999: 7), Truscott claims that this type of feedback is, like any other, pointless, since the teachers are still grappling with loads of other issues such as being aware of every “developmental stage” of each learner (Truscott, 1996: 353), being able

to pinpoint each crucial, relevant error, explaining the correct use, being consistent, etc. (*ibid.*, 349-353)

Interestingly, Ferris agrees with some of Truscott's arguments against WCF. According to her, he highlights some aspects that are worth exploring (Ferris, 1999: 5). For instance, she agrees that some linguistic features such as morphological items, lexical items, etc. are not acquired in the same way and therefore, different types of WCF must be used (*ibid.*). She believes that in order for L2 learners to correct themselves they need to be told that doing that is important and they have to be trained to spot and correct frequent errors (*ibid.*). Finally, the language teachers need to explain to them why and how to correct their errors so that they can edit their written tasks (*ibid.*). She also adds that language teachers have to pay attention not only to the different types of language categories (i.e. lexicon, morphology, etc) but also to the "treatable" nature of these errors (*ibid.*, 6). Ferris explains that the so-called treatable errors "occur in a patterned, rule-governed way" (Ferris, 1999a in Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 166) and untreatable errors are errors for which "There is no handbook or set of rules students can consult to avoid or fix those types of errors" (Ferris, 1999a in Ferris & Roberts, 2001: 166). She argues that to handle the untreatable errors, it is not possible to adopt the same methods as with treatable errors (Ferris, 1999: 6). Therefore, she established another procedure for the teachers so that they can more easily give feedback on this kind of written error, namely a mix of "strategy training and direct correction" (Ferris, 1999: 6). To quote Ferris:

Most systems advocated in writing textbooks and editing handbooks seem based on the assumption that "one size fits all" and that marking "wc" (for word choice) is the same as marking "vt" (for verb tense)-ignoring the important fact that for the latter type of error, there are rules to consult, while the former type of error has none. (Ferris, 1999: 6)

Ferris also shares Truscott's view that teachers have to meet a series of criteria in order for the correction to be understood by the pupils (Truscott, 1996: 349-354 in Ferris, 1999: 6). The thing is that teachers are sometimes unable to provide suitable WCF (Ferris, 1999: 6). Nevertheless, Ferris states this problem can easily be sorted out if teachers are given the opportunity to attend practical and theoretical classes during which they will be better trained and prepared for the task of providing WCF (*ibid.*).

Furthermore, according to Truscott and Ferris, for a grammatical correction to be completely effective, the learners must also be motivated and actively involved in the learning process (Truscott, 1996: 351; Ferris, 1999: 6). However, it is not always the case; some of them might not understand the correction or they are not prepared to have a look at it (Truscott, 1996:

352-353; Ferris, 1999: 6). She suggests that the teachers should make their learners more aware of the importance of being accurate in their writing and of being able to edit their texts (Ferris, 1999: 7). This skill needs to be developed for the learners to become more autonomous in their foreign language development (Bates, Lane, & Lange, 1993; Ferris, 1995c; Reid, 1997 in Ferris, 1999: 7).

Finally, Ferris thinks that there are many other reasons why WCF should not be abandoned: learners like being provided with WCF and teachers believe that if they do not correct, in other words if they do not provide their pupils/students with WCF, they might feel frustrated, which can have a negative impact on their morale (Ferris, 1999: 8). She also argues that not correcting frequent and serious errors might penalise the students in their future education. (*ibid.*). Lastly, it seems obvious that without WCF or any other types of correction, students will never really understand why it is so crucial to improve their so-called “editing skills” and as a result, they might never be able to improve their written production (*ibid.*).

However, despite Ferris’ criticism and arguments, Truscott sticks to his theory and reiterates in his article published three years later (i.e. in 1999) as a response to Ferris’ statements that teachers and learners should both stop believing that WCF will help learners progress and become better writers (Truscott, 1996: 359-360; Truscott, 1999: 116). He even goes further than that mentioning the existence of a vicious circle “By using correction, teachers encourage students to believe in it; because students believe in it, teachers must continue using it” (Truscott, 1999: 116). Unlike Ferris, who claims that failing to provide learners with correction will have a perverse impact on their feelings, Truscott argues that thanks to his first-hand experience as a teacher, he is in position to prove that Ferris’ statement is false; his students were not mad at him because he decided to stop using ‘grammar correction’ and he even claims that his students were even happier than his previous learners to whom he handed WCF out (*ibid.*).

Regarding one of her last statements in favour of WCF, namely about the usefulness of WCF when students have to edit their written tasks, Truscott already observed in 1996 that this method was indeed helpful during texts revision (Truscott, 1996: 347-349; Truscott, 1999: 117). However, he questions the relevance of her statement; Truscott claims that there are several discrepancies in her article, more specifically regarding the exact role of WCF in the so-called self-editing stage (Truscott, 1999: 117). To quote Ferris:

There is no handbook or set of rules students can consult to avoid or fix those types of errors. Instead, I developed an alternative approach to giving my students feedback about these

“untreatable” errors, a combination of strategy training and direct correction (hoping that the latter would, if nothing else, provide input for acquisition of these idiomatic forms). (Ferris, 1999: 6)

In reference to this quote, Truscott claims that Ferris mixes up two methods, namely WCF (i.e. direct corrective feedback) and the so-called strategy training (Truscott, 1999: 117). Moreover, according to Truscott, Ferris does not discuss the efficacy of WCF in itself but only the efficacy of one particular type of WCF to correct specific errors (*ibid.*).

4.3.2.4.2 Ferris' failures according to Truscott in 1999

Although Ferris criticised many points in Truscott's essay written in 1996, he pointed out in his article published in 1999, that Ferris failed to discuss a number of crucial details concerning WCF (Truscott, 1999: 117).

Firstly, both scholars agree that providing WCF can be a real burden for language teachers but unlike Truscott, who pleads for a total abandon of this practice to sort the issue out, Ferris does not provide any solution; in Truscott's view, she only suggests that teachers should emphasize the importance of taking the corrections into account to ensure that the learners make fewer written errors (*ibid.*).

Secondly, Ferris does not question Truscott's statement about learners' avoidance of new and complex linguistic forms after they have been provided with any type of correction (*ibid.*).

Thirdly, both scholars agree that providing WCF is tiresome and time-consuming (*ibid.*). However, Truscott claims that Ferris makes things even more difficult for teachers arguing that they should pay attention to the level and progress of their learners, that they should have a training, that they should adapt WCF to the type of errors, etc. (*ibid.*, 117-118). Furthermore, Truscott also observes that when Ferris implicitly argues that language teachers have to put in a lot of time and energy to come up with appropriate correction, she does not provide any solution, nor does she discuss Truscott's statement about the potential harmfulness of 'grammar correction' on the learners' time and energy (*ibid.*, 117-118). As quoted by Truscott: “she leaves unchallenged the claim that students who would benefit from grammar correction must also spend a great amount of time and energy on it and that this devotion will detract from other aspects of their learning” (Truscott, 1999: 118)

Finally, Truscott claims that Ferris avoids addressing some sections of his 1996 essay. For instance, in the section entitled “Theoretical problems”, Truscott observes that the acquisition of a foreign language is complex and gradual and that it is not the result of “the

transfer of information from teacher to student” (Truscott, 1996: 342). Moreover, Ferris does not actually take a stand for or against his view about ‘pseudolearning’ (Truscott, 1999: 118).

4.3.2.5 *Their final stance on WCF*

4.3.2.5.1 Ferris’ position

In spite of all Truscott's arguments against the use of WCF by teachers, Ferris’ 1999 article plead for the use of WCF although she admits that further studies are necessary (Ferris, 1999: 9-10). According to her, Truscott wrongly jumps to the conclusion that it is not necessary to do so (Ferris, 1999: 10). To quote Ferris:

Based on limited, dated, incomplete, and inconclusive evidence, he (i.e. Truscott) [my addition] argues for eliminating a pedagogical practice that is not only highly valued by students, but on which many thoughtful teachers spend a great deal of time and mental energy because they feel that helping students to improve the accuracy of their writing is vitally important. (Ferris, 1999: 9)

In her view, language teachers should keep using corrections while paying attention to certain factors such as the level as well as the progress made by the learners, the type of error, the type of feedback that should be used, etc (Ferris, 1999).

4.3.2.5.2 Truscott’s position

Just like Ferris, Truscott stands his ground regarding the inefficacy of the so-called ‘grammar correction’ and its damaging effects on teachers and L2 learners. As he stated in his article in the nineties “the harmful effects of the practice provide a strong case for the opposite position—that correction should be avoided until a convincing case can be made for its use.” (Truscott, 1999: 119).

However, contrary to what Ferris claimed, he denied stating that any type of correction is absolutely useless and ever will be (*ibid.*, 121). In his view, it would be much more sensible to assume that grammatical correction is a method to be avoided in general; however, he does not rule out that in some well-defined situations correction might be necessary but only as a tool (*ibid.*). Moreover, he argues that even if some researchers report positive impacts of correction on the learners’ writing skill, that does not suffice to prove that WCF is efficient and should therefore be used, since there must be much more evidence allowing “to justify the problems that accompany the practice or that these problems can be adequately managed” (Truscott, 1999: 121). Finally, he argues that there are many ongoing debates and research on WCF but for the meantime, teachers are faced with difficult choices when giving written tasks

and thus, providing correction (*ibid.*). He adds that teachers should not ignore these debates, studies and justification for or against the use of correction in classes and in the end, they should make a decision as to how they should help their learners (*ibid.*).

As Truscott claimed in 1999; “The decisions will ultimately be made not by me or by Ferris or by anyone else who writes about this subject, but by individual teachers.” (Truscott, 1999: 121).

4.3.2.6 Results of some recent studies in favour of WCF

Some other famous scholars in this field have already been mentioned in this MA, namely Chandler and Bitchener. It would be interesting to have a closer look at their studies.

4.3.2.6.1 Chandler (2003)

In his article, *The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 writing*, Chandler wrote that to prove his point, Truscott relied on studies showing that WCF does not necessarily help L2 learners to progress and become better writers (e.g. among others Semke in 1984, Kepner in 1991, Sheppard in 1992 and Polio et al.’s in 1998) (Chandler, 2003: 268-269).

On the other hand, according to Chandler, other scholars share the same opinion as Ferris about the efficacy and usefulness of written corrective feedback (e.g. among others Cardelle & Corno in 1981, Ferris in 1997; 2010, Ferris & Roberts in 2001) (Chandler, 2003: 269). Nonetheless, he interestingly points out that the study of Ferris and Roberts in 2001 did not show any consequential divergence between the students whose written tasks were corrected and those who did not receive WCF (*ibid.*, 270). However, he argues that only the study of Ferris & Roberts in 2001 and Lee in 1997 made use of “control groups that received no error correction” (*ibid.*). However, this will also be the case in subsequent studies such as Bitchener’s 2008 study, which will be analysed in the 4.3.2.4.2 section. Nevertheless, Chandler claims that “Neither of these studies measured the effect of these treatments on the accuracy of student writing over time” (Chandler, 2003: 270).

In conclusion, it appears that there is no consensus about this among scholars: some share Truscott’s opinion and others are of the same mind as Ferris (i.e. WCF is helpful, it makes the learners progress in their writing accuracy).

Although Chandler observes that Ferris and Truscott have different views on WCF, he explicitly says in his article that they both agree that there is a need for more studies, more data

to answer the question “whether error correction can be an effective way to improve the accuracy of L2 writing” (Chandler, 2003: 268).

4.3.2.6.1.1 Chandler’s first study in 2003

In his first study he sought to fill some of the gaps that existed in the area of written correction at the very beginning of the 21st century. He tried to find out whether the correction by the learner of his/her own errors highlighted by the language teacher affects his/her long-term accuracy in his/her future writing tasks (Chandler, 2003: 270). He also devoted attention to the effect of the absence of correction by the learner on the long-term accuracy (*ibid.*). Finally, he also looked into the grammar and vocabulary enhancement of the learners in the following written tasks in both the absence and presence of correction by the learners (*ibid.*).

His study focused on 31 intermediate/advanced East Asian students in “first- or second-year at an American conservatory” (*ibid.*, 271). The group of students was divided into two distinct classes, namely one control group (i.e. they received WCF but they only correct their errors later in the semester) and one experimental group (i.e. they were given WCF and were asked to edit their work before each new written homework) (*ibid.*, 267). All of them were asked to write five assignments over the semester: “over the semester, each student’s goal was to write about 25 pages of autobiographical writing in addition to a book review” (Chandler, 2003: 272). Moreover, Chandler specified that after the study “the teacher provided direct correction for any remaining errors or ones that had been corrected incorrectly” (Chandler, 2003: 273).

At the end of his first study, he demonstrated that providing WCF and asking students/L2 learners to correct their written task helps them (i.e. the L2 learners) to progress in accuracy and fluency (*ibid.*, 279). However, it is noteworthy that both groups enhanced their ‘fluency’ (i.e. the control group and the experimental group) (*ibid.*), which could be explained by the fact that they both had to hand out five homework over the ten-week period (*ibid.*, 272-273). According to Chandler,

mere practice resulted in a significant increase in fluency for both groups; that is, at the end of the semester they were able to write the same amount and kind of text (in the same context of a homework assignment) in much less time, according to self-reports. (Chandler, 2003: 280)

Given the difference between the two groups of participants, Chandler argues that his study demonstrated the usefulness of WCF and that it undermines Truscott’s theory set out in his 1996 essay and his 1999 article (*ibid.*, 279-280).

Chandler concluded his first study stating that not asking L2 learners to correct/edit their written tasks on the basis of the teacher's correction amounts to giving no feedback at all, since the learners do not pay attention to the teacher's feedback and as a result, they do not progress in the writing skill (*ibid.*, 280). By contrast, if these learners are requested to review their written tasks and if they actually do so, the number of written errors in the following written tasks will shrink over time (*ibid.*).

In a nutshell, Chandler claims that practice without correction does not lead to writing enhancement in subsequent tasks (*ibid.*). Besides, he argues in his article that giving L2 students several written tasks over a long period of time (i.e. with over without WCF) helps them to become more fluent (*ibid.*).

4.3.2.6.1.2 Chandler's second study in 2003

After examining the L2 learners' progress in the writing skill thanks to WCF, Chandler paid more attention to the teachers' WCF practice: "Should teachers simply correct the errors or should they mark the errors for student self-correction? If the latter, is it more effective for a teacher to indicate the location or the type of error or both?" (Chandler, 2003., 280).

In this second research, he asked students (i.e. thirty-six in total) from another grade to take part (*ibid.*, 281). However, the results of this study were only based on students who consistently edit their homework on the basis on the teacher's feedback right after receiving it (*ibid.*, 284). Here the students had to write longer texts over the six-month period: forty pages instead of the twenty-five required in the first study (*ibid.*, 281). In contrast with his first study, all the learners were urged to correct their written texts, which guaranteed that all students had read the teacher's comments thoroughly (*ibid.*).

In order to check if the teachers' way of providing feedback can have an impact on learners' accuracy, each of them was provided with four different types of feedback (i.e. direct correction, indirect correction with description, description of the written error only and only underlining) over the whole study but not in the same order. (*ibid.*). To quote Chandler: "It is important to give the treatments in different orders so as not to confound order and type of treatment" (Chandler, 2003: 281). In other words, every student got the four distinctive WCF types after the four assignments (*ibid.*).

The results of his study showed that WCF actually helps L2 learners to improve their writing skill, especially the fluency and exactness (*ibid.*, 284). In other words, both of his studies corroborate Ferris' findings: WCF is efficient and helpful.

Chandler also took other aspects into consideration. Firstly, he tried to find out if there was a link between the number of errors and the quality/richness of the texts (*ibid.*, 285). His findings showed that there was no correlation between the two;

“though the ratings for the final assignment were slightly higher than those for the first” (Chandler, 2003: 285). “Thus there was no evidence that the writing at the end of the course was less interesting or complex, judging from holistic ratings” (Chandler, 2003: 285).

Secondly, he paid attention to the teachers’ most efficient WCF type. According to him, direct corrective feedback, called Correction in Chandler’s study, and Underlining WCF are the two WCF types that led to a more substantial writing improvement (*ibid.*, 286).

Chandler demonstrated in his 2003 study that only Correction and Underlining led to more accuracy over time whereas the two other types did not help the students to become better writers in the following assignments (*ibid.*, 285-286). However, the scholar argued in his study that these findings had to be looked at in detail because only nine out of the twenty students who edited all their assignments showed significant improvement following direct corrective feedback/ correction (*ibid.*, 287).

As it has been shown before, the time factor has been looked into a lot in the recent research on WCF. In this regard, Chandler thinks that two of the analysed types, namely Underlining with Description and only Description are time-consuming (*ibid.*, 289).

On the basis of his two studies, he also argued that providing WCF and asking the learners to edit their texts “resulted in a significant improvement in both accuracy (errors per 100 words) and fluency (time to write 100 words) in subsequent writing of the same type over the semester” (Chandler, 2003: 290). However, he points out that in his study the learners’ progress in the writing skill is not quite significant yet because this skill takes time to be fully mastered and as a result, it is difficult to see the impact straightaway (*ibid.*, 290).

Although Chandler demonstrates the positive impact of feedback and editing over time, he is critical of Ferris’ 2002 study, in which she claims that learners progress better through self-correction before any comment from the teacher (*ibid.*, 291). According to Chandler, teachers’ correction is essential to learning (*ibid.*).

Regarding the type of analysed WCF, Chandler demonstrated that direct corrective feedback - labelled Correction in his study - is the type of feedback that led to the most significant progress in terms of accuracy in subsequent tasks (*ibid.*, 293). It was not only preferred by the learners but also by language teachers when they have to deal with many copies (*ibid.*). However, the so-called Underlining WCF also showed positive effect on the learners’ fluency and accuracy but this type can only be used with students whose level in English is

already quite high (*ibid.*). In his second study, he demonstrated that the so-called Underlining was as effective as Correction (*ibid.*). To quote Chandler:

It could be argued that Underlining was effective only because some students in the second study had previously received more explicit treatments, but the experimental group in the first study was exposed only to Underlining throughout the semester, and they also showed a significant increase in accuracy. (Chandler, 2003:293)

Moreover, he argued that in the second study Underlining was seen as less time consuming and was favoured by some students, since they felt more active in their learning (*ibid.*).

Finally, he stresses the importance of making the learners aware of their written errors and of prompting them to take the feedback into consideration and edit their tasks (*ibid.*).

4.3.2.6.2 Bitchener, Young and Cameron (2005) and Bitchener (2008)

Like Ferris, Bitchener believes in the effectiveness of WCF in helping students progress in writing competence and this is explicitly set out in two of his studies, namely in *The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing* published in 2005 and in *Evidence in support of written corrective feedback* published in 2008 (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005; Bitchener, 2008).

Following the many debates and questions already raised by researchers such as Ferris and Truscott, Bitchener along with other scholars argues that it is highly necessary to carry out more studies on whether there is a significant difference between the learners who received feedback and those who did not and on the impact of either strategy in the long term (Ferris, 2002, 2004; Truscott, 1999 in Bitchener, Young & Cameron 2005: 193). This point was also expressed in *Evidence in support of written corrective feedback*, in which Bitchener pointed out that targeted studies on the long-term effect of different WCF types on new written tasks are badly needed (Bitchener, 2008: 103). According to Bitchener,

it is clear that a conclusive answer to the question will not be possible unless researchers make a concerted effort to conduct well designed studies that examine over time the effectiveness of different corrective feedback options on new pieces of writing and by comparing them with the texts of students who do not receive corrective feedback. (Bitchener, 2008: 103)

Bitchener, Young and Cameron therefore decided in 2005 to carry out a research on the effects of WCF on a wide range of types of written errors in new written tasks (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 194-195). They believed that it was necessary to work with participants who were “migrant and international learners in non-academic and pre-degree settings” and whose

levels in English was described as low (*ibid.*, 195) and in different contexts requiring the use of different types of WCF and mix strategies (*ibid.*).

They tried to find out how a specific type of correction - in this case, oral explanations and direct WCF for the first group, only direct WCF for the second and just feedback on the content of the task for the third one - provided on specific linguistic errors (i.e. prepositions, the use of the Simple Past and definite article) (*ibid.*, 195-197) can affect the learners' writing exactness in new written tasks (*ibid.*). To quote the three scholars "The three linguistic errors chosen by the researchers to be targeted in the research were those which occurred most frequently during the first writing task. The researchers identified and categorised all errors in the first writing task" (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 197).

They discovered that if no distinction was made between the different chosen error types, then one could claim that Truscott was totally right about the uselessness of WCF (*ibid.*, 201).

Still, it is better to look at the effects of the different chosen types of feedback on each of the chosen target language forms because each actually represents a distinct area of knowledge and is mastered through different processes and at a different pace (*ibid.*). This crucial aspect was indeed emphasised by Truscott in his 1996 essay (Truscott, 1996, 342-344) but also by Bitchener, Young & Cameron:

The results of our investigation into the effects of different types of feedback on individual linguistic features suggests that this type of examination is more fruitful because it acknowledges the fact that different linguistic categories represent separate domains of knowledge and that they are acquired through different stages and processes. (Ferris, 1999, 2002; Truscott, 1996 in Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 201)

At the end of their study, their findings went against Truscott's arguments in 1996. Firstly, they discovered that providing WCF on the three chosen linguistic items had a positive impact on the L2 learners' accuracy in using these items when used separately in new written tasks (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 201). Secondly, if direct corrective feedback is provided and if learners have the chance to talk about it with the teacher (i.e. oral feedback), then there was even some further improvement in the use of the Simple Past and the definite article (*ibid.*). Still, it was not the case for the prepositions, since these are more "idiosyncratic" whereas the Simple Past and the definite article are items governed by a series of rules (*ibid.*). In other words, these two linguistic items (i.e. the Simple Past and the definite article) are what Ferris called treatable errors (Ferris, 1999 in Bitchener, Young & Cameron 2005: 201). The three researchers argue that those two treatable categories are therefore ideal for written and oral

feedback (Bitchener, Young & Cameron 2005: 201). Thirdly, the study also showed that the overall improvement in accuracy could not be compared to a clear and linear trajectory from the first task to the last one (i.e. four tasks in twelve weeks) (*ibid.*). Fourthly, their research also revealed that learners who received direct feedback and oral explanations were able to better master the use of prepositions over the course of the four tasks; in other words, there is a link between the long-term improvement and the type of feedback provided (*ibid.*). However, for the use of the past tense and the definite article, the time factor had no notable impact on the three types of WCF, namely oral and direct written feedback together, written direct feedback only and no feedback at all (*ibid.*).

In other words, Bitchener, Young and Cameron suggested in 2005 that the combination of direct written feedback and oral feedback during individual interviews is more effective in the long term in the case of “the past simple tense and definite article” (Bitchener, Young & Cameron 2005: 202). They added that since little research on the effects of direct feedback on the improvement of written accuracy in new tasks had been carried out, this finding was interesting, especially because indirect feedback was believed to be more effective than direct corrective feedback in helping the L2 learners to upgrade their written accuracy (*ibid.*, 202). Moreover, they also discovered that the use of both oral corrective feedback and direct written feedback is more effective over time than direct written feedback alone and that the above-mentioned combination was more suitable for treatable than for untreatable errors (*ibid.*).

They came to the conclusion that language teachers should use both oral and written feedback to deal with so-called treatable language errors, but they should also “discuss with their learners which linguistic errors should be focused on” (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 202). Furthermore, they stated that the use of direct WCF is very often compared with the use of indirect WCF but according to them, it would be interesting to check the respective effects of both WCF types on the so-called treatable and untreatable errors (*ibid.*).

Even though they proved that direct corrective feedback is efficient in some cases, they argued that further studies were needed, namely involving L2 learners at other proficiency levels, on other and more complex “idiosyncratic” linguistic items than the chosen ones and also on the impact of WCF over a longer period of time (*ibid.*, 203). To quote Bitchener, Young and Cameron: “in order to be able to observe patterns of consistent improvement, we would suggest that there is a need for research to examine the effects of corrective feedback more longitudinally. Investigations over several semesters would be ideal” (Bitchener, Young & Cameron, 2005: 203).

In 2008, Bitchener went further in his research on the use and efficacy of WCF. He mainly focused on direct WCF and wondered whether the accuracy of the chosen linguistic items (i.e. “the referential indefinite article “a” when referring to something for the first time [...] and the referential definite article “the” when referring to something that has been mentioned before” (Bitchener, 2008, 110)) varied in time and whether it (i.e. the accuracy) depended on the type of WCF that is used by language teachers (*ibid.*, 109). He also wanted to find out whether meta-linguistic explanations and the time factor could have an impact on the learners’ written exactness of the chosen linguistic items (*ibid.*).

Bitchener said that the goal of his study was to check “whether targeted corrective feedback on ESL student writing results in improved accuracy in new pieces of writing over a 2-month period and to see whether there is a differential effect on accuracy for different corrective feedback options” (Bitchener, 2008: 115).

Just like in 2005, he proved in his 2008 study that direct WCF had a positive effect on the learners’ accuracy in the use of two chosen English linguistic items and he also demonstrated that the accuracy was stable two months later without providing any further “feedback or instruction” (Bitchener, 2008: 115). The study also shows that providing direct WCF helps learners to progress and master the use of the chosen items on the long term (i.e. in new written tasks) (*ibid.*). More precisely, the L2 learners who were provided with direct WCF and written meta-linguistic explanations, direct WCF along with “written and oral meta-linguistic explanations” and those who only received direct WCF performed better than the control group which did not receive any corrective feedback (*ibid.*).

In other words, he proved a second time that the combination of direct WCF and oral explanations can help learners to master certain specific linguistic forms and that this positive effect lasts in time (*ibid.*, 116).

Pedagogically speaking, he suggests that the teachers should follow three steps when it comes to preventing frequent written errors: firstly, teachers should spend time giving what he called mini-lessons about recurrent written errors; secondly, they should organize meta-linguistics sessions on specific errors for the learners experiencing difficulties in dealing with these errors; and finally, they should give individual lessons to the learners who need some more information (*ibid.*). Just like in 2005, Bitchener advised teachers to discuss with their pupils which linguistic items or forms to focus on so that there is a consensus in this regard (*ibid.*).

Nevertheless, Bitchener argued that further studies were needed to check whether his results were also valid for other sorts of error and whether WCF was efficient enough to help

L2 learners to gain accuracy in the use of new linguistic forms (*ibid.*, 115-116). He also considered important to find out whether different types of written tasks could have different effects on the L2 learners' accuracy and whether combining direct and indirect feedback of one kind or another led to better results (*ibid.*, 116). He also argued that there was still a need for research including students having a different mother tongue and culture and who have different levels in English (*ibid.*). Finally, he used the same argument as in 2005 about longitudinal studies; "further research would do well to extend this scope to include several additional post-tests over a longer period of time (in preparation) so that the ultimate value of written corrective feedback for acquisition can be determined" (Bitchener, 2008: 116).

5 Teacher's practice

5.1 Teachers providing WCF

5.1.1 Introduction

Up to now, many different types of WCF have been distinguished and have been the subject of a thorough analysis showing their advantages, disadvantages and specificities. It has also been noticed that some scholars favour certain types of written corrective feedback. But how is WCF provided classrooms? In other words, how do language teachers actually deal with WCF in their practice? This problematic aspect was highlighted by Lee in 2008b study: "most of the studies [...] thus far have focused on the effectiveness of WCF, or student's perspectives on its usefulness. Less space has been devoted to the relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices regarding WCF" (Lee, 2008b in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

This meaningful issue prompted me to devote this second theoretical part to the teachers' practice and beliefs.

I will first focus on the way language teachers provide their L2 learners with WCF, then on what is considered the right way of providing WCF. Lastly, I will concentrate on the teachers' beliefs about WCF.

5.1.2 How do teachers provide WCF?

"The process of giving feedback to student's writing...fills me with anxiety because I am afraid that I will not help but only confuse the student more" (English 215B teaching ESL Writing in Ferris, 2007: 165)

This quote from Ferris' 2007 article shows how difficult and challenging it can be to provide learners with WCF (Ferris, 2007: 165). What particularly struck Ferris in her feedback studies was that many students felt discouraged by their teacher's comments/feedback (*ibid.*, 166). However, she argues that even though there may be some "horror stories" about the

negative impact of WCF on L2 learners (e.g. “That’s what I think of your paper”, “not everyone is cut out for college”) (Ferris, 2007: 166), some L2 learners recognize the benefits of WCF (*ibid.*). In the same line as Ferris, Burke and Pieterick argue that “Tutors must be cautious about the control they assert over students’ texts and the ways they choose to comment. [...] they need to understand that not all commenting is useful and some comments may even be damaging” (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 9-10). This negative aspect of discouragement is clearly expressed by Shute in Burke and Pieterick’s book: in order to enhance learning, language teachers/tutors should not “present feedback that discourages the learner or threatens the learner’s self-esteem” (Shute, 2008 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 17).

As did all the above-mentioned scholars, Lee argued in 2009 that even though providing WCF is often seen as essential, it is often described with negative terms such as “gruelling and anxiety-ridden” (Ferris, Pezone, Tade and Tinti, 1997 in Lee, 2009: 13).

From the studies carried out by many scholars, it has emerged that WCF differs between teachers. This aspect is clearly highlighted in Hashemnezhad & Mohammadnejad in 2012. To quote them “every teacher is still following his or her own way of error feedback” (Hashemnezhad & Mohammadnejad, 2012: 230). However, in the analysed studies, it seems that the strategies actually applied by teachers are quite similar.

In Mao and Crosthwaite’s study, four out of five teachers tend to use indirect feedback more often than direct feedback (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 52). According to them, this is surprising, since “The teachers’ questionnaire data (Table 3) indicated the most favoured WCF form was direct feedback” (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 54). However, the results showed that they mainly made use of indirect feedback (*ibid.*). The gap between teachers’ practices and beliefs will be mainly discussed in the following part (i.e. part 6).

As to local and global errors, all teachers seem to pay more attention to local errors than to global errors (*ibid.*, 52-53), which can be interpreted as an evolution given that Ferris’ 1997 study showed that only 15% of WCF focused on local errors and 85% of WCF was about “students’ ideas and rhetorical development” (Ferris, 1997; Ferris, Pezone, Tade, & Tinti, 1997 in Lee, 2008: 70).

On the other hand, if one considers the proportion of focused and unfocused WCF, it is also clear that focused WCF prevails (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 53-54).

Moreover, in previous research Lee and other scholars found out that some teachers prefer identifying every single error when correcting a text written by a L2 learner (Lee, 2008: 71). To quote Lee: “Regardless of the error feedback strategies, some L2 teachers prefer marking all student errors to prevent fossilization (e.g. Lee, 2004; Higgs & Clifford, 1982;

Lalande, 1982)” (Lee, 2008, 71). This scholar also asserts in his article that even if teachers can decide which type of WCF they use, some of them “have become prominent in recent literature” (Lee, 2008, 71).

Firstly, Ferris, Frantzen and Lalande argue in their respective studies that indirect WCF has a more useful effect on L2 learners’ learning acquisition on a longer term than direct WCF (Ferris, 2003; Frantzen, 1995; Lalande, 1982 in Lee, 2008: 71).

Secondly, scholars like Ferris argue that coded feedback can easily discourage L2 learners, that is why Ferris argued in 2002 and 2003 that this strategy should be explained to the learners; in other words, the code must be clear and it should only be used when necessary (Ferris, 2002, 2003 in Lee, 2008: 71). This issue is also highlighted in Burke and Pieterick’s book: “the terms we use in feedback should be ones students are familiar with” (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 76).

Thirdly, teachers should abandon the correction of every single error they encounter in a learner’s text since it is not efficient (Ferris, 2002; Mantello, 1997 in Lee, 2008: 71). To quote Lee: “selective error feedback is generally more productive than marking of all errors, since comprehensive error feedback is exhausting for teachers and overwhelming for students” (Ferris, 2002; Mantello, 1997 in Lee, 2008: 71).

Amongst the many readings on WCF, I have observed that very few studies deal with teachers’ practices but Lee’s 2008 study does. Many specialists are looking at the most useful kind of feedback or the combination of possible strategies that would allow learners to improve, others look at beliefs about WCF but very few seem to consider what is applied by teachers and the gap between theories and practice. Goldstein argued in 2001 and 2006 that most studies on written feedback were “acontextual and non-social” (Goldstein 2001, 2006 in Lee, 2008: 73). He meant that scholars should take the beliefs and the educational contexts into account when telling teachers what they should do/ how they should provide learners with WCF (*ibid.*).

In my research about WCF and in my analysis of teachers’ actual practices, I realized that it was important to pay attention to the ways teachers provide their pupils with WCF. That is why I have decided to focus on the gap between theories and actual practices regarding WCF.

5.1.3 Factors influencing teachers’ practice in Lee’s 2008 article.

The fact that some language teachers persist in using correction strategies which could be considered inappropriate or ineffective, could be explained by the fact that some factors affect the way teachers correct L2 learners’ written text.

Indeed, in his 2008 study, Lee found out that there was a gap between what is actually recommended by the scholars and the language teachers' actual practice (Lee, 2008: 73) and according to him, that is because some factors can have an influence on the way they provide WCF (*ibid.*). For instance, Kennedy (1988) believed that "the cultural and political systems exert a greatest influence on the teachers' practice" (Kennedy, 1988 in Lee, 2008: 73). Leki in 1992 argued that language teachers' WCF was "laden with political content" (Leki, 1992 in Lee, 2008: 73).

In his study conducted in a school in Hong Kong, Lee discovered that language teachers were not free to choose the type of WCF they wanted or the most appropriate one (Lee, 2008: 79). Indeed, during the conducted interviews, the participants (i.e. teachers) argued that "there was a school policy that required teachers to respond to student writing in certain ways, teachers were accountable. If they deviated from the established practice, they had to justify it" (Lee, 2008: 79).

Some of the interviewed teachers admitted that it was a real burden: when they decided to use another method recommended by some scholars, they were likely to receive a warning from the board of directors (*ibid.*): "I hate marking student writing. I do it for the panel chair and principal. I do not think it is benefiting my students" (Lee, 2008: 79). "I have my own thoughts, but I must follow the panel policy. I have once argued with the panel chair that underlining errors without using symbols is good enough, but she was not convinced" (Lee, 2008: 79).

As Truscott explained earlier, students want and expect to be corrected, to receive feedback because it is the tradition (i.e. they have always believed that thanks to WCF they will progress) (Truscott, 1996: 359).

However, Lee points out that not only the students want WCF; so do the parents (Lee, 2008: 79). In this study, the teachers admitted that many parents wanted and expected teachers to provide their children with detailed WCF and when it was not detailed enough, the language teachers were described as "lazy and irresponsible" (*ibid.*). Even though non-selective WCF has widely been rejected by many scholars, it would seem that this type of WCF is still rooted in the teachers' practice: Lee argues that detailed WCF was still used by many teachers because it showed that they pay attention to what students write (*ibid.*). To quote Lee: "Detailed marking was also used to do justice to student efforts and to provide incentives for further efforts from students" (Lee, 2008: 79).

Furthermore, in his study, Lee argues that some English teachers suggested moving from exhaustive correction to a selective one, but the implementation of this strategy was

rejected because if it had been the case, language teachers would have had to double the number of written tasks and if they had decided not to do so, they would have been seen as lazy (*ibid.*). To quote one teacher in his study: “My panel chair thinks we cannot do less work or else we will be criticized.” (Lee, 2008: 79).

This pressure and the fact that teachers have to prove they are “hardworking” is also highlighted in Lee’s 2013 article: “Also, teachers feel under pressure to demonstrate, through comprehensive WCF, that they are hardworking teachers, who have to satisfy the expectations of students and parents” (Lee, 2013, 109-110).

Pressure exerted by the school and the parents is not the only factor explaining why some teachers do not opt for more efficient WCF. Lee argues that the lack of teacher training in new ways of providing WCF also accounts for that issue (Lee, 2008: 81). In his 2008 study, he found out that four interviewed teachers did not know anything about more recent ways of correcting their pupils’ written tasks (*ibid.*). More precisely, some of them argued that the sole training they had in correction was given by older, more experienced teachers (*ibid.*): “There are seniors to teach us what to do when it comes to marking student writing” (Lee, 2008: 81). As a result, they were told not refrain from correcting every error in a text written by a pupil (*ibid.*). This testimony is in line with those of Al-Bakri’s 2016 study (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 49). This scholar found out during his survey that few teachers in the Sultanate of Oman had difficulties in producing direct and selective WCF (*ibid.*). According to Al-Bakri’, there is an explanation for that issue:

Teachers experienced difficulty producing comprehensive, direct WCF, but a general lack of professional training for Omani teachers on WCF resulted in limited self-reflection on WCF practice. It was recommended that teachers should receive better training in alternative WCF practice as well as to communicate more with their students and peers about their WCF practice. (Al-Bakri, 2016 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 49)

With his study, Lee managed to show that language teachers are not masters of their own choices regarding WCF: school policy, the culture of the country and pupils’ parents can have an impact on the types/strategies adopted when giving WCF (Lee, 2008: 82). In addition to this, the teachers' beliefs also play a role.

Part 6 of this master’s thesis will be devoted to some tracks leading to the provision of better WCF as well as to teachers’ WCF beliefs.

5.1.4 The time factor in Ferris' and Lee's articles

As expressed by Bitchener & Knoch in 2008, it would be more efficient to provide L2 learners with a combination of written correction and written or oral “rule reminders or explanations” (Bitchener & Knoch: 2008 in Ferris, 2010: 193). However, Ferris argued in 2010 that even though this combination of WCF types seems to work, in reality the situation is much more complex (Ferris, 2010: 193): many language teachers do not make use of that type of WCF because they do not have enough time (*ibid.*). In other words, time is also a factor that can have a negative impact on the way teachers provide WCF. To quote Ferris: “Most teachers have neither the time nor the patience to give that much feedback in that much detail” (Ferris, 2010: 193). Moreover, she argues that the implementation of that WCF type is quite complex, since not every language teacher has enough knowledge of English linguistics, nor the time to explain every error (*ibid.*). Finally, this WCF type (i.e. combination of written and oral feedback) is not always possible, since teachers also have to focus on a variety of aspects “such as ideas, organization, and processes” (Ferris, 2010: 193).

In 2007, Ferris was already arguing that providing WCF is time-consuming and thus, asking teachers to provide WCF and to plan face-to-face meetings to talk about their pupils' errors would be quite difficult to implement even though it is efficient and help learners to progress (Ferris, 2007: 177).

In a way, it could be said that Lee agrees with Ferris about the time factor. According to Lee, language teachers are asked, if not urged, to provide L2 learners with what he calls timely WCF (Lee, 2013: 114). In 2010 Evans et al. defined timely WCF as “feedback that is given at the right time” (Evans et al., 2010 in Lee, 2013: 114). According to Evans et al. it would be better if it was not “an unproductive time gap between when the error was made and when it is corrected” (Evans et al., 2010 in Lee, 2013: 114). Even though several studies showed that timely WCF helps L2 learners in their second language acquisition, it puts pressure on teachers because it is not always feasible and therefore, it takes a lot of effort on their part (Lee, 2013: 115). To quote Lee:

While timely WCF is beneficial for students, it may be less so for teachers because it requires hard work and gives them extra pressure, and this is particularly true for EFL teachers faced with material challenges like large class sizes and heavy workloads. (Lee, 2013: 115)

Even though teachers are under pressure to supply their learners with timely WCF, it is seen as a kind of goal; “teachers see the provision of timely feedback as a goal, trying to make sure that WCF is returned to students without a long delay” (Lee, 2013: 115).

6 Teachers' beliefs about WCF

6.1 Definition of beliefs

Before getting to the heart of the matter, it seems important to understand what is meant by belief. According to Mao and Crosthwaite, many scholars have been focusing on the efficacy or non-efficacy of WCF, but less attention has been paid to the question of how teachers conceive WCF and especially what their convictions are in relation to WCF, especially “in English as a Foreign language (EFL) contexts” (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47).

By getting the teachers to reflect on the ‘why’ and the ‘how’ of their own visions/beliefs, not only do they get a better understanding of the different factors that come into play (concerning their convictions about WCF) but they get personally involved in changing their own practice of WCF (Phipps & Borg, 2009 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47). The idea of teachers being aware of their own beliefs through self-examination is crucial in their teaching: “Understanding the structure of teachers’ beliefs is necessary when investigating their professional preparation and teaching practices” (Ashton, 1990; Buchmann, 1984; Fives & Buehl, 2012 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47).

The word belief can be interpreted in different ways depending on the context in which it appears (Eisenhart, Shrum, Harding, & Cuthbert, 1988 in in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). Bandura thinks that beliefs “are used to interpret, plan and make decisions, as well as define behaviour and organise knowledge” (Bandura, 1986 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). According to Mao & Crosthwaite, Pajares shares the same opinion as Bandura but she argues that it is quite complex to know whether teachers’ beliefs have an impact on their practice or if it is the other way around (Pajares, 1992 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

As with the definition of WCF, it seems complicated to come up with one single definition of the belief concept. However, in their study, Mao and Crosthwaite decided to adopt Borg’s approach to teachers’ beliefs (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). According to Borg, teachers’ beliefs are “what teachers think, know and believe and the relationships of these mental constructs to what teachers do in the classroom” (Borg, 2003 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). In the light of this approach, the decisions made by language teachers concerning WCF are strongly influenced by their previous language learning experiences, the training they have had and their own experience in the classroom as language teachers (*ibid.*). Furthermore, Borg argues that their experience as teachers and the situations they end up in will lead to mismatches between their convictions and their actual practices (Borg, 2003 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

In 2009 Phipps and Borg explained that teachers' beliefs and practices go hand in hand (Phipps & Borg, 2009 in in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). They meant that their beliefs have an impact (i.e. they can influence) on their WCF practice but that their practice can also lead to changes in their beliefs (*ibid.*, 48-49). However, it has also emerged that "the practices of teachers do not always reflect their beliefs, leading to misalignment or tension" (Lee, 2008a, 2008b; Montgomery & Baker, 2007 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 49).

Finally, Griffiths argued in 2007 that "Teachers' beliefs and practices play a pivotal role in the classroom, since they have a direct bearing on the teaching and learning process" (Griffiths, 2007 in Lee, 2009: 13-14). In 2009 Lee argued that exploring the belief(s) underpinning "teachers' practices can help identify the factors that contribute to effective feedback" (Lee, 2009: 14). In other words, it is essential to explore teachers' beliefs, to understand them and to provide solutions that could help ESL teachers to modify their beliefs.

6.2 Mismatch between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice

After explaining what is meant by 'belief', it would be interesting to look at what this concept actually includes. Through many articles and especially Lee's 2009 article on *Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice*, it is possible to discover that there are many inconsistencies between what teachers believe about WCF and what they actually do. In order to better understand the teachers' beliefs, I will focus on Lee's '*ten mismatches*' and back up his arguments by referring to other scholars, articles or books.

6.2.1 Focus on language form vs on focus content

The results of Lee's 2009 study show that teachers tend to focus too much on language form compared to WCF on content (Lee, 2009: 15). When interviewing the participants (i.e. teachers), Lee found out that they all concurred with the view that it was important to pay attention to the content (*ibid.*). To quote Lee: "all the teachers said that good writing depends not only on accuracy but also on development of ideas and organization" (Lee, 2009: 15). Unquestionably, there is a gap between what teachers actually do in practice and what they think is necessary when providing WCF to their pupils/L2 learners. This gap could be explained by the fact that once language teachers have decided to correct learners' language errors, they soon realize they are lacking time or place to correct the content (*ibid.*).

Moreover, this "form-focused approach" is also said to be due to the so-called "exam culture in schools" (Lee, 2009: 15). Because teachers want to ensure that pupils are ready for the exams, they put in too much time and energy trying to improve the learners' writing accuracy even though they believe it is important to go beyond the accuracy level (*ibid.*). In

Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms, Lee stated that “They focused mainly on accuracy because, according to them, this was the major focus of the exams authority in marking student writing” (Lee, 2008: 80).

Furthermore, Lee argued in another study entitled *Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms* that although some teachers are well aware of the necessity of paying attention to content in WCF, some of them asserted that some learners have fewer problems with the content than with the English grammar and that is why they tend to focus more on the language form (Lee, 2008: 80). This can suggest that teachers are torn between their beliefs, the exam pressure and the school policy and what they believe they should do.

6.2.2 Comprehensive WCF vs selective feedback

A second mismatch between their beliefs and practices concerns the selective/focused and comprehensive/unfocused feedback. As stated in the first theoretical part, scholars (e.g. Ferris, Lee, Ellis, Bitchener, etc.) argue that teachers should use focused WCF. However, this is not applied by all teachers. The results of Lee's 2009 study show that twelve out of nineteen teachers said they prefer focused feedback to unfocused feedback, but they mainly use the latter (Lee, 2009: 15). When Lee asked the participants if they could explain the gap between what they think they do and what their actual practice, teachers argued that it was because of the school policy “that require(s) them to attend to every single student error, and thus policy is deeply entrenched.” (Lee, 2009: 16). To some extent, it could be argued that their practices are influenced by the “the more the better” maxim (Lee, 2013: 110).

Even though scholars tend to encourage teachers to make use of focused WCF, some of them agree that comprehensive WCF can be used when dealing with high-advanced learners whose level of written accuracy is quite high (Lee, 2013: 109): “More recently, Bitchener & Ferris (2012) have added that comprehensive and unfocused WCF may be useful to advanced learners with a high level of accuracy” (Bitchener & Ferris 2012 in Lee, 2013: 109). Moreover, Bitchener and Ferris argue in 2012 that when providing WCF, teachers should first take the level of the learners into account and adapt their WCF accordingly (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012 in Lee, 2013: 109).

In her 2007 article, Ferris stated that the only way to make learners progress without disheartening them is to use selective/ focused feedback and before doing so, teachers “should have some principles that guide their work and [...] these principles should be made transparent to their students” (Ferris, 2007: 169). On the other hand, she highlights several reasons why

(novice) teachers should stop hoping for the perfect text from their pupils (*ibid.*: 167). Firstly, it is time-consuming and tiring (*ibid.*, 170). Secondly, by making use of focused feedback, teachers will keep in mind that the ultimate goal of WCF is to help learners to become better writers, to be able to correct their own errors and thus, to be more autonomous (*ibid.*).

6.2.3 Direct WCF vs indirect WCF

It has also been noticed that teachers tend to use direct corrective feedback instead of indirect corrective feedback even though most of them believe that indirect feedback helps L2 learners to progress in writing accuracy and promotes autonomy (Lee, 2009: 16). In other words, many teachers in Lee's research believed that indirect feedback is more efficient because it prompts the learners to correct their own errors and to learn from them, and yet, they generally make use of direct feedback (*ibid.*). This discrepancy is due to the teachers' belief that the learners are unable to locate and to correct their own errors themselves (*ibid.*). To quote one teacher in Lee's study: "I tried to ask them to locate errors themselves, but the result was not good . . . I also asked them to correct others' work, but they tended to have many arguments" (Lee, 2009: 16).

It is interesting to note that Lee's results contradict Mao & Crosthwaite' findings. In their questionnaire given to the teachers, they found out that teachers believed they favoured direct feedback over indirect feedback, which came as a surprise to the two scholars, since 68% of the provided WCF was indirect (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 54). Some teachers believed that direct WCF helped learners to become aware of their own errors, others believed that this type of WCF helped them to progress in their second language acquisition (*ibid.*). The belief that direct WCF is better than indirect WCF comes from their own educational experience (*ibid.*).

6.2.4 Coded vs uncoded feedback

In the survey in *Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice*, Lee found out that more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of the interviewed teachers admitted using coded WCF (Lee, 2009: 16). However, the results from the survey demonstrate that teachers in general believe that it is better to use uncoded feedback, since pupils do not always understand what the codes/letters refer to, especially L2 learners with a lower level (*ibid.*).

This preference for coded WCF has been demonstrated by Leki in 1991 and by Ferris & Roberts in 2001 (Leki, 1991; Ferris & Roberts, 2001 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). Ferris argues that this type of WCF is often preferred by both students and teachers because "it is supposedly more conducive for students' cognitive engagement and reflection when analysing the WCF provided" (Ferris, 2002 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48). Nevertheless, scholars

argue that this strategy can be unclear to learners and even sometimes to teachers (Lee, 2008a; Robb et al., 1986 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48) and that it should only be used if the learners are familiar with the codes (Ferris, 2003 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48) or if it is “required as part of school policy” (Al Shahrani & Storch, 2013 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

The idea of complex WCF that students have to decipher and understand is also expressed by Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick in their 2006 article *Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice*. According to them, some empirical data show that some WCF can be complex and difficult to decipher (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 3). Therefore, the teacher should ensure that the students have the opportunity to be told about them (*ibid.*). Only then will they be able to progress in their learning and perform better (Higgins, Hartley and Skelton, 2001; Ivanic, Clark and Rimmershaw, 2000 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 3).

The reason why there is a gap between their practice and beliefs concerning the use of coded WCF is because language teachers believe that coded written feedback is beneficial to the learners, since it prompts them to look at their errors/ errors types and to correct them by themselves (Lee, 2009: 16). Moreover, according to Ferris, it is “more conducive for students’ cognitive engagement and reflection when analysing the WCF provided” (Ferris, 2002 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

Still, obviously, if the L2 learners are not motivated, they will not take the trouble to try to understand the code and correct their texts on their own (Hyland, 2010 in Lee, 2013: 113; Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 58)

6.2.5 Giving grades

It is widely known that in our society students give more weight to the marks they receive than to the remarks; in other words, to the WCF provided by the teacher. This problem is highlighted in the article by Lee, by Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick and it is something that the teachers are well aware of (Lee, 2009; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). And yet they still provide their pupils with grades because they feel compelled to do so (*ibid.*). Indeed, because of their educational experience and the school policy, teachers “still award grades” (Lee, 2009: 17). To quote Lee: “A reason to explain why teachers still award scores/ grades is that this is necessary for summative purposes (as these scores/ grades count towards the final grade students get)” (Lee, 2009: 17).

Already in 1998 Butler demonstrated that there was a clear difference in learners’ interest when they received WCF with or without grades (Butler, 1998 in Nicol & Macfarlane-

Dick, 2006: 12). This scholar stated that L2 learners tend to ignore WCF when it is provided along with grades and they do not even bother to have a look at WCF to make headway (*ibid.*). Butler also had demonstrated a few years earlier (1987) that not only did grades undermine the power of WCF but they also led to comparison between peers (Butler, 1987 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 12) and to negative effects on “the self-esteem of low ability students” (Craven, Marsh & Debus, 1991 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 12). In the same line, Dweck argued in 1999 that grades “encourage students to focus on performance goals (passing the test, looking good) rather than learning goals (mastering the subject)” (Dweck, 1999 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 12).

6.2.6 WCF on weaknesses

It was also found that teachers pay more attention to learners' weaknesses although they also believe it is important to focus on their strengths (Lee, 2009: 17). In Lee's 2009 survey, the results demonstrate that WCF mainly focuses on the weaknesses, in other words, on the errors made by the learners (*ibid.*).

According to Lee, teachers seem aware that they should focus more on what is good and correct and they also seem to believe that it is important to praise the learners (Lee, 2009: 17). Still, teachers do not seem to put into practice what they actually believe (*ibid.*). The source of this mismatch can be attributed to the so-called “error-focused approach to written feedback” (*ibid.*). Indeed, it would seem that teachers believe that the first function of WCF is to correct what is wrong but as argued by many scholars like Ferris or Burke & Pieterick, it is also crucial to take learners' strengths into consideration and to encourage them to progress (Ferris, 2007: 168; Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 48-50).

Ferris argues in her 2007 article that encouragement and praise is beneficial to everyone and in this case, to L2 learners:

[I]t is also important to remind these future teachers that encouragement is important, that everyone benefits from it, and that they must strive to identify and articulate what the student writer has done well before launching into a fix-it list. (Ferris, 2007: 168)

However, Butler does not seem to share Ferris' view. This scholar agrees with teachers' practices: Butler and other scholars sharing the same opinion claim that if a teacher includes praise in WCF, highlights what is good in a L2 learner's text, this learner will mainly be concentrated on himself/ herself (i.e. what Butler calls ‘the self’) and not on the task or his/her progress anymore (Butler, 1987 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49). Regarding Burke and Pieterick, their view is in accordance with Lee's and Ferris' but they add that if teachers want

to go against their practice and include more praise in their WCF, they should be careful in doing so because in their view it is often used to soften the correction of the learners' errors rather than congratulate them on a good job (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49).

Sadler and Hattie agree on the importance of praise but they "do not see it as a valuable form of feedback" (Sadler, 1989; Hattie, 2001 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49).

Other scholars such as Connors and Lunsford, Bardine et al. and Straub agree with the teachers' belief: praise encourages L2 learners to progress, to overcome their misgivings when it comes to writing texts in a foreign language and "motivates them to develop more positive attitudes" (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49). Connors and Lunsford argued in their 1993 study that teachers were not always aware that pupils not only ask for WCF but they also want to be praised and encouraged in some ways (Connors & Lunsford, 1993 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49).

In this regard, Race suggested that teachers should make a distinction between praising something 'good' and something 'excellent' in a learner's written task (Race, 2001 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49). To quote Race: "it is better to praise exactly what was very good or excellent in a little more detail, rather than take the short cut of just using the adjectives themselves" (Race, 2001 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49).

Several tips given by scholars regarding 'praise' and 'encouragement' will be given and discussed in part 7 of this master's thesis.

6.2.7 Students are not in control

As Lee pointed out in his 2008 study, language teachers' practice does not allow L2 learners to be expert at correcting their texts, although teachers believe that it would be preferable that they correct their written work themselves (Lee, 2009: 17). Indeed, in his research, the scholar found out that teachers generally correct everything (i.e. unfocused feedback) and in a very direct manner (i.e. using of direct WCF) (*ibid.*). As a result of this practice, L2 learners' involvement in correcting their own errors in their written tasks is undermined (*ibid.*). As expressed by Lee: "Without being asked to perform self-/ peer-editing or evaluation, students are not provided with opportunities to develop responsibility for learning" (Lee, 2009: 17). The gap between their belief about self-correction and their practice finds its origin in a number of factors (*ibid.*). Firstly, Lee argues that the English panel policy plays a role in this gap (*ibid.*). Secondly, teachers' frequent use of direct WCF leads them over time to ignore any other existing method (*ibid.*).

The fact that teachers all too often use direct feedback as well as non-selective correction can lead to what Ferris calls “teacher “appropriation” of student work” (Ferris, 2007: 167). Ferris believes that teachers should give more control to the students and therefore find the right balance between correcting or modifying the students’ written texts and making the texts their own when correcting them, which Ferris regarded as detrimental (*ibid.*).

Straub’s view about teachers’ control on written tasks is somewhat similar to Ferris’. This scholar argued in 1996 that if too much written feedback is provided, this will lead to a takeover by the teachers of the text written by the pupil, who consequently will become less independent, less in control and will therefore progress at a slower pace (Straub, 1996 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 39). Sommers shares the exact same opinion as Straub: “When tutors exert too much control in their feedback, they not only run the risk of appropriating student texts but they also redirect student’s attention ‘towards the teacher’s purpose in commenting’” (Sommers, 1982 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 39).

If the two types of WCF mentioned above are too frequently used, the written task will no longer help the L2 learners to progress and to realise where they are in their learning and what they still need to achieve in order to progress (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 39). In other words, as expressed by the two authors of the book, “The feedback stops being formative, and thus no longer helps students to become independent, critical thinkers and more self-regulated learners” (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 39).

6.2.8 One-shot writing

Another of the mismatches highlighted by Lee is the teachers’ request to write one single draft/text for which WCF is provided and yet, teachers believe that writing is acquired in the long run (Lee, 2009: 18). In other words, Lee argues that “teachers ask students to do one-shot writing although they think process writing is beneficial” (Lee, 2009: 18). According to the teachers interviewed in Lee’s 2009 study, it would be better to ask L2 learners to write several texts before providing them with WCF but they fail to put this into practice because they do not have enough time to implement that “as they need to cover more writing topics/text types to prepare students for examination” (Lee, 2009: 18). Here again it can be seen that the exam pressure affects teachers’ feedback practices. As claimed by Curtis in 2001, time is seen as a real coercion in the teachers’ feedback practice in “an exam-oriented culture” (Curtis, 2001 in Lee, 2008: 80).

6.2.9 Teachers continue correcting errors that they know will recur later

Given the development of the different beliefs and practices of teachers, it can be said that their practice is error-focused although they do not always believe in the effectiveness of this practice. In Lee's 2009 survey, some teachers expressed some concern about their practice, which they believe is not effective enough in making L2 learners progress by learning from their errors (Lee, 2009: 18). To quote one of the teachers:

“The effectiveness of marking written errors seems not satisfactory enough. I hope to find a better method to improve students' awareness of language structures” (Lee, 2009: 18). Notwithstanding some teachers' belief that their WCF is not effective (i.e. L2 learners keep on making the same errors even after several provisions of WCF), they continue providing it as explained by the following teacher: “For weaker students, they go back to square one and make the same mistakes again” (Lee, 2009: 18).

Lee does not explain what this mismatch results from. However, one could argue that it is related to the teachers' objective, i.e. expecting the students to deliver a perfect error-free text, which was highlighted by Ferris in 2007 (Ferris, 2007: 167). According to this scholar, it is pivotal to urge teachers to stop aiming for perfection and consistently correcting recurrent errors (*ibid.*). Ferris argues in her 2007 article that teachers should keep in mind that writing is a long-term process and that instead of asking the learners to write a perfect text at the first attempt, teachers should help them to develop strategies to progress in their learning: “The most important end-product, I argue, is each student's progress and increasing awareness of and skill in using various strategies to compose, revise, and edit their own work” (Ferris, 2007: 167).

6.2.10 Teachers' WCF strategies do not pay off

The last mismatch between teachers' WCF practices and beliefs is pretty similar to the one discussed above. According to Lee, teachers believe in the efficacy of WCF but they also think that all their efforts to provide WCF to their L2 learners is fruitless (Lee, 2009: 18). Lee does not explain why there is a gap between teachers' beliefs (i.e. they spend a lot of time writing WCF but they suspect that their learners often ignore it) and their practice (i.e. they still provide WCF) (Lee, 2009: 18). However, several scholars tried to explain this discrepancy by pointing out that some students decide not to pay any attention to WCF and only look at the marks (i.e. see 6.2.5 giving grades). For instance, Chandler argues that “the findings of the present study suggest [...] that if students did not revise their writing based on feedback about errors, having teachers mark errors was equivalent to giving no error feedback” (Chandler, 2003: 280). Seven years later, Hyland will share the same opinion as Chandler. The scholar stated in his 2010

article that “WCF is useful only when learners are ‘willing and motivated to engage with it’” (Hyland, 2010 in Lee, 2013: 113). This argument was also highlighted by Truscott in his 1996 essay.

6.3 Teachers’ workload

It goes without saying that to provide WCF on a regular basis with all the recommendations of the specialists in the field while it does not fit your own beliefs must be distressing. This idea of workload is discussed in many works from the 21st century such as in Ferris’ in 2007, Lee’ s in 2013 and in Mao & Crosthwaite’s in 2019.

Ferris stated in 2007 that one of the biggest problems “in-service teachers” and “pre-service teachers” face is their inclination to correct every single error they come across in a written text but if they do so, they will be overwhelmed with work (Ferris, 2007: 167). In 1986 Hairston already mentioned that problem saying that they would become “a composition slave” (Hairston, 1986 in Ferris, 2007: 167).

Mao and Crosthwaite share the same opinion as Ferris and argue that: “the low proportion of unfocused feedback provided overall suggests that contextual issues of time and workload appear to take precedence when it comes to how comprehensive the actual feedback will be in the end, positive intentions none-withstanding” (Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 57).

Lee looks at the workload in relation with the time factor. According to him, it is difficult for teachers to hand in all WCF in time and if they aim to do that, they are faced with a fairly substantial workload (Lee, 2013: 115). This is even more true when teachers have large classes or when they are confronted with material problems (*ibid.*). According to Lee, the larger the class, the more difficult it will be to provide WCF in the recommended time (*ibid.*). This claim was also discussed by Nicol & Macfarlane-dick in 2006: “the workload of teachers in HE increases year by year as student numbers and class sizes become larger” (Nicol & Macfarlane, 2006: 3).

6.4 Teachers’ fear

Before devoting attention to what is proposed by the different researchers in this field in terms of steps to follow or important points not to be neglected when writing WCF, it seems crucial to dwell on the fear felt by teachers when they have to correct the texts written by their pupils.

Indeed, so far, I have looked at the opinion researchers have on the different types of WCF, the background of WCF, the teachers’ current practices and beliefs but the psychological distress of pre-service teachers cannot be neglected. This important element is clearly discussed by Ferris in 2007.

This scholar argued in her 2007 article that some pre-service teachers she worked with, admitted that they were afraid of not providing the pupils with good WCF or incorrect WCF, which would then lead the students in error and thus not help them to progress (Ferris, 2007: 176).

What would be interesting is to find out if this feeling of fear persists over time (i.e. until the end of one's career).

7 What teachers could/should do

In part six, teachers' beliefs about WCF were discussed. In this last theoretical part, solutions to problems and ways to counter their beliefs will be provided. Several possibilities/solutions will be discussed in this last part such as: How to provide L2 learners with WCF? Where to begin? How much WCF?

7.1 Providing L1 learners with efficient WCF

7.1.1 How does the power of WCF work? The three questions (Hattie & Timperley's 2007 study)

It is obvious that when discussing WCF and its power on learners' learning, one has to mention two important researchers in this field, namely Hattie & Timperley. According them, in order to understand its power and how it works, it is crucial to keep in mind that WCF is a consequence of what has been produced by a learner (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 81).

To be effective, WCF must be part of a learning context but it is only one part of it and it only happens after the L2 learner has received initial instruction (learning content, transmission of new knowledge) (*ibid.*, 82). Moreover, they argue that to be effective and to have a real effect, WCF must be a response to an error, a misinterpretation (of what has been taught, transmitted) (*ibid.*). Therefore, if there is a total lack of understanding, the feedback has little or no effect (*ibid.*). To put it another way, the information that the learners receive is useless since they cannot put it in relation to anything they know or understand (Kulhavy, 1977 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 82). To quote Kulhavy: "If the material studied is unfamiliar or abstruse, providing feedback should have little effect on criterion performance, since there is no way to relate the new information to what is already known" (Kulhavy, 1977 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 82).

According to Hattie and Timperley, in order for WCF to be powerful and therefore, efficient, it has to answer three important questions raised by the teachers and/or by the L2 learners themselves, namely "Where am I going? (What are the goals?), How am I going?

(What progress is being made toward the goal?), and Where to next? (What activities need to be undertaken to make better progress?)” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 86).

Both scholars argue that these three questions “correspond to notions of feed up, feed back, and feed forward” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 86).

The level at which WCF functions (i.e. “the level of task performance, the level of process of understanding how to do a task, the regulatory or metacognitive process level, and/or the self or personal level”) (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 86) will determine to which extent the answers to these three questions are effective in closing the gap between what is already acquired and the goals that the learners have to achieve (*ibid.*).

7.1.1.1 *The learning objectives related to a task (Where am I going?)*

The first question discussed by Hattie and Timperley is “Where am I going?” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 88). This first question helps the L2 learners to know whether the learning objective related to a task has been achieved or not (*ibid.*). Indeed, when talking about WCF and its power, it is crucial to set out the objectives that are related to it: via the provided feedback, teachers want to help their learners to achieve those set goals. That is why it seems essential to discuss the objectives.

According to Bargh, Gollwitzer, Lee-Chai, Barndollar, and Trotschel, the objectives may trigger action to achieve them but they may also have the effect of producing perseverance in the learners even if there are obstacles, difficulties (Bargh, Gollwitzer, Lee-Chai, Barndollar, and Trotschel in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 88). The authors also claimed that the goals may encourage “the resumption” of interrupted tasks even though there might be other “attractive alternatives” (Bargh, Gollwitzer, Lee-Chai, Barndollar, and Trotschel in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 88).

As argued by Black and William in 1998, the more challenging the objectives are, the more feedback is provided, the higher the commitment and quality of the learner's work will be (Black & William, 1998 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 88). It can therefore be argued that the objectives imply two things: “challenge and commitment” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 88).

In their 2007 study, Hattie and Timperley cited Locke and Latham, who claimed in 1990 that the objectives and feedback have two things in common: the first is that they both inform the learners about the level to be reached so that they can adapt their action and efforts (*ibid.*). To quote Locke and Latham: “Feedback allows them to set reasonable goals and to track their performance in relation to their goals so that adjustments in effort, direction, and even strategy can be made as needed” (Locke & Latham, 1990 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 88).

Furthermore, Hattie & Timperley claimed that neither the criteria for achievement nor the objectives should be too vague or unclear, otherwise it would be too difficult to determine whether or not the objective has been achieved (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 88). The second common point is that, like the objectives to be achieved, feedback enables learners to set suitable future objectives once the previous ones have been accomplished (*ibid.*, 88-89). However, Hattie and Timperley do not explain in their article how this is possible.

Moreover, WCF can only lead to improvement in the writing skills if and only if the objectives are clear enough to enable the learners to close the gap between their current knowledge and what their second language teachers ask them to achieve (*ibid.*, 89). In other words, learners need to be fully aware of the objectives, to be able to define them clearly, otherwise they will not feel the need to fill the gap (*ibid.*).

Hattie and Timperley also claim that if there is no relation between the provided WCF and the objectives, it will not be of any help (*ibid.*). To put it differently, there should be a match between the criteria for success and the correction (i.e. WCF).

Finally, when students want to attain the goals, they will generally do everything to obtain feedback (i.e. the goals then makes the feedback more effective) (Locke & Latham, 1990 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 89). However, it is important not to take this commitment for granted, but to nurture and develop it (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 89). Hattie and Timperley argued that this commitment can be driven by different factors such as “peer groups; competition; role models; public statements about intentions, incentives” (*ibid.*) and also by different types of instruments such as “rewards; punishment; and general valence and instrumentality” (*ibid.*).

So, WCF is powerful if the objectives are clear, if there is a relation between the provided feedback and the set goals, if it helps the learners to achieve these goals and if the students are encouraged to ask for WCF.

7.1.1.2 *How to achieve those objectives? (How am I going?)*

The second question to focus on to grasp the power of WCF is “How am I going?” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 89). Now the learners know the objectives/goals they have to reach, it is important to work out how they will be able do that and to identify the tools they need to achieve these goals. According to Hattie and Timperley, this second question can be answered provided that teachers have issued information about the purpose of the task, often stipulating the desired standard before it is actually performed by the learners (*ibid.*). Both scholars argue that WCF

is only effective when it gives information on the learners' progress and/or on how to achieve this (*ibid.*).

Regarding the learners, they are often keen to know how they are doing, where they are going but too often the only answer they get is a test or assessment, which - according to Hattie and Timperley - does not always fit the bill (*ibid.*). To quote Hattie and Timperley: ““Tests” are but one method used by teachers and students to address this question and, [...], often fail to convey feedback information that helps teachers and their students to know how they are going” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 89).

They claimed in 2007 that tests are just one form of answer among many others, but they often miss the mark, inasmuch as they do not give the information the L2 learners are seeking (i.e. how are we going?) (*ibid.*).

So, if WCF does not set out how to accomplish the goals (i.e. first question), it will not be of any help to the learners and it will lose its power. In other words, in order for the WCF to be powerful, the goals must be clear as well as the way to achieve them.

7.1.1.3 Impact of WCF and achieved objectives in the long term (Where to next?)

Once the L2 learners know the goals and how to achieve them on the basis of WCF provided by the teacher, the last question is “Where to next?” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 90), which means that once all the preliminary and necessary information is provided, WCF can be a helpful and beneficial source of “information that leads to greater possibilities for learning” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 90).

Indeed, as argued by Hattie and Timperley, the teaching process is made up of a series of consecutive steps; one of them is to give information and/or tasks that the learners try to accomplish, after which teachers provide the learners more information (*ibid.*). So, to the question “where to next?” learners get “more” as an answer (*ibid.*). And yet, WCF can be a more thorough and accurate answer providing more targeted information that will allow a better learning in the future (*ibid.*). To quote them: “students thus learn that the answer to “Where to next?” is “more.” The power of feedback, however, can be used to specifically address this question by providing information that leads to greater possibilities for learning” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 90). The various positive effects of WCF on the future tasks are: “enhanced challenges, more self-regulation over the learning process, greater fluency and automaticity, more strategies and processes to work on the tasks, deeper understanding, and more information about what is and what is not understood” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 90).

7.1.1.4 Conclusion of the analysis of these three crucial questions

Hattie and Timperley showed in their article that giving feedback just for the sake of it is not fruitful, in that it does not help L2 learners to progress in their learning and reach to set goals (Hattie & Timperley, 2007).

The three discussed questions and their answers aim at helping teachers provide a better feedback but more importantly, at helping students to improve their learning of a second language “when there is a discrepancy between what is understood and what is aimed to be understood” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 102).

7.1.2 Where to begin when providing WCF?

Although this is more of a problem for novice teachers than for experienced ones, I believe it is important to discuss it and to understand the different steps that need to be followed to provide effective and useful WCF.

According to Ferris, four different “sources” can be used when supplying WCF (Ferris, 2007: 170). Firstly, teachers should look for “the course rubric or grading criteria” and check if they have access to them (*ibid.*). If standards are to be taken into account when assessing a learner’s written task, the teacher should make them known to the pupils and should provide them with WCF that will help them to achieve the standards (*ibid.*).

Secondly, she argued that teachers should adapt their WCF according to the type of text they ask the learners to produce (*ibid.*).

Thirdly, on subsequent written tasks, teachers can adapt their WCF to each individual L2 learner’s need and progress (*ibid.*). To quote Ferris:

For example, if on a previous paper the student had trouble with focus or development, the teacher might want to raise the issue again on a subsequent paper, either to encourage the student for improvement or to remind the student that it is still a problem. (Ferris, 2007: 170)

Fourthly, teachers can focus their WCF on aspects have been covered in class and that need to be mastered (*ibid.*, 170-171). In other words, when providing WCF, teachers should keep in mind this following question: what I am looking for? (*ibid.*, 171).

7.1.3 Where should/must WCF be located?

After highlighting what needs to be taken into account in the process of issuing WCF, it seems relevant to know where WCF should be located; this question has barely been discussed in the

consulted articles and books, albeit skimmed over by Bitchener & Ferris in *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*.

In Ferris' and Bitchener's book, this idea of writing WCF in the margin is present throughout. They argue that when teachers issue indirect feedback, they can make use of various forms of it (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 132). For instance, teachers can decide to note in the margin the number of errors of a learner's text (*ibid.*). Even though this form of WCF can be quite implicit, it does not mean that it does not help students to progress in their learning (*ibid.*). Indeed, Haswell found out that providing learners with a specific type of implicit WCF called minimal marking system (i.e. grades only) and asking them to edit their texts themselves (i.e. rewriting) may help L2 learners to reduce the number of errors after some time (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 92; 150; 162). As explained by Haswell in Bitchener and Ferris', in the "minimal marking system" students receive checkmarks in the margins of lines in which there are errors, the number of checkmarks is recorded in the gradebook, and students are given time in class to try to find and correct the errors; their success in doing so impacts their grade" (Haswell, 1983 in Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 162).

Moreover, they state in their book that if language teachers decide to use the margin to provide WCF, using technology and more precisely processing tools can be quite helpful (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 152). Indeed, teachers can select a part of a sentence where an error has been made and thanks to processing tools, they can link it to a correction, a specific code, a suggestion in the margin "using the "comments" or "track changes" features" (*ibid.*).

7.1.4 Should questions be used?

Ferris argued that "jargon" and/or "rhetorical questions" should be avoided in the margins when providing WCF because it can be totally alien to the learners (e.g. Inc Senc) (Ferris, 2007: 171) or they (i.e. especially novice L2 learners) might mistake a rhetorical question for a real one (*ibid.*). To quote Ferris: "the student may not recognize a question as an indirect speech act and thus ignore the suggestion, frustrating and confusing the teacher, who thought s/he was politely making his/her expectations clear" (Ferris, 2007: 171). Furthermore, even if the learners understand these questions, they might not be able to use what the teacher is asking for in their subsequent reviews (*ibid.*). Finally, if the questions are not related to the objectives or if they are far too abstract, feedback might not help them to become better writers (*ibid.*).

Ferris points out that the comments written in the margin should not be lengthy, otherwise there will be some kind of imbalance between the students' productions and the teacher's comments: "I have seen where the teacher literally wrote more (in marginal comments

and a summary end note) than the student did! This, I argue, is more than a bit out balance!” (Ferris, 2007: 170).

7.1.5 Which types of WCF should be applied and how?

In order to identify the kind of WCF suitable for students/ L2 learners, it is extremely important to know their level in the target language. This crucial aspect is discussed in several articles such as in Lee’s 2013, in Mao & Crosthwaite’ 2019, in Guénette’s 2007 and in Ferris’ & Bitchener’s book *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*.

Many scholars agree that the first thing teachers need to know is where the learners are in their learning process (e.g. Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 126). On the basis of this crucial information, teachers will be able to apply the right WCF type. According to Ferris and Bitchener, it is clear that learners with a lower proficiency level in the target language need more WCF (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 126). They also believe that the least advanced or least gifted learners expect more regular feedback from their teachers (*ibid.*). Still, teachers need to be aware of how much WCF they issue, since too much could be potentially damaging (*ibid.*, 126; 129). On the other hand, L2 learners having fewer difficulties in the target language may need less WCF but that does not mean that teachers should not provide any: these learners need more WCF “on other aspects of their writing” (*ibid.*, 126). The two scholars also highlighted that advanced L2 learners are more likely to be able to spend more time working on their text than learners with a lower proficiency level (*ibid.*, 129). The former are therefore more likely to be able to cope with a larger amount of WCF (*ibid.*).

Regarding the types of WCF, both scholars also argue that before selecting items/aspects that need to be corrected, teachers should first determine whether the error spotted is a real one that should be corrected or just a simple mistake (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 130). In order to find out whether the error committed is indeed one which deserves attention, teachers should check whether the exact same error occurs in other parts of the learners’ texts or they can decide to provide indirect WCF and check whether it helps the L2 learners to understand the error committed (*ibid.*).

If the same error occurs again in subsequent written tasks, then it must be looked into and therefore selected (*ibid.*). After identifying all the errors, teachers have to decide whether it is judicious to provide the L2 learners with selective or non-selective WCF (*ibid.*).

If teachers decide to provide unfocused WCF, they would be wise to wonder whether each error should be dealt with this way or not (*ibid.*). However, it may not be helpful to apply

this type of WCF, since it may demotivate the learners or overstretch their attention span, which would stop producing lasting gains (*ibid.*).

If teachers choose to provide targeted WCF, they will have to determine which categories of error they will focus on (*ibid.*). When doing so, Bitchener & Ferris claim that it may be preferable to start with the most frequent types of error “(e.g. past simple tense; noun-verb agreements)” (*ibid.*) and to move on to the less recurrent ones over time (*ibid.*). The advantage of this choice of strategy is that “it may help the learner reduce a large number of frequently occurring errors within a particular category” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 130).

Moreover, unfocused feedback can also be provided to advanced learners; they may make the most of this type of WCF provided that “they have already developed a high level of accuracy in using the items that are responded to” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 129). Bitchener and Ferris also pointed out in 2012 that selective feedback is helpful for both advanced and less advanced L2 learners (*ibid.*). Indeed, if teachers focus on specific aspects, all learners will be able to progress (*ibid.*). Depending on the learners’ proficiency level and the complexity of the targeted aspects, language teachers might decide to focus on one or several aspects in their WCF (*ibid.*,130). Furthermore, if the selected aspects/items are fully acquired by the learners after some written tasks, the teachers may decide to focus on new aspects/items in new written tasks (*ibid.*). In addition, Bitchener and Ferris are quite specific about the amount of time that will be required for the students to fully assimilate a linguistic item (i.e. they are able to use the selected and focused linguistic items correctly):

Over a semester, this targeted approach could well enable learners to increase their levels of accuracy in using a wide range of forms and structures. The number of categories that could be treated effectively in this way might also depend on the presence of other variables (e.g. proficiency level of learners; simplicity or complexity of linguistic form or structure being targeted [...]). (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 130)

Furthermore, as Bitchener, Young & Cameron have argued in their article in 2005 and as explained in Bitchener & Ferris’ book: “The combination of explicit instruction and written CF is likely to focus the learner’s attention more acutely than if only one of these forms of input is provided” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 130).

Concerning global or local errors, Burt argues that teachers should focus on errors that negatively affect communication (Burt, 1975 in Lee, 2013: 112). Related to this issue of global or local errors, Van Beuningen’s, De Jong’s & Kuiken’s 2012 study showed that “direct WCF is more effective for grammatical errors, and indirect WCF works better for non-grammatical errors” (Van Beuningen, De Jong & Kuiken, 2012 in Lee, 2013: 112). Bitchener & Ferris (2012)

claim that language teachers should first focus on errors which might lead to label some L2 learners “as less proficient writers” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012 in Lee, 2013: 112).

Finally, like other types of WCF, the use of direct or indirect WCF depends on the level of proficiency of the learners. Telling the learner what is wrong in their texts and giving them a correct example is likely to be more useful if learners do not understand their errors (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 132). Both scholars argue that in the literature, teachers can choose between two ways of providing correct information (*ibid.*, 131). On the one hand, if teachers make use of direct WCF, they can add a symbol like an asterisk next to the error to signal to the learner that he/she can find explanations at the bottom of the text (*ibid.*, 132). On the other hand, it is possible to directly provide the L2 learners with a correction next to the error and to indicate that meta-linguistic information can be found at the bottom (*ibid.*).

Regarding indirect WCF, it has already been mentioned before that it can take various forms: “underlining, circling, and highlighting —are more explicit than marginal tally of errors” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 132). Even though the learners’ proficiency level in the target language has an impact on the teachers’ choice of WCF, Bitchener and Ferris argued in their book published in 2012 that some less advanced learners might prefer receiving indirect feedback to getting direct one (*ibid.*, 134). According to these two scholars, several factors “might determine whether a learner prefers direct or indirect feedback include prior language learning experience, confidence or apprehension, commitment to the task of learning the language, contextual and situational variables, and nature of the writing task” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 134).

Furthermore, before opting for a specific type of WCF, they suggest that it would be wise to talk about WCF with the learners because if they agree with your choice and if they think it will help them to progress, they will be more likely to take the feedback into consideration and therefore, make the most of it (*ibid.*).

Although the two kinds of WCF mentioned above (i.e. direct and indirect WCF) have been discussed at length in this master’s thesis, there is no conclusion as to which form of feedback is the most effective in the long term. Several specialists in the field have their own opinions on this subject, but to date there is no clear-cut conclusion. As stated by two pioneers in this field:

[M]any of the early studies found no difference in effect for direct and indirect types of feedback, but recent studies comparing the two approaches have found that direct feedback is more effective for SLA purposes over time even though there may be short-term benefits for both. (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 132)

These two scholars propose different paths that can be used by teachers to help all their learners progress in their language learning: “Teachers may find, for example, that a mixture of direct and indirect feedback options are the best way to scaffold learners who fail to benefit immediately from a single feedback session” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 133). They also claim that “This approach could be used with lower proficiency learners as well as advanced learners” (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 133).

Finally, eight years prior to Hattie & Timperley’s study, i.e. in 1999, Hattie clarified that some WCF Types were more efficient than others (Hattie, 1999 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 83-84). It is noteworthy that the most fruitful feedback is when the student is given information about a task and the way to perform it more effectively (Hattie & Timperley, 2007: 84). If the feedback consists of punishing, rewarding or congratulating, then the effect will be quite minimal (*ibid.*). Hattie's 1999 study found out that the most effective forms of WCF are: feedback reinforcing the learner’s skills, computer-assisted instructional feedback of a pedagogical nature (e.g. a new lesson) or feedback that is relevant to the set objectives (*ibid.*). The forms providing no information whatsoever about the task such as congratulations, rewards, punishments and programmed instruction are the least effective (*ibid.*).

7.1.6 What quantity?

As mentioned in the point above, the pupil’s level can have an impact on the choice of WCF but also on the amount issued. Indeed, as stated by Bitchener and Ferris, the large amount of WCF might have an impact on L2 learners who are touchier than others (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 128). To quote them:

It is a well-established fact that most learners want and expect clear and regular feedback on their writing, but there is always the possibility that too much feedback at any one time might be demotivating or too burdensome for cognitive processing. (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 128)

In order to decide how much feedback to provide to the students, it is important to consider two specific points. Firstly, one must wonder for each individual student whether focused or unfocused feedback is preferable (*ibid.*). Secondly, if the teacher decides to provide focused feedback, then he should narrow it down to a limited series of selected types of errors (*ibid.*). By contrast, if he/she chooses to provide unfocused feedback, then there is no limited number of categories to address (*ibid.*). One of the main reasons for opting for a focused approach on several categories of error or on a very limited number of them is the level of the learners and therefore their processing capacity (*ibid.*).

As stated above, Bitchener and Ferris argue that teachers must pay attention to the learners' level when providing WCF so that they do not discourage them; "At lower proficiency levels, learners can easily be overwhelmed with too much information to process, even when they are not given much corrective feedback" (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 129). Moreover, they state that more advanced L2 learners are more likely to be able to cope with a larger amount of WCF than less advanced L2 learners (*ibid.*).

7.2 Strategies to be taken into account and possibly applied when providing WCF

7.2.1 The goals must be clear

Firstly, WCF is undoubtedly an essential contribution to the learner's development as well as a potential support for the learning process, which is more and more regarded as a rather complex journey requiring a personal and active involvement of the learner himself (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). Transmission of knowledge in the classroom can therefore be seen as a small part of the learning process (*ibid.*). Still, that doesn't detract from the importance of the role of the teacher, who remains a crucial cog in the wheel, more particularly when providing advice and counsel, namely by providing corrective feedback. The learners are given information about the gap between their current level of language and the target, i.e. what is expected from them (*ibid.*).

In order to achieve its main goal, which is to contribute to the global learning process, in other words, help the learners improve, the corrective feedback should meet some requirements.

According to Ek and Sauvage, there is often a significant gap between what the objectives outlined by teachers are and what the L2 learners think they are (*ibid.*). The aim of WCF is to get students to meet the expected standards, which must therefore be clear because otherwise the provided WCF will not be effective. This is clearly exposed in Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick's study in 2006. According to these two scholars, it is crucial to make sure that the goals are crystal clear in the pupils' minds (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 7). In their article, they argue that many studies have shown that it is really a problem that needs to be tackled by language teachers (*ibid.*). Indeed, if L2 learners do not understand what the precise goals are, it can have a negative impact on what they produce but also on the value of WCF (*ibid.*).

Moreover, explaining the goals does not only mean that teachers should outline them but there must also be some coherence between what the teacher requires and what the students are able to perform. As cited by Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick: "understanding goals means that

there must be a reasonable degree of overlap between the task goals set by students and the goals originally set by the teacher” (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 7).

One way for teachers to specify their goals/criteria is to provide L2 learners with written information on the “assessment criteria and/or standards that define different levels of achievement” (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 8). However, research has shown that it is difficult to implement that through handouts or “verbal descriptions in the classroom” (Rust, Price & O'Donovan, 2003 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 8).

Different effective strategies for clarifying the objectives have been developed by different researchers. For instance, in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick’s article, Orsmond, Merry and Reiling have suggested providing students with examples of other students’ performances (Orsmond, Merry et Reiling, 2002 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 8). According to them: “Exemplars are effective because they make explicit what is required and they define a valid standard against which students can compare their work” (Orsmond, Merry et Reiling, 2002 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 8).

Ek and Sauvage have discussed another strategy that could be helpful: proposing an assessment exercise in which the pupils are asked to comment the work of another L2 learner using the criteria grid the teacher uses (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version).

7.2.2 Provide them with opportunities of self-assessment

WCF can also provide assistance to help learners to progress in their learning by giving them the chance to reflect on various aspects of their own learning (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version).

As argued by Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, there has been a growing interest in recent years in what is known as 'self-regulation' (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 8). Indeed, many researchers in the field have shown that, when properly conducted, 'self-regulation' can lead to significant improvement in learning (*ibid.*). As explained by Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick:

For example, McDonald and Boud (2003) have shown that training in self-assessment can improve students’ performance in final examinations. Also, Taras (2001; 2002; 2003) has carried out a number of studies on student self-assessment in higher education which have shown positive benefits. (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 8)

Another way of developing the so-called self-assessment skills is to ask learners to assess one another (*ibid.*, 9). Indeed, these peer reviews help to develop the skills needed to make objective judgements in relation to the objectives, “skills which are transferred when students turn to

producing and regulating their own work” (Boud, Cohen and Sampson, 1999; Gibbs, 1999 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 9).

These two strategies, namely self-evaluation/self-assessment and peer review are also highlighted in Ferris’ 2007 article. Contrary to what one may be tempted to think, she argued that teachers using these types of strategy are not to be seen as idle (Ferris, 2007: 167). As far as self-evaluation is concerned, she highlights the fact that editing one's own text usually leads to some amelioration (*ibid.*). In terms of peer feedback, she emphasized the value of writing for “different audiences and readers and that the dynamics of receiving praise and suggestions from classmates differs considerably from those of obtaining feedback from an authority figure such as a teacher” (Ferris, 2007: 167).

7.2.3 The given WCF should be of high quality.

In order for WCF to be useful to the learners, it should be handed in shortly after the written production has been submitted, otherwise the learners might have forgotten what the written composition was about and how they tried to reach the set target (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). These two scholars also mentioned that teachers should focus not only on the strengths but also on the shortcomings, but more importantly, learners must get helpful advice (*ibid.*).

They added that teachers should also limit the amount of information so that the L2 learners do not feel overwhelmed: this will therefore give them the feeling that they can achieve the goals and thus motivate them. Finally, they should stay focused on the expected goals set by the teacher (*ibid.*). However, according to Faulx and Danse, teachers should not only focus on the objectives that still need to be achieved by the L2 learners but also on what they have already attained (Faulx & Danse, 2015 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version).

7.2.4 WCF should be discussed with the L2 learners to ensure it is understood

In order for the student to use the feedback correctly and properly, the student has to understand it. Although this may seem quite obvious, it is often far from being the case. Therefore, it is essential for teachers to take the time to provide plain information (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). Still, corrective feedback is by no means a mere transfer of information: it also involves an active participation on the part of the learners in the error treatment through dialogues with the teacher (Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). However, because it is not always possible to discuss the feedback with every single pupil (i.e. it is time-consuming), Nicol & MacFarlane-

Dick suggested other strategies that can be used to make sure the WCF is clearly understood (Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). For instance, teachers can arrange meetings in small groups, they can ask pupils to discuss WCF with their peers or ask them to identify some elements of the provided WCF that could help them to progress (Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version).

For their part, Daele & Lambert (2013) suggest other strategies such as answering L2 learners' questions about own written tasks or, like Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, planning an individual appointment (Daele & Lambert, 2013 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version).

7.2.5 Teachers should motivate their learners and boost their self-esteem through WCF

As Ek and Sauvage claim in their article, it is widely recognised that WCF can have either a beneficial or detrimental impact on the learner's confidence and subsequently, on the learning process (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). It is therefore crucial on that account to encourage the learner by stressing what has already been achieved, what the learner is already able to do (*ibid.*). This is indeed essential to boost their self-esteem and their motivation (Faulx & Danse, 2015 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version).

Still about self-esteem, Ek and Sauvage argue that corrective feedback should never have to do with the character of the learner; corrective feedback must be only about the produced written task (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). According to Ek and Sauvage, if L2 learners believe that the teachers focus on their personality rather than on their efforts in their tasks, they will not try to correct themselves and arguably to enhance their skills (*ibid.*). Moreover, the language used in the written corrective feedback should by no means be disparaging (*ibid.*). On the contrary, it should be perceived by the learner as something positive (*ibid.*).

Besides focusing on the students' written production, Ek and Sauvage suggest several tracks to encourage L2 learners and to help them improve their writing skills (*ibid.*). For instance, teachers should avoid handing in marked tasks without WCF because this practice can distract learners from what they need to achieve in that they will solely focus on the marks (*ibid.*). Teachers can also allow students to alter certain aspects of their written tasks before final submission (*ibid.*). In the same line, Faulx & Dance (2015) claimed in 2015 that teachers should keep positive behaviour in mind before addressing learners' errors and telling them what should be improved (Faulx & Dance, 2015 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online

version). Finally, Daele & Lambert (2013) also suggest explaining to the learners which errors should be avoided in the future writing tasks while pointing out what is already mastered by the L2 learners and what remains to be done (i.e. objectives) (Daele & Lambert, 2013 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version).

With regard to the overriding role of the learner's motivation, we should also mention Ferris' argument concerning the appropriation of students' written texts by teachers. Indeed, in Ferris' view, some teachers tend to make their pupils' text their own when correcting them (Ferris, 2007: 167). By that she means that teachers tend to cross what L2 learners have written and rewrite the right formula, structure or word (*ibid.*, 167-168). Ferris argues that teachers should avoid doing that, since it discourages their learners (*ibid.*, 168). In order to prevent that, Ferris suggests that teachers should suggest improvement (*ibid.*). To quote Ferris:

I provide several specific suggestions as to how they can avoid appropriation, such as making "hedged" suggestions ("Maybe you could. . ."), staying away from crossing out or rewriting student texts, giving explicit permission to students to disagree with or choose not to utilize a teacher or peer suggestion as long as they can explain why, and asking students to include a revise-and-resubmit cover memo explaining how they did/ did not apply feedback they received. (Ferris, 2007, 168)

7.2.6 L2 learners must have opportunities to improve.

As the corrective feedback aims to enhance the learner's level, in other words to help the learners reach the set targets, it might be helpful to allow the learners to submit their corrected production a second time or to use the corrective feedback when working on another production (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). This would help the learners realise how helpful WCF is in the learning process.

To help learners to understand WCF and subsequently make use of it, teachers can give them the chance to re-submit their written tasks and/or they can propose them what could be called a multi-stage assignment which would allow the learners to use the information collected during the first step in the ensuing ones (*ibid.*).

The necessity for allowing the learners to look carefully at the WCF and to apply the teacher's recommendations is also discussed in Nicol's & Macfarlane-Dick's 2006 article. According to them, most learners have limited opportunities to use the feedback they receive as WCF (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 13). They argue that most teachers provide L2 learners with WCF and then swiftly move on to the next assignment, task (*ibid.*). In this article, Boud (2000) claims that re-submissions are instrumental in improving the writing skills (Boud,

2000 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 13). Another scholar, namely Hounsell agrees with the three above-mentioned scholars: “greater emphasis might need to be given to providing feedback on work-in-progress (e.g. on structures for essays, plans for reports, sketches) and to encouraging students to plan the strategies they might use to improve subsequent work” (Hounsell, 2004 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 13).

7.2.7 WCF helps teachers to improve their teaching

Good WCF practice does not only help learners to progress but it also contributes to a better teaching (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 14). As Yorke stated in 2003: “The act of assessing has an effect on the assessor as well as the student. Assessors learn about the extent to which they [students] have developed expertise and can tailor their teaching accordingly” (Yorke, 2003 in Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 14).

In order to produce relevant and efficient WCF, teachers need reliable data on their learners’ level and progress in the target language (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 14). Teachers can use different strategies, to gather these useful data about their pupils. Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick mention some of them: tests, in-class presentations and putting questions to the learners (*ibid.*). According to these two scholars: “Such information helps teachers uncover student difficulties with subject matter (e.g. conceptual misunderstandings) and with study methods” (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 14).

Other strategies can be used by teachers to gather information about their learners’ progress. For instance, teachers can ask their students to assess the way they provide corrective feedback (*ibid.*). When giving an assessed written task, they can also ask them to self-identify their own difficulties; they can ask them to work in groups and to come up with “‘a question worth asking’, [...], that they would like to explore for a short time at the beginning of the next tutorial” (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 14).

7.3 Conclusion on the suggested solutions.

Even though this MA has identified several tips and strategies to help teachers to provide better WCF and to counteract their beliefs, some authors explain that it is not easy to go against one’s beliefs and change the way language teachers supply WCF to their learners. As expressed by one participant in Lee’s 2008 study: “It’s hard to change the conventional practice of detailed marking. I think students, parents, and teachers are all used to it” (Lee, 2008: 81).

In her article, Guénette claims that teachers should go on correcting learners’ written tasks but they also have to bear in mind that there is no “corrective feedback recipe” (Guénette,

2007: 51). She implies that there is no such thing as perfect WCF: even though specific strategies can lead to better WCF, other factors are beyond teachers' control (i.e. some of them were outlined in 5.1.3 and 5.1.4) (*ibid.*, 51-52). This scholar argues that the success of WCF depends on "the classroom context, the type of errors students make, their proficiency level, the type of writing they are asked to do, and a collection of other variables that are as of yet unknown" (Guénette, 2007: 51-52). She concludes her article by stating that if teachers do not take a crucial factor into consideration, namely the pupils' motivation, any type of WCF will inevitably result in failure (*ibid.*, 52). In other words, no matter how much WCF is issued, it will not help if the students are not keen to improve their writing skills (*ibid.*). This aspect is also discussed in Chandler' 2003 study. To quote Chandler:

What the findings of the present study suggest is that if students did not revise their writing based on feedback about errors, having teachers mark errors was equivalent to giving no error feedback since the students' new writing did not increase in correctness over one semester. (Chandler, 2003: 280)

8 The present study

8.1 Aim of this master's thesis: reminder

The aim of this master thesis is to highlight the difference between what the specialized literature says about WCF (i.e. what the language teachers should choose and apply) and the actual practices of teachers, while highlighting teachers' beliefs on this subject matter. In this eighth part, the different stages of my analysis will be explained.

8.2 Methodology

8.2.1 The methodology used in this MA

For my master thesis, I was inspired by the methodology used Montgomery & Baker's article *Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance* (2007). I have decided to base my methodology on this article for several reasons. Firstly, because the central subject matter of this study is close to mine, since it is about the effect of written corrective feedback in second language acquisition. Secondly, because it highlights the different strategies used by English language teachers to correct the various written tasks given to students. Thirdly, because the authors made use of questionnaires, a method used for the analysis of genuine corrections anonymously provided by teachers.

8.2.2 Subjects

Unlike much research on corrective feedback given to second language learners, this thesis is dedicated to written and not oral corrective feedback. Although several teachers did not follow up on my emails or decided to stop participating in my research in February 2020 because of COVID19, I still managed to get in touch with four teachers who were eager to help me out with my research on WCF.

Five teachers (two females and three males) agreed to participate in my survey. Four of them are currently teaching in secondary schools and the last teacher has been retired for almost a year. Those teachers were all English and Dutch teachers, and all of them have been teaching English for several years. Currently, four of them are still correcting written tasks and giving written corrective feedback to pupils from the fifth secondary to the final year. Even though the fifth teacher retired last year after 38 years of work, I thought it would be interesting to analyse his self-assessment and his way of correcting after a whole career. However, a clear distinction will be made between the four currently practising English teachers and the retired one.

8.2.3 Procedure

8.2.3.1 Students' written tasks and teachers' written corrective feedback

The first part of my qualitative study will be devoted to the analysis of the four teachers' way of providing WCF. In order to do so, six corrected written tasks per teacher were collected during the second semester of 2021. The four teachers provided me with two papers with good marks (i.e. between 14 and 20 out of 20), two others that need to be improved (i.e. between 10 and 13 out of 20) and finally, two with low marks (under 10/20). One of the teachers (i.e. teacher A), provided me with six unscored copies. On the basis of his assessments and his comments via e-mails about his corrected written tasks, I will distribute the copies among the three above-mentioned categories. Furthermore, I asked the four language teachers to provide me with corrected written tasks that really reflect their usual practice of WCF. Indeed, as my analysis will be based on a limited number of copies, it was important to have texts reflecting their everyday practice.

This first part aims at analysing the kind of feedback used by the four teachers according to the level of their students and comparing it with what is written in the literature. Secondly, I will focus on the strategies discussed in this MA and see if they are applied by my participants. Finally, a short analogy will be made between the teachers' way of providing WCF and their answers to my questionnaire in order to find out whether there are discrepancies or not.

8.2.3.2 Teachers' self-assessments

Teachers have been asked to complete a questionnaire about their way of providing WCF to examine their self-assessment on WCF.

The first part of the questionnaire is related to the type of feedback they use. The teachers had to choose from four different options circling one of them (i.e. 1= toujours; 2= souvent; 3= parfois ; 4= rarement ; 5= jamais). For instance, if they believed they correct every error, they had to circle "1" but if they never do that, they had to circle 5. Unlike Montgomery and Baker, I decided to make use of a numerical code because I felt that if they had had to circle words such as 'jamais' instead of numbers, the subjects might have felt embarrassed or unsettled. The second part of it concerns the pupils' reactions to their WCF. Lastly, the third part of the questionnaire is about their feelings about the effect of WCF on their pupils, about their teacher training and their career. It also seeks to find out if specific factors (e.g. parents, the school policy, etc.) have an impact on their way of providing WCF.

It is important to add that in this MA, I only focused on the relevant answers.

9 Analysis of the data

9.1 Analysis of the corrected written tasks

9.1.1 Introduction: focus on the analysis

In this first part, I am going to analyse the three types of corrected written tasks. In the first instance, I will look at and compare the pieces of writing which got fairly good grades. Indeed, I will focus on the comments used and on the method of correction: code, highlighting, global remarks or not. After this first analysis, I will do the same with the two other types of corrected written tasks, namely written tasks with above average grades and low grades. The goal of this part of my master's thesis is to find out whether language teachers adapt their WCF to the level of their pupils and if they apply strategies that are recommended by scholars and that are explained in part 7 of this MA.

In order to make the analysis clearer and most importantly anonymous, all annexes (i.e. corrected written tasks) and teachers are coded.

9.1.1.1 Comparison and analysis of the writings with good marks

9.1.1.1.1 Grades and praise

If appendices 1 to 8 are analysed, it can be noted that the correction technique is by and large the same; when the text is very good, which is the case for the written tasks 1,2,3,4,7,8 (17/20 between 18/20), almost no correction or comment is given to the student. However, if the two

first texts (i.e. annexes 1,2) are analysed in depth and compared with the others, one can see that teacher A does not provide any grades to the pupils' texts. It can therefore be argued that this teacher goes against Lee's statement: "A reason to explain why teachers still award scores/grades is that this is necessary for summative purposes (as these scores/grades count towards the final grade students get)" (Lee, 2009: 17). Somehow, it could be said that this particular teacher seeks the welfare of the students as suggested by Craven, Marsh & Debus in 1991: "Feedback given as grades has also been shown to have especially negative effects on the self-esteem of low ability students" (Craven, Marsh & Debus, 1991 in Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006: 12).

In the case of teacher A, there are no grades and virtually no error is corrected. Indeed, there is only positive appreciation or praise and as it could be seen in this MA, many scholars do not find a common ground regarding the usefulness of encouragement in WCF. For instance, scholars like Sadler (1989) and Hattie (2001) do not believe that praise is "a valuable form" of WCF (Sadler, 1989; Hattie, 2001 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49) whereas Lee and Ferris agree that it is rather important not to focus only on the negative points of a student's text (Lee, 2009: 16-17; Ferris, 2007: 168) and that is exactly what teacher A does: "bel effort", "not bad".

However, the fact that this teacher does not give the learners any grades might disturb them: indeed, if they do not have access to their grades, they might wonder if what they have produced is good enough or if they still have to make progress in order to be able to pass exams. In other words, this corroborates what Butler claims, i.e. that if a teacher includes praise in WCF, this learner will mainly be concentrated on himself/ herself (i.e. what Butler calls the 'self') and not on the task or his/her progress anymore (Butler, 1987 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 49).

Unlike teacher A, teachers B, C and D correct many more errors. However, only teacher D uses symbols in her copies with very good grades to show that what the pupils have produced is correct.

Finally, teachers B and C do not provide praise on the L2 learners' copies or make use of symbols that could indicate to the learner that what she/he has written is good and that she/he should keep up the good work. Furthermore, if we compare all the written tasks with good grades, one could notice that both teachers - but mainly teacher C - focus on pupils' weaknesses and errors, which could undermine the pupils' morale as suggested by Connors and Lunsford in their 1993 study, teachers are not always aware that pupils not only ask for WCF but also want to be praised and encouraged in some ways (Connors & Lunsford, 1993 in Burke &

Pieterick, 2010: 49). Teacher C does not seem aware of that wish. The chosen type(s) of WCF used by the participants will be analysed and discussed below.

9.1.1.1.2 Type of WCF used

As mentioned earlier in this MA, specialists in this field advocate taking the student's level into consideration before starting to provide WCF. If one looks at the written tasks with good marks, it can be noticed that different types of strategies are used. For instance, teachers A and B use very little WCF. On the one hand, teacher A hardly corrects or modifies anything. Indeed, this teacher corrected in total only nine errors in both copies using direct WCF. On the other hand, even if teacher B only corrected few errors, which is not surprising as the students got 18/20, when he did, he favoured indirect feedback, mostly underlining or coding (e.g. 'PL', 'SP').

If one analyses the corrected texts of teacher D, one can notice that although 1 point separates the copies of teacher B (18/20) and D (17/20), the method used is not the same. Indeed, teacher D is much more of a stickler and only uses direct corrective feedback, as can be seen in annexes 7 and 8.

It is noteworthy that teacher C makes use of the two main types of feedback, namely direct and indirect WCF. However, if we closely look at the two corrected texts and focus on the proportion of the two types of feedback, it appears that the teacher clearly inclines towards indirect feedback, e.g. underlining and codes. Moreover, in contrast to the other corrected texts, hers are full of corrections and without an ounce of encouragement. Nevertheless, this assumption is to be confirmed with the answers to my questionnaire on how she provides her pupils with WCF.

What is interesting about attached files 5 and 6 is that, unlike the other teachers, teacher C uses a lot of codes and tends to correct a lot of sentences/words, especially in appendix number 5. Since she does not select the type(s) of error(s) she corrects in the L2 learners' pieces of writing, one could conclude that she is not aware that the more non-selective feedback she uses, the more demotivating it might be for the students in their learning. As highlighted by Ferris in 2007, constantly using comprehensive WCF can lead to damaging consequences for both teachers and pupils:

Whether I am discussing content-focused or form-focused feedback, I do try to steer trainees toward a selective, prioritized approach to responding rather than attempting to address every problem they see in every student paper. The first reason for this is practical—they will exhaust themselves and overwhelm their students if they provide an excessive amount of commentary or correction. (...). Secondly, being selective and prioritizing reminds these future teachers that their

long-term goal of moving students toward improved writing and increased autonomy in assessing and revising their own work is more important than the short-term aim of “fixing” the particular paper under construction. (Ferris, 2007: 170)

This passage from Ferris' article is particularly relevant since Teacher C is a rather young teacher who has only been teaching for only a few years. Through the questionnaire I will try to find out whether she unwittingly only provides unfocused WCF.

Although Ferris urges to use more selective than comprehensive WCF, she along with Bitchener argued in 2012 that comprehensive WCF can be used when dealing with learners whose level of written accuracy is quite high (Bitchener & Ferris 2012 in Lee, 2013: 109): “More recently, Bitchener & Ferris (2012) have added that comprehensive and unfocused WCF may be useful to advanced learners with a high level of accuracy” (Bitchener & Ferris 2012 in Lee, 2013: 109). However, teacher C informed me that she could not send me the corrected papers of the most advanced pupils because they did not take any written tasks during the second term of the school year. It could therefore be argued that there is a gap between what the scholars (i.e. in this case, Bitchener & Ferris) advocate and what this teacher actually applies, i.e. selective WCF even though the learners are not that advanced.

Furthermore, although the way teachers C and D correct texts produced by good students is different, both seem to exert a lot of control over the students' texts when correcting them. Indeed, teacher D only uses direct feedback, which does not allow the student to reflect on his/her mistakes and understand the reason. As for teacher C, she uses non-selective feedback, which does not allow her pupils to improve on their ability to correct their texts autonomously, since they are overwhelmed by corrections, which could be detrimental in the end. As argued by many scholars, teachers should strike the right balance between these two types of WCF. For instance, Straub argued in 1996 that if language teachers tend to use direct and comprehensive feedback, this leads to them having a great control over the text written by the pupils, who will become less independent, less in control and will therefore progress at a slower pace (Straub, 1996 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 39). Ferris shares the same opinion as Straub and argues that they should hand over more control to their pupils and find the right balance between correcting learners' texts and altering the students' written tasks and taking them over when correcting them (Ferris, 2007: 167-168).

Unlike the other teachers, teacher C is the only one using several colours. On the basis of my analysis, I have come to the conclusion that red was used to correct errors and green to highlight words that were appropriately used. These statements will be confirmed on the basis of the answers to the questionnaire.

It could be concluded that for the same type of texts (i.e. texts with good grades), the subjects in this MA do not use the same kind of feedback. Indeed, one would think that as they are dealing with good quality texts, they would predominantly make use of indirect feedback, selective feedback and coded WCF but this is not the case: each teacher is different and applies their own type of WCF. What will be interesting in the rest of this MA is to see if, depending on the level of the student, teachers adapt their way of correcting.

9.1.1.2 Comparison and analysis of the writings with above average marks

In this part, I paid attention to the copies which, according to the four participants, were produced by learners who usually get good grades (i.e. above the average) but who could perform better.

9.1.1.2.1 Comparison and analysis of the papers with marks above average

If one has a closer look at the copies, it is noticeable that the type of feedback supplied to those students is extremely similar to that of the previous target group.

Regarding teacher A, one can see that he sticks to his method: no grades. However, compared with his first two corrected texts, this teacher seems to have corrected more errors and he made use of direct corrective feedback. For instance, if one pays attention to annexes 9 and 10, one can see that errors like *'I try too watch'*, *'graps'*, *'almost all'*, *'to don't'* were directly corrected. As with the corrected texts 1 and 2, it is also possible to see brief overall comments about the texts produced such as *'not bad'*, *'bon vocabulaire'*, *'attention à l'orthographe'*. This strategy (i.e. encouragement, highlighting what has been well produced) has been long debated by Ek and Sauvage. Indeed, as they showed in their 2017 article, the impact of WCF on the learners' confidence and progress can be either beneficial or damaging (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). It is therefore important to encourage them by emphasizing what has already been achieved, what they are mastering (*ibid.*) and this is exactly what teacher A is doing here: he focuses on what has been achieved and not on his learners' personality.

As written above, teachers B, D and C stick to their own methods, i.e. indirect feedback, direct feedback and a mixture of both for teacher C.

Regarding teacher B, he could only provide me with one corrected written task with an above average grade. During a meeting with this teacher, he said that his pupils were either very good or very poor. That is why I was given only one corrected text from that teacher in

this section. There is nothing new about his feedback method: he solely makes use of indirect corrective feedback, more precisely underlining and sometimes coded feedback. In constantly using a specific type of indirect WCF, namely Underlining (Chandler, 2003), this teacher seems to agree with Chandler's opinion on this. As demonstrated in the theoretical part of this MA, Chandler is a defender of specific types of WCF notably the one used on annexes 10 and 11. According to Chandler, the so-called Underlining WCF has a positive effect on L2 learners' progress but it can only be used when learners' level is already quite high (Chandler, 2003, 293).

With regard to teacher C, it is noteworthy that in contrast to annexes 5 and 6, she uses more codes/letters in annexes 12 and 13. For instance, this teacher uses 'Cz', 'Log', 'p', 'a', etc. From an external point of view, it can be quite complicated to understand the meaning of these letters. As argued and as demonstrated by NG & Ishak in their 2018 study: "All three students (D, E and F) in the indirect WCF group seemed to face difficulties in the beginning of receiving the feedback. The reason being they were not familiar with the error codes" (Ng & Ishak, 2018: 104).

It would be interesting to know whether teacher C explains the meaning of her codes to her pupils beforehand. Indeed, as highlighted by the same two scholars, a document setting out the meaning of the codes can help L2 learners and thus, to progress in their writing skills: "Student F of the indirect WCF group stated that with the assistance provided by the guideline paper, she was able to do the corrections by herself" (Ng & Ishak 2018: 108).

On the other hand, the combination of unfocused feedback and a large quantity of code/letters might be felt as a real burden by the students. As demonstrated by Lee in 2013:

When students receive papers filled with a large range of error codes, they can be easily put off. In fact, it is common to find students simply copying error codes such as 'art' (for 'article') and 'prep' (for 'preposition') when they do their corrections (a common practice in Hong Kong schools after students receive teacher feedback), instead of writing out the correct answers. This shows that when error codes are used for errors that students are unable to fix, real learning cannot take place. (Lee, 2013: 111)

All these different arguments suggest that the research, the studies and therefore what is advised by the specialists in this field is hardly known, not to say unknown by the teachers surveyed in this MA. This statement will be confirmed or refuted by the questionnaire which will be discussed later.

In contrast to Appendices 7 and 8, it might make more sense to use direct feedback in Appendices 14 and 15, since the students, who produced texts 14 and 15, are less advanced. In

some ways it could be suggested that this teacher agrees with the conclusion of the study carried out by Ferris and Roberts in 2001 which showed that direct WCF is deemed helpful to learners since it reduces their hesitancy and misinterpretation (Ferris & Roberts, 2001 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47-48). Nevertheless, as it has been showed in this MA, many scholars do not find a clear and definitive agreement on the use of direct and indirect WCF. I mean that while some researchers think that direct is more useful than indirect feedback, others think it is the other way around. As explained in this MA (i.e. see 3.3.2.1): Robb et al. in 1986 and Ferris and Roberts in a more recent study (2001) concluded that all L2 learners made progress in their writing accuracy no matter which type of corrective feedback is actually applied (Robb et al., 1986; Ferris & Roberts, 2001 in Guénette, 2007: 48).

What distinguishes this from the first two appendices of this teacher is the use of some symbols such as interrogation or exclamation marks to signal major errors. Although both teachers C and D make use of symbols, the code used by teacher D seems to be much clearer.

9.1.1.3 Comparison and analysis of the papers with low marks

This last part of the analysis of the corrected texts and at the same time of the kind of WCF is particularly interesting because these texts are produced by students labelled as weak in the writing skills, it will be possible to see if the subjects adjust their WCF according to the level of their pupils or if they use exactly the same as for the other two categories of texts (i.e. corrected tasks with good grades and with grades above the average).

Regarding the weaker students' papers, one can clearly see that teacher A has changed his strategy when it comes to supplying WCF to weaker students. This language teacher makes use of direct WCF and of 'advisory feedback'. For instance, the pupils are given information about certain points to improve on. The teacher also explains the difference between certain words that do not have the same usage or meaning (i.e. see annexe 16 and 17). It could therefore be stated that this teacher adapts his WCF to weaker students. On the basis of his answers to the questionnaire, it will be possible to determine whether there is a correlation between his practice and his beliefs about WCF.

Unlike teacher A, teacher B does not change his type of WCF for weaker students. As it can be seen on annexes 18 and 19, the grades are 8/20 and 9/20 but if one closely examines the correction of the written texts, one can easily see that there is hardly any WCF: a few underscores and very few letters/codes. As stated by several scholars (e.g. Bitchener, Ferris and Guénette), teachers must in the first place pay attention to the level of the pupils and adapt their WCF consequently: so, on this basis, teachers should apply the most appropriate type of WCF

(Gu nette, 2007: 51; Bitchener & Ferris 2012: 126). According to Bitchener and Ferris, learners with a lower proficiency level will need more written corrective feedback than more proficient learners (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 126). What is here stated by Bitchener & Ferris is not applied by teacher B. It would be interesting to know whether this teacher is aware of this, whether certain factors influence the way he/she provides this particular type of feedback (e.g. the school policy, the parents' wish).

Regarding teacher C's copies, one can notice that she keeps the same sort of WCF as for the four other written productions. In contrast with her four other corrected texts discussed above, she added some comments such as '*not relevant*', '*obviously*' or '*use the passive voice instead*'. The two first comments seem to have a negative connotation while the third one could be seen as a remark that could help the student to get better (i.e. supportive remark). If one carefully looks at the two first comments, they can be seen as evaluative. Burke and Pieterick argued in their book that evaluative WCF is more about value judgement: "Evaluative feedback [...] captures the tutor's perception of the student's performance" (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 27). According to Elbow, if teachers write evaluative comments, it means that they mainly focus on the learners' performances and thus on "how well the student did in relation to criteria" (Elbow, 1993 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 29).

Concerning the third comment, namely '*use the passive voice instead*', one can regard it as advisory feedback as it provides "learners with guidance about how to improve on future task or assignment; to identify aspects of the performance which need improvement or support" (Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 27).

Regarding support, as argued by Faulx & Danse, and Ek & Sauvage, it is crucial to encourage L2 learners by emphasizing their progress (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). Indeed, by doing so, the learners' motivation is boosted (Faulx & Danse, 2015 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). In annexes 20 and 21, there is no sign of encouragement coming from teacher. Her views on whether WCF must be supportive or not will be discussed and analysed on the basis of the answers to the questionnaire.

Finally, teacher D makes use not only of direct but also of indirect WCF in texts 22 and 23. Interestingly, this teacher does not use direct WCF more frequently than for her four other pupils' corrected written texts. When what is written is intelligible, she uses indirect corrective feedback, more precisely Underlining and when it is comprehensible but wrong, she makes use of direct feedback like in her other corrected texts.

As discussed above, teachers B and D have their own way of providing WCF but according to several scholars such as Ferris or Straub in Burke & Pieterick, if teachers exert too

much control over their learners' productions in their way of correcting/providing WCF, it will then be detrimental to them (Ferris, 2007: 167-168; Straub, 1996 in Burke & Pieterick, 2010: 39)

9.1.2 Differences between what is applied by those teachers and what is written in the literature

Now that the types of WCF used in the corrected texts have been analysed, it would be interesting to know if some of the strategies put forward by theorists are applied by these teachers. In other words, I will try to see whether there is a gap between the literature and the practices of these teachers.

9.1.2.1 *Strategies (7.2.1; 7.2.3; 7.2.5) applied and avoided by the four teachers*

In point 7.2 different strategies that should be applied by teachers when writing WCF were outlined. Since my analysis is strictly based on texts corrected at some point, I will not be able to provide a complete picture of the situation. Therefore, it is not possible yet to discuss whether 7.2.2, 7.2.4, 7.2.6 are applied by the subjects in this section but it will later on.

9.1.2.2 *Teachers' goals and clarity of the prescribed criteria*

According to Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, language teachers should ensure that what they expect their pupils to produce (i.e. the goals) is completely clear to them (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 7). In their paper, they argue that many studies have shown that if L2 learners do not understand them, it can affect the quality of their writing as well as the effect of the WCF (*ibid.*).

If one scrutinises Teacher A's instructions (i.e. appendix 1), it is noticeable that the students are asked to write a text about a particular subject but nothing is said about the goals or the criteria: what should learners achieve? What should the text contain? How many words? What type of text should they produce? As stated by Ek and Sauvage:

«Si le but du feedback est d'amener les étudiants à atteindre les critères attendus, alors ceux-ci doivent être clairs sans quoi le feedback ne sera pas percutant » (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). To that they also added: « Il est utile de présenter à vos étudiants le relevé des critères d'évaluation » (Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). This is an important aspect that could be implemented by this teacher; in doing so, he would prevent confusion in the learners' minds and they would know what to include in their texts and what aspects is going to be assessed.

Regarding teachers B, C and D, the evaluation criteria and the goals are much better spelled out but there are still some nuances between these teachers. Firstly, concerning teacher

B, the context and the task are detailed: the students know what they have to produce. If we take a closer look at the evaluation criteria, they are just as explicit but when compared to the criteria defined by teachers C and D, those of teacher B are much lighter. Of course, this does not mean that his criteria are not right (i.e. it respects Ek and Sauvage's words): what the students write must be pertinent, original, coherent and the grammar and the vocabulary used must be appropriate to the task.

Macfarlane-Dick & Nicol have highlighted other strategies that could be used by the subjects of my survey to make their goals and standards clearer to students:

- (i) providing better definitions of requirements using carefully constructed criteria sheets and performance level definitions;
- (ii) increasing discussion and reflection about criteria and standards in class (e.g. before an assignment);
- (iii) involving students in assessment exercises where they mark or comment on other students' work in relation to defined criteria and standards;
- (iv) workshops where students in collaboration with the teacher devise or negotiate their own assessment criteria for a piece of work. (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 8)

Teacher C's criteria and goals are very explicit as it appears from appendix 5. For instance, she clearly asks them to use specific structures and tools (e.g. 'outils de communication', 'structures variées') in their text to prove that they master them. This teacher usually hands out a comprehensive table of the criteria that she will take into account when correcting the L2 learners' texts (e.g. 'adjectives', 'relatives', 'the passive voice', etc.). In other words, this teacher is in line with what is explained by Ek & Sauvage and Macfarlane-Dick & Nicol about the clarity of objectives and criteria.

Finally, Teacher D's way of setting out criteria and goals is somewhere between teachers B and C, since the goals are quite similar to teacher B's and more implicit than teacher C's. Indeed, when reading the 'mise en situation' and the instructions, it is not clear compared to teacher C's way of setting the goals.

9.1.2.3 Teachers' WCF must be of high quality

As stated before, good quality WCF informs L2 learners about what has been achieved and what remains to be mastered (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006 in Ek & Sauvage, 2017, no page number, online version). In order for WCF to be helpful and efficient, teachers should tell them what is still perfectible and give them advice (*ibid.*).

In this respect, teacher A makes comments on his pupils' strengths and weaknesses when providing critical corrective feedback whereas teachers B, C and D seem only to focus

on errors. In addition, Bitchener & Ferris following idea not too much WCF is not adopted (Bitchener & Ferris, 2012: 128).

9.1.2.4 *Teachers should motivate their learners*

This point has already been discussed in the analysis of the corrected texts. I will therefore not dwell on it but will only highlight a few crucial aspects. Macfarlane-Dick & Nicol stated in 2006 that teachers' way of providing WCF can have an impact on the L2 learners' "motivation and self-esteem" (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 12). More precisely, through their WCF teachers can influence the objectives that learners set for themselves "as well as their commitment to those goals" (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006: 12). According to these scholars, supporting L2 learners' efforts in WCF as well as encouraging them to focus on the objectives through feedback, is much better and will help them to progress in their learning rather than only focusing on their "ability or intelligence" (*ibid.*).

Regarding teachers' strategy to increase learners' motivation and morale, two profiles emerge. On the one hand, teacher A clearly encourages his L2 learners and gives them tips or highlights some aspects that they should pay attention to. On the other hand, teachers B, C and D do not make use of praise, nor encouragement in their WCF. These teachers only focus on correction and not self-esteem building or encouragement toward progress.

9.1.3 Conclusion

No common approach concerning WCF among the four teachers has emerged in my survey. Every single teacher seems to have their own way of correcting and providing feedback, which in a way reflects the situation in the specialised literature where scholars cannot reach an agreement either.

9.1.4 Analysis of the answers to the questionnaire

In this section I will look at the answers of English language teachers to my questionnaire.

I will try to find out if what they do (i.e. their practice) is consistent with their beliefs. I will then also try to see whether some of the mentioned external factors (i.e. time, school policy, parents, etc.) have an impact on the way they issue WCF. I will thereafter analyse their answers about their training and career. I will eventually conclude this second analysis focusing on the answers of the retired teacher, whose opinion on WCF could be interesting, too.

9.1.5 Discrepancies between WCF practice and beliefs emerging from the questionnaire.

Here the analysis of the survey will try to see to what extent what the teachers believe match their actions in their daily practice. In order to highlight the potential inconsistencies between their beliefs and practice, I have decided to only focus on the entries providing insight into this matter.

9.1.5.1 Analysis of the shared discrepancies

From the analysis of the selected entries, it appears that for all of the teachers there is a gap between their beliefs and their practice, albeit teacher A's answers being closer to his practice. Indeed, out of the 15 entries selected, nine of them are consistent with his practice. As far as the three other teachers are concerned, they show almost as many consistencies (eight out of fifteen) as discrepancies (seven out of fifteen). To be more precise, just over 50% of their answers match their daily practice.

9.1.5.1.1 Praise and encouragement

As far as encouragement in WCF is concerned, we observe an inconsistency among all teachers, albeit different according to the teacher. Indeed, their answers to the two selected entries (i.e. 9 and 10) do not match their daily practice. On the one hand, teacher A claims that he sometimes provides encouraging feedback but if one looks at his corrected copies, he always does. On the other hand, none of the other teachers have provided any encouraging comments while claiming that they actually do (i.e. 'sometimes', 'always', 'often').

9.1.5.1.2 WCF location

I notice another discrepancy with respect to WCF location. Indeed, three teachers, namely A, B and D, believe that they write feedback in the margin; however, when scrutinising their corrected copies, it is mostly found in the pupils' texts itself (i.e. A, B and D) and at the end (i.e. only A).

9.1.5.1.3 Number of corrected errors

Regarding the number of corrected errors, the answers given by three teachers, namely A, B and C do not match their usual practice: teacher A believes that he consistently corrects every single error but this is not the case when analysing his copies; teacher B believes he sometimes corrects every one of them but he actually always does; teacher C believes she never corrects all the produced errors but just like B, she corrects every global and local errors.

9.1.5.1.4 The level of the learners

Here again, we observe inconsistencies between teachers' practices and beliefs. Teacher C and D claim that they always adjust their WCF to their pupils' level. However, after analyzing their respective corrected copies, it appears there is no difference between the feedback supplied to advanced, less advanced and weaker students. As far as teacher A is concerned, the analysis requires to be more qualified. Indeed, regarding entry 4, i.e. "Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves.", A circled "2", which means that he thinks he often adapts his WCF to the level and needs of his pupils. However, if one looks at the corrected written tasks, he does not seem to differentiate between advanced students (i.e. students with good grades) and students who are average but should provide more effort. Nevertheless, he does provide more WCF to weaker pupils.

9.1.5.1.5 Use of indirect WCF (codes and letters)

What is striking is that teacher A's and D's beliefs are in total contradiction with their practice when it comes to using codes/letters. Indeed, teacher A believes that he often uses different colours (i.e. entry 10) and that he always uses coded WCF in the margin (i.e. entries 11 & 12). However, no colour except red is used and no code is found in the margin. Furthermore, he claims that when correcting grammar, he usually uses the letter G and circles it when the pupil has made a meaningful grammatical error but none of this is present in his selected corrected tasks. To quote this teacher:

«Pour la grammaire, j'entoure la lettre G si la faute est « grave ». Ensuite je compte toutes les lettres G : une lettre non entourée compte pour 1, tandis qu'une lettre entourée compte pour 2. Une grille indique combien de points l'élève reçoit pour la grammaire : 0 à 3 G = 2,5/2,5 ; 4 ou 5 G : 2/2,5 ; etc. Il y a une grille aussi pour l'orthographe et la ponctuation. Pour le vocabulaire, je survole le texte et évalue la richesse du vocabulaire (en fonction du thème)». (Teacher A)

At first sight, teacher D's answers for entry 15 seem to show a consistency between practice and beliefs. Indeed, she makes use of different symbols such as questions marks when the meaning is not clear at all, arrows when a part of a sentence is not correctly positioned or warning signs when the pupil has made a major error. But contrary to what she wrote on the questionnaire, she does not provide any brief explanations nor key words (e.g. "aux").

9.1.5.1.6 'Boîte à outils'

Some teachers like to provide their pupils with a list of aspects of the English language (i.e. verbal patterns, auxiliaries, tenses, etc.) that should be included in their tasks.

Teacher C thinks that she never provides any, and yet, she actually does. Teacher D thinks she often provides it but she never does.

9.1.5.1.7 Type of feedback

Teacher A and B show some inconsistencies in this regard. Indeed, teacher A thinks that he occasionally writes the corrected form in the students' texts; however, he most of the time makes use of direct WCF. Teacher B believes that he often directly provides the correct form, and yet, he actually makes use of indirect feedback in most cases. In fact, he provides direct or indirect feedback depending on the type of errors: when he deals with a local error (e.g. spelling), he tends use direct feedback whereas when he has to correct global errors, he tends to use indirect feedback, namely underlining. This corroborates what he answered in the questionnaire (i.e. entries 16 and 17).

9.1.5.1.8 Tasks without marks

Teacher A's and C's respective answer to the entries related to copies without marks are in total contradiction with what they usually do. Indeed, teacher A claims that he sometimes provides his pupils with unmarked copies. However, as I announced earlier, the subjects of my survey were asked to provide me with corrected written texts reflecting their usual way of giving WCF. Therefore, if we start from this premise, his answer is not consistent with his practice: he often if not always gives corrected papers without marks. Teacher C believes she sometimes gives unmarked copies, I only got marked copies, though. There could therefore be a gap between their beliefs and practice. Nevertheless, more corrected copies coming from those teachers would be necessary to confirm this.

9.1.5.2 Analysis of some interesting individual discrepancies

Regarding the type of WCF, teacher A mainly uses direct WCF. Still, he believes that he combines the two methods, namely direct and indirect corrective feedback.

Interestingly enough, teacher B's answer related to the adaptation of WCF to the level of L2 Learners goes against what is recommended by an overwhelming majority of specialists: he does not adapt his WCF to L2 learners' level while claiming to do so. Indeed, for entry 8 (i.e. or entry 4 on the selected entries sheet), he claims that he rarely adapts his WCF to the needs and level of the students, which is consistent with what is observed.

What is quite surprising about teacher C is that she asserts that she does not always but often give WCF, but when analysing her corrected written tasks, which is supposed to reflect her usual way of providing WCF, she consistently gives feedback to each of her pupils. Two

other answers worth noting concern: entries 16 (i.e. use of direct feedback) and 17 (i.e. use of indirect feedback), for which teacher C circled “3 = parfois”. This is quite surprising, since she always uses both forms of feedback, i.e. direct and indirect WCF.

9.1.5.3 Shared feelings and opinions regarding WCF

In addition to the practices and beliefs of the four teachers, I also looked at their feelings when it comes to providing WCF. Indeed, I believe it is interesting to know what they think about it.

The four teachers agree that pupils tend to pay more attention to the grades than to the provided WCF. This could explain why teacher A has decided not to give marks but only corrective feedback. Moreover, three of them believe that pupils tend to dodge certain grammatical patterns that were corrected in a previous task because they are wary of making the same error again. However, teacher C thinks that it depends on the pupil: some take her comments into account in order not to repeat the same error.

Regarding the time devoted to the correction of a written text, only teachers B and D believe that providing WCF is time-consuming and a waste of time. Even though teacher C does not feel she spends a lot of time correcting copies, she concurs with the opinion that it is a waste of time because pupils do not take her WCF into account. Only teacher A does not believe that he spends too much time correcting and he does not believe that giving feedback is pointless.

I also enquired about their opinion on their experience of personal teacher training and asked whether anything should be changed in order for the teachers to be better prepared to give appropriate feedback. None of them are aware of or have ever heard of research on WCF and they all thought it would be good idea to set up seminars where teachers could learn more about written corrective feedback (i.e. how to provide good feedback, where to start, etc.).

Looking back on the classes they had at university (i.e. especially English linguistics courses: morphology, syntax, pragmatics), all the teachers but A said it helped to provide efficient WCF. Teacher A justified his answer saying that he has a degree in translation and that he never had any courses about feedback in his education.

9.1.5.4 Factors influencing their WCF

Several factors such as time, parents, school, etc. that can influence the use of WCF have been previously discussed in this MA. In order to find out whether these factors are actually taken into account when choosing a type of feedback, I decided to ask the question in my survey.

Three teachers believe that time is a key factor when it comes to choosing the type of feedback. As Truscott already announced in 1996, it is because of this time factor (i.e. giving

WCF is time-consuming and teachers could use this time to do other things) that WCF should be abandoned (Truscott, 1996). However, as it has been noted, few scholars and teachers in this MA, share Truscott's view although teachers B, C and D admit that WCF is time-consuming. Regarding this factor, teacher B notes that during exam periods, he tends to modify his way of correcting because his language exams are always held at the end of the exam periods, which gives him little time to correct. Teacher C shares this opinion: « lors des sessions d'examens, nous sommes tenus par un délai de correction relativement court ».

For B and C, time is not the only factor that plays a role in the way they give WCF. According to B, pupils' parents also affect his way of providing feedback. In an e-mail, he justified his choice by stating that parents tend to ask questions in order to understand their children's grades. This is why he gives thought to how he corrects copies so that he can justify the marks awarded. Teacher C believes that certain habits become ingrained over time, particularly for formative and certificate evaluations:

« Je fais une différence entre l'évaluation certificative de juin et l'évaluation formative. Comme son nom l'indique, l'évaluation formative 'forme' à l'évaluation certificative de juin. D'où l'importance des commentaires et du feedback pendant l'année. Lors d'évaluations certificatives, j'utilise uniquement des symboles et des codes couleurs (voir supra), je n'écris pas de commentaires. L'élève ne reçoit en effet pas sa copie d'examen. Par contre, s'il souhaite la consulter, je parcours sa copie d'examen avec lui/elle et je la commente oralement». (Teacher C)

Like teacher C, teacher A thinks that his habits have fashioned his way of providing WCF but he is the only teacher to think that the WCF practice of his former language teachers have had an impact on the way he gives feedback. This looks very much like a corroboration of what Borg said in 2003, pointed out by Mao and Crosthwaite in 2019: “that decisions made by teachers – in this case decisions about WCF – are strongly influenced by their prior language learning experience, their teacher education” (Borg, 2003 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 48).

9.1.6 The retired teacher's answers

Although this part is only based on one teacher, I have decided to interview a retired teacher in order to find out how he felt about his practice of WCF throughout his career. I found it interesting to know if over the years, this teacher changed his practice or if he was influenced by other factors. As for the other teachers, I focused on the interesting answers to his questionnaire.

9.1.6.1 *The retired teacher's practice and beliefs over his teaching career*

First of all, he confirmed that in all his years of teaching, he always gave individual feedback to each student and that it (i.e. his practice) changed over time. Indeed, over his 40-year career, he admits often adapting his feedback to the level of his students. Regarding the type of error, he always tended to correct more local than global errors. He never used colours nor codes. Still, he sometimes added comments that allowed the L2 learners to understand their error in order to put them on the right track.

As for the language used in feedback, this has always varied during his 40 years of teaching: sometimes he wrote in English, sometimes in French and sometimes his feedback encouraged students or emphasised what was wrong.

Unlike the other four teachers, he always told his students the type of error he would correct. In other words, he used so-called focused corrective feedback. However, there was no limit to the maximum number of corrected errors (i.e. he often corrected almost all the errors in a text). According to this teacher, it was essential to signal when an error was produced, otherwise pupils could not get better and this could be detrimental to them in their further education where the requirements are much higher.

This teacher shares the same opinion as teacher B and D regarding the amount of time that is needed to correct pupils' text: indeed, like the above-mentioned teachers, he believes that he spent too much time on his pupils' copies and that it was often pointless, since they did not always pay attention to it.

Surprisingly, he was not influenced by any of the factors mentioned in the questionnaire: neither the time, nor habits, nor parents, etc. had any effect on the way he provided WCF. According to him, over the years, he managed to adjust his way of providing feedback so that none of the factors were a burden.

10 Conclusion

The aim of this MA was to find out whether written corrective feedback is an effective practice in the teaching and learning of L2 learners.

On the basis of the theories put forward and the analysis of four teachers' actual practices, it has been shown that WCF is indeed a key element in the process of L2 teaching and learning. However, as demonstrated in this MA, several scholars are not convinced of its effectiveness -and subsequent usefulness - but those advocating its use outnumber those who think it should be abandoned. It has also been noted that although it is used by teachers and expected by students, there is no strict consensus as to which type of feedback is most effective.

However, proponents of WCF argue that it is essential to take the L2 learners' level into consideration. In this regard, I noticed during the analysis of my survey that this aspect was not always taken into account by the participants when providing WCF. Moreover, none of them seem to be aware of the existence of the (recent) theories on WCF. Each teacher has his or her own method of providing WCF and, as written by Gu  nette in 2007, there is no silver bullet for providing the perfect WCF, but one improves with time (Gu  nette, 2007: 51) (something that is confirmed by the answers of the retired teacher).

The successfulness of WCF will depend on several factors such as the students, their proficiency, their motivation for improving their writing skills, the type of errors produced, the type of feedback provided by teachers, etc. Furthermore, as Gu  nette argued, teachers should not forget that learning a foreign language takes time (Gu  nette, 2007, 52) and that feedback is one of many key factors that contribute to this process (*ibid.*).

Although helping teachers respond to students' writing productions is no easy task and is time-consuming; all participants told me that giving feedback is still an essential part of their teaching practice in helping students improve their learning. However, they all agreed that feedback seminars are needed so that they could be updated on the practice, learn from research and improve their own way of providing feedback.

Nevertheless, it would be difficult to instruct them in 'the ideal practice of WCF' as the many specialists in this field do not always agree on its actual effectiveness nor on the most effective type(s).

Regarding the answers to the questionnaire, it was interesting to see that there is a frequent gap between teachers' beliefs and their practice and that they do not seem to be aware of that. As with practices, beliefs differ between teachers. Furthermore, even though some of them think it is pointless because pupils do not take it into consideration, they still provide it believing that it helps L2 learners to progress if they bother to pay attention to it.

I acknowledge that my survey was mainly based on qualitative analyses and involved a limited number of participants. It is therefore only a first and humble step towards the clarification of WCF as an efficient tool in the teaching and learning of L2 learners. Furthermore, although this survey has highlighted some factors that could account for the gap between beliefs and practice, surely other factors deserve to be considered.

To better assess the efficacy of WCF in EFL classrooms, it would be interesting and necessary to replicate these analyses using a larger corpus of corrected copies coming from different teachers and to further investigate their awareness of their own WCF practice. As suggested by Phipps & Borg, 2009, in doing so, they would get a better understanding of the

different factors that come into play (Phipps & Borg, 2009 in Mao & Crosthwaite, 2019: 47) and I believe it would lead to better practices and thus, to better WCF.

11 Acknowledgements

Writing a master's thesis is a long-term task that cannot be completed without the help of supportive people. First of all, I would like to thank my thesis promoter, Fanny Meunier. Without her help, I would not have been able to complete this work. I would like to thank her for her proofreading and comments on all the chapters of this master's thesis. Her comments and our conversations on Teams have often helped me to see things more clearly. Thanks also to the five teachers who gave me their completed questionnaires and their corrected writing tasks. Without them, I would not have been able to collect data on teaching practices nor carry out the research on WCF. Thanks to all those who have supported my long speeches on my subject matter and on the different hurdles that I had to overcome during the last two years.

12 Bibliography

- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of second language writing*, 17(2), 102-118.
- Bitchener, J., & Ferris, D. R. (2012). *Written corrective feedback in second language acquisition and writing*. New York: Routledge.
- Bitchener, J., & Knoch, U. (2010). Raising the linguistic accuracy level of advanced L2 writers with written corrective feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(4), 207–217.
- Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 14(3), 191-205.
- Burke, D., & Pieterick, J. (2010). *Giving students effective written feedback*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
- 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.
- Connors, R. J., & Lunsford, A. A. (1988). Frequency of formal errors in current college writing, or Ma and Pa Kettle do research. *College composition and communication*, 39(4), 395-409.
- Dictionary.com. (n.d.). Audio-lingual method. In *Dictionary.com*. Retrieved May 14, 2021, from <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/audio-lingual-method>
- Ek P., & Sauvage M. (2007). *Comment fournir un feedback qui favorise l'apprentissage?* Université de Liège, Retrieved April 18, 2021, from <http://www.labset.ulg.ac.be/QAPES/01-fournir-feedback.pdf>
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371.
- Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 165-193.
- Ferris, D. (2011). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. University of Michigan Press.

- Ferris, D. (2015). Written corrective feedback in L2 writing: Connors & Lunsford (1988); Lunsford & Lunsford (2008); Lalande (1982). *Language Teaching*, 48(4), 531-544.
- Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(1), 1-11.
- Ferris, D. R. (2010). Second language writing research and written corrective feedback in SLA: Intersections and practical applications. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32(2), 181-201.
- Ferris, D.R., & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: How explicit does it need to be?. *Journal of second language writing*, 10(3), 161-184.
- Guénette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of second language writing*, 16(1), 40-53.
- Hashemnezhad, H., & Mohammadnejad, S. (2012). A Case for Direct and Indirect Feedback: The Other Side of Coin. *English Language Teaching*, 5(3), 230-239.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hendrickson, J. M. (1978). Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *The modern language journal*, 62(8), 387-398.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge university press.
- James, C. (1998). *Errors in language learning and use*. White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley Longman.
- Kang, E., & Han, Z. (2015). The efficacy of written corrective feedback in improving L2 written accuracy: A meta-analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99(1), 1-18.
- Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 47(1), 211-23.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Lardièrè, D. (2009). Some thoughts on the contrastive analysis of features in second language acquisition. *Second language research*, 25(2), 173-227.

- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of second language writing*, 17(2), 69-85.
- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT journal*, 63(1), 13-22.
- Lee, I. (2013). Research into practice: Written corrective feedback. *Language Teaching*, 46(1), 108-119.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting & task performance*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Mao, S. S., & Crosthwaite, P. (2019). Investigating written corrective feedback:(Mis) alignment of teachers' beliefs and practice. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 45, 46-60.
- McDonald, B. & Boud, D. (2003) The impact of self-assessment on achievement: the effects of self-assessment training on performance in external examinations, *Assessment in Education*, 10(2), 209-220.
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.
- Ng, L. L., & Ishak, S. N. A. (2018). Instructor's Direct and Indirect Feedback: How do they Impact Learners' Written Performance?. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature®*, 24(3).
- 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(2), 199-218.
- Pawlak, M. (2013). *Error correction in the foreign language classroom: Reconsidering the issues*. Poland: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioral science*, 28(1), 4-13.
- Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL quarterly*, 20(1), 83-96.
- Taras, M. (2001) The use of tutor feedback and student self-assessment in summative assessment tasks; towards transparency for students and tutors, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(6), 605-614.

- Taras, M. (2002) Using assessment for learning and learning from assessment, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27(6), 501-510.
- Taras, M. (2003) To feedback or not to feedback in student self-assessment, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 549-565.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”:
A response to Ferris. *Journal of second language writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Truscott, J. (2007). The effect of error correction on learners’ ability to write accurately. *Journal of second language Writing*, 16(4), 255-272.
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. P. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of second language writing*, 17(4), 292-305.
- Yorke, M. & Knight, P. (2004) Self-theories: some implications for teaching and learning in higher education, *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(1), 25-37.
- Ziafar, M., & Namaziandost, E. (2019). Teachability/Learnability Hypothesis and Its Implications for Language Instruction. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, 1(2), 11-16.

13 Appendices: corrected written tasks

13.1 Appendix 1

UNIT 1 – DO YOU SPEAK ENGLISH?

2. ENGLISH IN THE WORLD

2.1. English as lingua franca? (O – SB, p. 12)

Because of the international situation, we have to study foreign languages. A lot of people are in favour of the idea that the same language should serve as the "lingua franca": the universal language to be used by all nations around the globe for international relations. English, undoubtedly, has this position nowadays. That is why some people defend the use of English in institutions for higher education and even in secondary school.

devoir : Writing
exercise

6/10/2020

Ang 4h

N°3

6°C

☺ bel effort Julie-simon!

This text contains my personal answers to the questions on page 13.

I don't like learning languages, overall Dutch, because it's the subject that gives me the most difficulty, overall in listening.

My main difficulties are listening and some grammar points like the passive voice, the past perfect and the future perfect. To improve myself, I try to watch more videos in English and to speak in English with my best friend. But for me, a foreign language is learned in the land of the language.

My experiences with foreign languages outside the classroom aren't great, overall in Dutch. I can't make myself understood to the locals. With globalization, the place of the foreign languages will become more and more important. Finally, I would like to learn Korean because I planned to live there for 1 year with my best friend (in WHV (in French: PVT))

We/want to get a WHV.
plan

English: foreign language 6C
not bad! 03/10/20

I find learning a new language is very interesting. It is useful when I travel. Even if it's not always easy, I like it.

Learning vocabulary is easier than speaking because the spelling and the pronunciation aren't the same. It's also difficult to understand a foreign language because when you talk with people, they often have different accents. To solve my difficulties, I try to listen to TV or radio programmes. So I hear the accent and pronunciation. I try to understand some words. And with these words, I am some times able to understand the subjects.

Two years ago, I went with my grandmother and my cousins to New York. It was the travel of my dreams. For us it was difficult to understand what people said because they speak American ^{English} and not ^{British} English. The words and the accent are totally different and they also speak very fast. But New Yorkers were very friendly to help us to understand.

In the future ~~the~~ foreign languages will be

more important because there are more and more new foreign industries. English will be the needed language and maybe ~~the~~ Chinese language will be necessary because they are at the top of the new technologies.

I want to become an industrial engineer and I know that some lessons are given in English. In Belgium, we must also speak French and Dutch but for the moment I don't want to learn another language.

Writing test on English File (Upper Intermediate)
Part 1A Questions and answers
(key moment #1)

CONTEXTE

Tu as un correspondant anglais. Pour le journal de son école, il désire avoir l'avis d'un Belge concernant le thème des entretiens d'embauche. Afin de t'aider dans l'écriture de ton texte, ton correspondant voudrait que tu axes ta production écrite sur des éléments tels la pression subie lors de ces entretiens, le type de questions posées, l'intérêt réel de poser des questions en apparence absurdes, la stratégie qui se joue derrière un entretien extrême, la façon dont il faut réagir lors de tels entretiens, jusqu'où faut-il garder sa vraie personnalité, la façon de faire bonne impression par rapport à un recruteur que l'on ne connaît pas et qui ne nous connaît pas, etc.

TÂCHE

- Ecris un texte argumentatif (**PAS** une lettre !) de ^{140 mots} **minimum 160 mots (maximum 200 mots)** conformément au contexte décrit ci-dessus. Les divers éléments proposés ne sont que des pistes d'inspiration de départ ;
- Tu indiques en haut à gauche de la page de retranscription de ton texte (=page suivante) le nombre de mots écrits ;
- Des interlignes de 1½ sont déjà présents. Tu ne dois par conséquent pas écrire une ligne sur deux **ni jamais passer de ligne** ;
- N'oublie pas de rédiger une production ordonnée, à savoir une introduction, un corps et une conclusion, et de présenter de façon structurée les différents paragraphes au moyen de mots-liens variés ;
- Fais attention au soin en général et **tout particulièrement à ton écriture** (la négligence de ces divers éléments sera également sanctionnée).

CRITERES D'EVALUATION

critères de base devant être TOUS LES TROIS respectés sinon maximum de 8/20	
compréhensibilité du message	<input type="checkbox"/> OK
respect des consignes (pertinence)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK
langue standard (adaptée aux exigences)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK

évaluation si "OK" pour les TROIS critères ci-dessus	
pertinence et originalité	2/14
cohérence (idées et texte)	3/14
grammaire	5/16
vocabulaire	5/16

TOTAL 18/20

164 mots

I'm going to tell you about the job interviews and their problems and difficulties.

First of all, I'm going to describe the different sorts of questions. The recruiting officer is very demanding with the job-seekers. You have to know your subject and to prepare it! He will try to destabilize you with difficult and strange questions that can sometimes hurt you. The interest is to see how you react in every situation and with people.

Secondly, I'm going to give you some advice for the interview. Don't be stressed and be yourself. Stay calm in front of the recruiting officer and show him the best of your personality, not the worst. He doesn't know you and you don't know him so you can be who you want at this moment but keep a little part of you during the interview.

Finally, I would say you to be cool and relax during this moment and be the guy that you ever wanted to be!

Writing test on English File (Upper Intermediate)
Part 7A Don't argue !
(key moment #1)

CONTEXTE

Tu as un correspondant anglais. Pour le journal de son école, il désire avoir l'avis d'un Belge concernant le thème des disputes, des discussions « animées ». Afin de t'aider dans l'écriture de ton texte, ton correspondant voudrait que tu axes ta production écrite sur des éléments tels que les causes principales menant à une dispute, la responsabilité des intervenants, les stratégies les plus fréquemment utilisées par les uns et les autres (hommes-femmes, parents-enfants, professeurs-élèves, adolescents-personnes adultes/âgées, autochtones-étrangers, etc.), les divers moyens de solutionner des querelles et d'en éviter d'autres à l'avenir, les éventuels avantages et inconvénients liés à une dispute, etc.

TÂCHE

- Écris un texte argumentatif (**PAS** une lettre !) de ¹⁴⁰ **minimum 160 mots (maximum 200 mots)** conformément au contexte décrit ci-dessus. Les divers éléments proposés ne sont que des pistes d'inspiration de départ ;
- Tu indiques en haut à gauche de la page de retranscription de ton texte (=page suivante) le nombre de mots écrits ;
- Des interlignes de 1½ sont déjà présents. Tu ne dois par conséquent pas écrire une ligne sur deux **ni jamais passer de ligne** ;
- N'oublie pas de rédiger une production ordonnée, à savoir une introduction, un corps et une conclusion, et de présenter de façon structurée les différents paragraphes au moyen de mots-liens variés ;
- Fais attention au soin en général et tout particulièrement à ton écriture (la négligence de ces divers éléments sera également sanctionnée).

CRITERES D'EVALUATION

critères de base devant être TOUS LES TROIS respectés sinon maximum de 8/20	
compréhensibilité du message	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK
respect des consignes (pertinence)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK
langue standard (adaptée aux exigences)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK

évaluation si "OK" pour les TROIS critères ci-dessus	
pertinence et originalité	4 / 4
cohérence (idées et texte)	4 / 4
grammaire	8 / 16
vocabulaire	8 / 16

TOTAL 18 / 20

Today, I'm going to talk to you about [✓]argues with my [?]belgium opinion,
Does it really change anything? I do not know, let's see.

Let's begin with the causes. Everybody had [✓]arguments with different people
at different ages. The causes of an argument can be very various, for example,
maybe your sister did not do the dishes though that was her housework,
or your brother let a empty bottle in the fridge. In [✓]an other context, maybe
your coworker is always on his phone or eating crisps all the time and finally
you are doing all the tasks. All of that stupid things can ^{start}begin an argument.

Then, I think it is not really difficult to avoid an argument, but it is
the opinion of a girl, anybody cannot think like me. Majority of [✓]usuals argues are
due to a failure to respect the manners, just some little things [✓]that looks dumb
at the first sight but ⁱⁿat the end it is very important for peace at home or work.

So, to conclude, I just want to say that anybody can avoid
an argument, just talk to other people about what you think is problems and
resolve them peacefully. Pl.

13.5 Appendix 5

Nom :

Prénom :

A.-S. Christiaens	6A24	Janvier 2021
Classe : 6 ^e année A	Partie 2. Savoir écrire Évaluation formative	Matériel : un dictionnaire (5 minutes, de 11:35 à 11:40)

Consignes : Voici deux situations ayant trait à des sujets abordés durant le premier quadrimestre. Tu choisis, pour la présente tâche d'écriture, **UNE situation** .

SITUATION N°1 : *IDENTITY*

*Quel est le facteur/quels sont les facteurs le/s plus important/s dans la manière dont tu te définis: ton pays, ta langue ou autre chose? Pourquoi? Ce sont les questions qui sont adressées aux lecteurs du journal britannique 'The Guardian'. Tu décides d'y répondre dans un **article** qui figurera dans la rubrique 'Opinions' du journal.*

SITUATION N°2 : *TALK*

As-tu déjà été confronté.e à un problème de communication, un malentendu, ou un souci quelconque lors d'une conversation? Qu'est-ce qu'une bonne conversation à tes yeux? Ce sont les questions qui sont posées par le journal britannique 'The Guardian'. Tu décides de relater la conversation la plus mémorable que tu aies jamais eue dans un article qui figurera dans la rubrique 'Opinions' du journal.

Indique le numéro de la situation que tu as choisie.

SITUATION N°....

TÂCHE

- a. Rédiger un **article** informel de min. **200 mots**.
- b. Utiliser dans ce texte des outils de communication abordés en classe.
- c. Prouver par cet exercice de composition que tu maîtrises ces outils et que tu es capable de faire passer des idées correctement en anglais.
- d. Utiliser des structures variées.
- e. Un dictionnaire peut être consulté pendant 5 minutes.

BOÎTE À OUTILS

À utiliser à bon escient !

- **Different 'tenses'**
- Adjectives
- Relatives
- Phrasal verbs
- (Semi-)modals
 - o Conseil : *je devrais*
 - o Reproche : *j'aurais dû*
 - o Habitude révolue
 - o Dédution (passée/présente)
 - o Etc.
- Exprimer :
 - o une volonté (Vouloir que)
 - o un souhait
 - *J'aimerais que*
 - *Si seulement...*
 - o un but
 - o une concession
- The passive voice
- Linkers
- (Dummy *it*)
- **Etc.**

TÂCHE

- Rédiger un **article** informel de min. 200 mots.
- Utiliser dans ce texte des outils de communication abordés en classe.
- Prouver par cet exercice de composition que tu maîtrises ces outils et que tu es capable de faire passer des idées correctement en anglais.
- Utiliser des structures variées.
- Un dictionnaire peut être consulté pendant 5 minutes.

CRITÈRES

RESPECT DE LA TÂCHE ET COMPÉTENCE D'ÉCRITURE	28 /40
Structure du texte	5 /5
Cohérence du récit : il y a une logique dans ton texte	5 /10
Respect des consignes	5 /5
Qualité de l'argumentation : ce que tu écris est varié et intéressant	7 /10
Lisibilité du message: <u>on comprend ce que tu écris</u>	6 /10
RESPECT DES CARACTÉRISTIQUES DE LA LANGUE ÉCRITE	39 /60
GRAMMAIRE	22 /30
Utilisation structures complexes	6 /10
Utilisation de structures adéquates	7 /10
Correction des constructions	8 /10
LEXIQUE	17 /30
Orthographe	3 /5
Présence d'un vocabulaire riche	7 /15
Vocabulaire utilisé à bon escient	8 /10
TOTAL	67 /100

67/100

TAPR

Communication problems are common and I think that we have all live this ^{? formal} So

I want to share with you my vision of a good conversation and also a communication problem ^{keeps on multiplying it}

To begin, I don't like ^{it} when a person butts in on and on. That's very annoying indeed! I think that we must listen when people are speaking. ^(talking)

But I enjoy when we have something in common and are on the same length because that's not living. ^{who? - vague!} A by (expl)

My experience is a misunderstanding it was a good conversation because the person in front of me was kind but we didn't understand ourselves.

A few months ago, students were employed in a firm and I was among the students.

That was in a context ^(US) with kids during the summer.

So I have had my boss on the telephone to speak about my job there. He told me that a student who works for the first year is cleaning lady and that was my first year! Then he speaks about the second year and at this moment you can not

- Q work in the office. So I understand that I will
✓ clean. The rest of the conversation was very well.
S Q The next Monday I came for my first day with
old clothes for my job but actually he took me
to the office to give information to people.
a S I was very embarrassed and I wish that will
never happen again.

Head of the story: speak more clearly and
understand better.

241 mots
words

13.6 Appendix 6

TÂCHE	
a.	Rédiger un article informel de min. 200 mots.
b.	Utiliser dans ce texte des outils de communication abordés en classe.
c.	Prouver par cet exercice de composition que tu maîtrises ces outils et que tu es capable de faire passer des idées correctement en anglais.
d.	Utiliser des structures variées.
e.	Un dictionnaire peut être consulté pendant 5 minutes.

CRITÈRES	
<i>RESPECT DE LA TÂCHE ET COMPÉTENCE D'ÉCRITURE</i>	
	37 /40
Structure du texte	5 /5
Cohérence du récit : il y a une logique dans ton texte	10 /10
Respect des consignes	4 /5
Qualité de l'argumentation : ce que tu écris est varié et intéressant	9 /10
Lisibilité du message: on comprend ce que tu écris	9 /10
<i>RESPECT DES CARACTÉRISTIQUES DE LA LANGUE ÉCRITE</i>	
	46 /60
<i>GRAMMAIRE</i>	
	26 /30
Utilisation structures complexes	8 /10
Utilisation de structures adéquates	10 /10
Correction des constructions	8 /10
<i>LEXIQUE</i>	
	20 /30
Orthographe	5 /5
Présence d'un vocabulaire riche	6 /15
Vocabulaire utilisé à bon escient	9 /10
<i>TOTAL</i>	83 /100

L1 16 2/20.

Situation n° 2: Identity Talk

these days, it's rare to have a good conversation with someone. By "a good conversation" I mean a conversation where both speakers can get a word in the conversation and can say what they think about the subject. ^{in edge words} A good conversation is made

of two or more good conversationalists, ^{people} persons who don't hog the conversation all time and who let others speak. And it is also made of persons who listen to each other.

We all would love to have such a conversation, but that isn't always the case. Actually, I had one the other day.

It was a conversation about school ^{and exams}. The conversation was perfect. It grew, both ^(*) speakers had his time to speak,

nobody hogged the conversation and we both listened to

each other. The thing I loved the most about this conversation,

is that the person who I was ^{talking to} speaking didn't always

talk about himself. He listened to what I was saying and he reacted at the right times. ^{with}

With such a conversation, both speakers can learn new things about the subject or even about the person who they are talking to.

We all need conversations like these and we all need to listen to each other.

(*) the → of

Unit 1 "Friends & Famous People" – Writing skills

→ Dictionnaire autorisé pendant un temps limité, au signal du professeur.

Contexte : Tu décides de participer à un concours en anglais sur Internet intitulé « Tell us about your best friend » et dont les conditions de participation sont données ci-dessous.

Tâche : Ecris le message que tu vas poster sur le forum internet pour valider ta participation au concours.

Writing Competition « Tell us about your best friend » !!!

Pour participer à notre concours et espérer ainsi gagner un séjour d'un weekend à Londres pour toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e), tu dois remplir les conditions suivantes :

- Écrire un message de 120-150 mots que tu vas poster sur le forum et dans lequel tu donnes quelques infos sur toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e) et où parles de ta relation avec lui/elle (rencontre, intérêts, etc.)
- Écrire cinq questions originales sur l'amitié, qui seront posées par notre jury aux participants pour permettre de départager les ex-æquo.

Critères d'évaluation :

Compréhensibilité du message	oui/non
Pertinence et respect des consignes	oui/non
<i>Si la réponse est non à un des deux critères ci-dessus, tu obtiendras au maximum 8/20</i>	
1° Pertinence et respect des consignes	/4
2° Cohérence	/4
3° Grammaire	/6
4° Vocabulaire	/6

Text:

Hey! My name is Léa and I'm 15 years old. I'll talk to you about my best friend Léa and our friendship. Léa and me met in elementary school when we were ten years old. The first time I saw her, I thought she was mean and I was never going to join her group of friends. But it was just an impression. I realized she was funny, shy, friendly and she was a good person because she saw the good in everyone and she was always there when it was necessary. We have lots of things in common. We like watching the same series, reading books, playing volleyball and we have the same style of clothing. Today, we are inseparable and I am grateful to have a best friend like Léa. I wish everyone to have in their life a best friend like her.

Léa.

144 mots

Questions:

- ✓ - Do you have a secret code between you?
- ✓ - Did you go on vacation together?
- ✓ - Do you give her a present for her birthday?
- ✓ - Do you have a t-shirt of friendship?
- ✓ - Do you know how to keep the secret of your best friend?

40 mots.

de
17/20

GRILLE D'EVALUATION – EXPRESSION ECRITE – 4A1 / 4A2(4h) / 4NL1 / 4NL2(4h) / 5A2(4h) / 5NL2(4h)

Les deux critères suivants sont des critères de base et doivent tous les deux être respectés :

<p>Compréhensibilité du message :</p> <p><u>Indicateur</u> : chaque passage est compréhensible sans effort à la 1^è lecture.</p>	<p>Respect des consignes et pertinence :</p> <p><u>Indicateur</u> : le type de tâche réalisée correspond à ce qui a été demandé en termes de longueur, de contenu et de type de présentation (nature du document, type de production langagière, domaines à traiter).</p>
---	--

Si ces 2 critères de base sont respectés, l'élève se voit attribuer une note sur 20 en additionnant les points obtenus pour chacun des critères ci-dessous :

Pertinence et originalité :	Cohérence :	Grammaire :	Vocabulaire :
<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect parfait des consignes (pertinence) : <u>Indicateurs</u> : Nature du document Type de production langagière Domaines à traiter L'ensemble de la production est personnalisé (originalité) <u>Indicateurs</u> : L'élève formule des idées personnelles et/ou L'élève reformule des idées de manière personnelle. <p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bon respect des consignes (pertinence) Plusieurs passages de la production sont personnalisés (originalité) <p>2/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect des consignes, mais traitement limité de certains domaines (pertinence) Peu ou pas de passages personnalisés (originalité) 	<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect de tous les éléments ci-dessous : <u>Cohérence des idées</u> : les idées sont développées de manière logique ; un fil conducteur est présent ; pas de contradictions <u>Cohérence textuelle</u> : Présentation adéquate du document Division en paragraphes Présence d'une intro/cd Utilisation correcte et adéquate de la ponctuation et de mots-clés Aucune redondance de sens <p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect de tous les éléments précités sauf un ou deux. <p>2/4 à 0/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect d'une partie des éléments précités mais faiblesses ne nuisant pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emploi correct de structures variées du niveau de langue simple et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière. <u>Indicateurs</u> : Utilisation de structures plus complexes et variées que SVC Utilisation de phrases autres que des phrases avec être/avoir Emploi correct des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. <p>4-5/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emploi de structures variées du niveau attendu et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière, mais quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la compréhension du message. Utilisation correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. <p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation de peu de structures variées, voire aucune, du niveau attendu et erreurs grammaticales plus nombreuses en nuisant pas à la compréhension du message. Utilisation rare ou rarement correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation correcte d'un vocabulaire spécifique et varié du niveau de langue simple Très peu ou pas de répétitions de mots <p>4-5/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation d'un vocabulaire le plus souvent spécifique et varié du niveau attendu. Quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la bonne compréhension du message. <p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation d'un vocabulaire peu ou pas spécifique et varié, compte tenu du niveau attendu. Quelques erreurs de choix de termes et/ou d'orthographe mais ces erreurs ne nuisent pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture.

Unit 1 "Friends & Famous People" – Writing skills

→ Dictionnaire autorisé pendant un temps limité, au signal du professeur.

Contexte : Tu décides de participer à un concours en anglais sur Internet intitulé « Tell us about your best friend » et dont les conditions de participation sont données ci-dessous.

Tâche : Ecris le message que tu vas poster sur le forum internet pour valider ta participation au concours.

Writing Competition « Tell us about your best friend » !!!

Pour participer à notre concours et espérer ainsi gagner un séjour d'un weekend à Londres pour toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e), tu dois remplir les conditions suivantes :

- Écrire un message de 120-150 mots que tu vas poster sur le forum et dans lequel tu donnes quelques infos sur toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e) et où parles de ta relation avec lui/elle (rencontre, intérêts, etc.)
- Ecrire cinq questions originales sur l'amitié, qui seront posées par notre jury aux participants pour permettre de départager les ex-æquo.

Critères d'évaluation :

Compréhensibilité du message	oui/non
Pertinence et respect des consignes	oui/non
<i>Si la réponse est non à un des deux critères ci-dessus, tu obtiendras au maximum 8/20</i>	
1° Pertinence et respect des consignes	/4
2° Cohérence	/4
3° Grammaire	/6
4° Vocabulaire	/6

Text:

Hi! This ^{is} Zoé writing with my best friends Eva,
we would like to take part in ^{the} competition.

First, we ~~have~~ ^{ARE} both 14 years old and we come from
Belgium, we love animals and sport.

Eva is very funny, loyal and generous. She had
a dog named Iggy and a sister Emily. Her
parents are very nice.

As for me:

I'm speed and I have a dog too. I'm an
only child, so a best friend is very important for
me. Eva is always there for me, she knows
when I'm upset or sad.

Together, we ^{are} a duo. When you first meet, it was
an evidence, we hit it off straightaway. We ^{sometimes}
have a row about silly little things but it's
funny.

So if you are interested by our profile give
us the star!

Zoé and Eva

Questions:

How much ^{long have} years are you ^{been} best friends?

Who is ~~carry~~ carry?

Do you ^{of} are in the same school?

Who is ^{the} most peaceful?

Do you spend lots of time together?

Zoé
17/20

GRILLE D'EVALUATION – EXPRESSION ECRITE – 4A1 / 4A2(4h) / 4NL1 / 4NL2(4h) / 5A2(4h) / 5NL2(4h)

Les deux critères suivants sont des critères de base et doivent tous les deux être respectés :

<p>Compréhensibilité du message :</p> <p><u>Indicateur</u> : chaque passage est compréhensible sans effort à la 1^è lecture. type de présentation (nature du document, type de production langagière, domaines à traiter).</p>	<p>Respect des consignes et pertinence :</p>
---	---

Si ces 2 critères de base sont respectés, l'élève se voit attribuer une note sur 20 en additionnant les points obtenus pour chacun des critères ci-dessous :

Pertinence et originalité :	Cohérence :	Grammaire :	Vocabulaire :
<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect parfait des consignes (pertinence) : <u>Indicateurs</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature du document Type de production langagière Domaines à traiter L'ensemble de la production est personnalisée (originalité) <u>Indicateurs</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L'élève formule des idées personnelles et/ou L'élève reformule des idées de manière personnelle. 	<p>4/4</p> <p>Respect de tous les éléments ci-dessous :</p> <p>Cohérence des idées :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> les idées sont développées de manière logique ; un fil conducteur est présent ; pas de contradictions <p>Cohérence textuelle :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Présentation adéquate du document Division en paragraphes Présence d'une intro/ccl Utilisation correcte et adéquate de la ponctuation et de mots-liens Aucune redondance de sens <p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect de tous les éléments précités sauf un ou deux. <p>2/4 à 0/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect d'une partie des éléments précités mais faiblesses ne nuisant pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emploi correct de structures variées du niveau de langue simple et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière. <p><u>Indicateurs</u> :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation de structures plus complexes et variées que SVC Utilisation de phrases autres que des phrases avec être/avoir Emploi correct des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. <p>4-5/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emploi de structures variées du niveau attendu et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière, mais quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la compréhension du message. Utilisation correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. <p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation de peu de structures variées, voire aucune, du niveau attendu et erreurs grammaticales plus nombreuses en nuisant pas à la compréhension du message. Utilisation rare ou rarement correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation correcte d'un vocabulaire spécifique et varié du niveau de langue simple Très peu ou pas de répétitions de mots <p>4-5/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation d'un vocabulaire le plus souvent spécifique et varié du niveau attendu. Quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la bonne compréhension du message. <p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation d'un vocabulaire peu ou pas spécifique et varié, compte tenu du niveau attendu. Quelques erreurs de choix de termes et/ou d'orthographe mais ces erreurs ne nuisent pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture.

→ we are 14

My English experience

I would like to tell you something about my English experience. I also like to learn languages.

Not bad:

I don't find it too difficult and I find it so funny. But I have some difficulties like every lesson. I have some problem with grammar and conjugation. To solve them I'm learning harder to have good results.

Two years ago I travelled to Italy with my family. And I was the only one who knows how to speak English. So I spoke all the whole holidays for my family with the residents. Since that whole days, when I've managed. I have more confidence in myself when I speak English. I think we all get along to understanding each other.

Also, I try to watch TV in VO or with original version English subtitles. I find it more interesting than watching in French. At the same time I'm trying to read one book in English. I want to speak a lot of foreign languages in my future. I would like to speak and to learn foreign languages with my job. I think the languages it's also too important to understand what other people say. It's interesting to learn about their culture and their expressions. It can only be beneficial. I want in my future study to have at least one course/subject in a foreign language to don't lose my accent and my learning not to. That's my English experience.

Writing :
 (i) bon vocabulaire
 (ii) attention à l'orthographe

I like learning languages because it's a cultural opening to the world. It allows you to travel and meet locals so we can learn about their culture ^{and} their traditions. In addition, English is a fairly easy language to learn because it is spoken almost everywhere. However I have not a good ^{grasp} of English but I figure ^{it} out ^{most of the time} almost all. I watch TV series in English to improve my English and when I am abroad, I try to speak English with the locals or I try to speak ^{Dutch} when I am in the Netherlands.

~~The~~ last year, I went to Germany ~~for~~ for a week-end and, since I don't speak German, I ~~must have spoken~~ ^{had to speak} in English and it was not simple.

In my opinion, speaking English is a way to overcome the language barrier since it is the language the most spoken.

I think foreign languages ^{are becoming} however a linguistic and cultural barrier because if we don't speak a foreign language, locals don't always understand our mother tongue. So, why not learn a universal language from motherhood to facilitate communication with the tourists even ^{though} though languages are part of the country's history and the country's culture.

Writing test on English File (Upper Intermediate)

Part 1A Questions and answers (key moment #1)

CONTEXTE

Tu as un correspondant anglais. Pour le journal de son école, il désire avoir l'avis d'un Belge concernant le thème des entretiens d'embauche. Afin de t'aider dans l'écriture de ton texte, ton correspondant voudrait que tu axes ta production écrite sur des éléments tels la pression subie lors de ces entretiens, le type de questions posées, l'intérêt réel de poser des questions en apparence absurdes, la stratégie qui se joue derrière un entretien extrême, la façon dont il faut réagir lors de tels entretiens, jusqu'où faut-il garder sa vraie personnalité, la façon de faire bonne impression par rapport à un recruteur que l'on ne connaît pas et qui ne nous connaît pas, etc.

TÂCHE

- Ecris un texte argumentatif (**PAS** une lettre !) de **minimum 160 mots (maximum 200 mots)** conformément au contexte décrit ci-dessus. Les divers éléments proposés ne sont que des pistes d'inspiration de départ ;
- Tu indiques en haut à gauche de la page de retranscription de ton texte (=page suivante) le nombre de mots écrits ;
- Des interlignes de 1½ sont déjà présents. Tu ne dois par conséquent pas écrire une ligne sur deux **ni jamais passer de ligne** ;
- N'oublie pas de rédiger une production ordonnée, à savoir une introduction, un corps et une conclusion, et de présenter de façon structurée les différents paragraphes au moyen de mots-liens variés ;
- Fais attention au soin en général et **tout particulièrement à ton écriture** (la négligence de ces divers éléments sera également sanctionnée).

CRITERES D'EVALUATION

critères de base devant être TOUS LES TROIS respectés sinon maximum de 8/20	
compréhensibilité du message	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK
respect des consignes (pertinence)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK
langue standard (adaptée aux exigences)	<input type="checkbox"/> OK

évaluation si "OK" pour les TROIS critères ci-dessus	
pertinence et originalité	3 / 4
cohérence (idées et texte)	2 / 4
grammaire	5 / 6
vocabulaire	3 / 6

TOTAL 10 / 20

8

First the extreme interview is to keep for true personality ^{Sp} during a long moment for the job. During this conversation if you make a good impression in front of the job seeker when he send the normal questions or the extreme questions.

Second / during this interview I feel me a little stressed with a lot of ambition and I was the smile for to make a good impression.

Then the job seeker send me a lot of questions also:

Are you a divorcee? I answered: no I aren't. This question to do me make smile. - Why do you have this interview? because I would like to have a job for to build a family and to sold a home. - How am I in the true life? I answered that I was open-minded, easy-going, laid-back, no often stressed. The interest to send the interview questions is to see if he has a open or narrow-minded.

Finally, I think that this job interview ^{Sp} to make feel because the job seeker was open-minded, and the smile. She said me, see you soon for the results.

190 words.

13.12 Appendix 12

TÂCHE

- a. Rédiger un **article** informel de min. **200 mots**.
- b. Utiliser dans ce texte des outils de communication abordés en classe.
- c. Prouver par cet exercice de composition que tu maîtrises ces outils et que tu es capable de faire passer des idées correctement en anglais.
- d. Utiliser des structures variées.
- e. Un dictionnaire peut être consulté pendant 5 minutes.

CRITÈRES

<i>RESPECT DE LA TÂCHE ET COMPÉTENCE D'ÉCRITURE</i>	26 /40
Structure du texte	5 /5
Cohérence du récit : il y a une logique dans ton texte	5 /10
Respect des consignes	3 /5
Qualité de l'argumentation : ce que tu écris est varié et intéressant	6 /10
Lisibilité du message: on comprend ce que tu écris	7 /10
<i>RESPECT DES CARACTÉRISTIQUES DE LA LANGUE ÉCRITE</i>	35 /60
<i>GRAMMAIRE</i>	21 /30
Utilisation structures complexes	7 /10
Utilisation de structures adéquates	8 /10
Correction des constructions	6 /10
<i>LEXIQUE</i>	13 /30
Orthographe	3 /5
Présence d'un vocabulaire riche	3 /15
Vocabulaire utilisé à bon escient	7 /10
TOTAL	61 /100

↳ 12/20

Partie 2: Savoir écrire

2 ~~title everybody!~~ ^{not relevant}
title?

vague
c I will write today about a few questions
which were asked by some people. What are the
most important factors in the way that you
S define yourself? Your language, your country
or another thing? I want to talk to you about
49 that in this article. Have a good reading!
^{activity!}

I will begin with the country. It's an important
✓ thing ~~for~~ many people. In the country, everybody
✓ is assembled on the same zone. We can
recognize ~~someone's~~ country with his ^{their} beard or
C the colour of ~~his~~ ^{their} skin. People like their coun-
c? try and are proud of us. We can also see
S ✓ rivalries between 2 countries! and we can say
"Oh! He must be french! He's not a man to
be trifled with!" for example. And then, they
c a? begin Rivals. That is why country is very impor-
88 tant ~~for~~ many people!

C We can also define we as our language. For
example, in Belgium, there are 3 communities [↑]
C with 3 different languages (French, Dutch and
✓ German). So that ^{cause/create} can make frictions into the
same country! That isn't really good for the
41 ✓ mental of the people.

last!

I'll finish with my opinion. I shouldn't be subjective in this article but I want to show what I mean. I come from Belgium. Belgians have a lot of stereotypes all around the world: we make chocolate, brew and drink beer. Another is that we are stupid. That's checked. We must define ourselves as what we are and what we want to be and not the stereotypes that we had to heard. I wish we are on the same wavelength. So I hope you enjoyed to read this article.

100
280

13.13 Appendix 13

- TÂCHE**
- Rédiger un **article** informel de min. **200 mots**.
 - Utiliser dans ce texte des outils de communication abordés en classe.
 - Prouver par cet exercice de composition que tu maîtrises ces outils et que tu es capable de faire passer des idées correctement en anglais.
 - Utiliser des structures variées.
 - Un dictionnaire peut être consulté pendant 5 minutes.

CRITÈRES

<i>RESPECT DE LA TÂCHE ET COMPÉTENCE D'ÉCRITURE</i>	27 /40
Structure du texte	4 /5
Cohérence du récit : il y a une logique dans ton texte	5 /10
Respect des consignes	4 /5
Qualité de l'argumentation : ce que tu écris est varié et intéressant	7 /10
Lisibilité du message: on comprend ce que tu écris	7 /10
<i>RESPECT DES CARACTÉRISTIQUES DE LA LANGUE ÉCRITE</i>	36 /60
<i>GRAMMAIRE</i>	20 / 30
Utilisation structures complexes	7 /10
Utilisation de structures adéquates	8 /10
Correction des constructions	5 /10
<i>LEXIQUE</i>	15 / 30
Orthographe	3 /5
Présence d'un vocabulaire riche	6 /15
Vocabulaire utilisé à bon escient	6 /10
TOTAL	63 /100

12⁶/₂₀.

little? Jan-Timothé

Hey, I'm CJ and I'm 23. Today I gonna talk about this time i met a girl and how happened our date. Actually he could be better, it happened so bad, I think it's the worst date ever, for me it is one of worstest date I have ever had.

At this time, during the winter's holidays, I met a girl on Instagram, Betty, on her page she looked nice, pretty face, ... We used to talk together. On Instagram she were funny, she had a sense of humour, I felt all her good vibes, everything was smoothly. still the day we decided to see on together, to have a date. First thing to notice is that she were more shy in real than on Instagram so I understood that I was going to keep the conversation over and over. At the restaurant she talked ANYTIME the only time she talked she just blat me in and she talked about things who didn't make sense like: What are you talking about? It's real I was prepping the conversation but I tried to let her get a word but nothing, I tried get a smile, a laugh, ... but nothing this girl were very funny sometimes i didn't had the choice and i did the goofy boy but still nothing (Robot cop).

It's why I'll give you some pieces of advice in case for when you want to go on a date. Make sure you're on the same wave length, if the girl is too shy you should ask her to talk about her self, like to introduce her self. You shouldn't hog the conversation like me and you should change topics, not be stuck on a topic all the time. However a told her that I would like to see her one more time and maybe it gonna be better.

handwritten

Unit 1 "Friends & Famous People" – Writing skills

→ Dictionnaire autorisé pendant un temps limité, au signal du professeur.

Contexte : Tu décides de participer à un concours en anglais sur Internet intitulé « Tell us about your best friend » et dont les conditions de participation sont données ci-dessous.

Tâche : Ecris le message que tu vas poster sur le forum internet pour valider ta participation au concours.

Writing Competition « Tell us about your best friend » !!!

Pour participer à notre concours et espérer ainsi gagner un séjour d'un weekend à Londres pour toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e), tu dois remplir les conditions suivantes :

- Écrire un message de 120-150 mots que tu vas poster sur le forum et dans lequel tu donnes quelques infos sur toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e) et où parles de ta relation avec lui/elle (rencontre, intérêts, etc.)
- Écrire cinq questions originales sur l'amitié, qui seront posées par notre jury aux participants pour permettre de départager les ex-æquo.

Critères d'évaluation :

Compréhensibilité du message	oui/non
Pertinence et respect des consignes	oui/non
<i>Si la réponse est non à un des deux critères ci-dessus, tu obtiendras au maximum 8/20</i>	
1° Pertinence et respect des consignes	/4
2° Cohérence	/4
3° Grammaire	/6
4° Vocabulaire	/6

GRILLE D'EVALUATION – EXPRESSION ECRITE – 4A1 / 4A2(4h) / 4NL1 / 4NL2(4h) / 5A2(4h) / 5NL2(4h)

Les deux critères suivants sont des critères de base et doivent tous les deux être respectés :

Compréhensibilité du message :

Indicateur : chaque passage est compréhensible sans effort à la 1^è lecture.

Respect des consignes et pertinence :

Indicateur : le type de tâche réalisée correspond à ce qui a été demandé en termes de longueur, de contenu et de type de présentation (nature du document, type de production langagière, domaines à traiter).

déjà
12/120
pas terminées!!

Si ces 2 critères de base sont respectés, l'élève se voit attribuer une note sur 20 en additionnant les points obtenus pour chacun des critères ci-dessous :

Pertinence et originalité :	Cohérence :	Grammaire :	Vocabulaire :
<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect parfait des consignes (pertinence) : Indicateurs : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature du document Type de production langagière Domaines à traiter L'ensemble de la production est personnalisé (originalité) Indicateurs : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> L'élève formule des idées personnelles et/ou L'élève reformule des idées de manière personnelle. 	<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect de tous les éléments ci-dessous : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cohérence des idées : les idées sont développées de manière logique ; un fil conducteur est présent ; pas de contradictions Cohérence textuelle : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Présentation adéquate du document Division en paragraphes Présence d'une intro/cc Utilisation correcte et adéquate de la ponctuation et de mots-liens Aucune redondance de sens 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emploi correct de structures variées du niveau de langue simple et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière. Indicateurs : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation de structures plus complexes et variées que SVC Utilisation de phrases autres que des phrases avec être/avoir Emploi correct des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation correcte d'un vocabulaire spécifique et varié du niveau de langue simple Très peu ou pas de répétitions de mots (5) Utilisation d'un vocabulaire le plus souvent spécifique et varié du niveau attendu. Quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la bonne compréhension du message.
<p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bon respect des consignes (pertinence) Plusieurs passages de la production sont personnalisés (originalité) 	<p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect de tous les éléments précités sauf un où deux. 	<p>4-5/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emploi de structures variées du niveau attendu et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière, mais quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la compréhension du message. Utilisation correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation d'un vocabulaire peu ou pas spécifique et varié, compte tenu du niveau attendu. Quelques erreurs de choix de termes et/ou d'orthographe mais ces erreurs ne nuisent pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture.
<p>2/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect des consignes, mais traitement limité de certains domaines (pertinence) Peu ou pas de passages personnalisés (originalité) 	<p>2/4 à 0/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Respect d'une partie des éléments précités mais faiblesses ne nuisant pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture. 	<p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation de peu de structures variées, voire aucune, du niveau attendu et erreurs grammaticales plus nombreuses en nuisant pas à la compréhension du message. Utilisation rare ou rarement correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation d'un vocabulaire peu ou pas spécifique et varié, compte tenu du niveau attendu. Quelques erreurs de choix de termes et/ou d'orthographe mais ces erreurs ne nuisent pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture.

Que 2 & ! : emanes

4A1 – Stress & Ways to Relax

WRITING

En cette période très spéciale d'enseignement à distance, les élèves sont fort stressés et on t'a demandé d'écrire un article (min. 150 mots) pour le journal de l'école, qui traite de la question du stress et des façons de le combattre.

Dans ton article, tu expliques aux élèves comment ils peuvent reconnaître les symptômes possibles du stress. Tu essayes ensuite de leur donner des conseils et faire des suggestions quant à la manière de combattre ce stress.

→ Dictionnaire autorisé pendant un temps limité, au signal du professeur.

➤ Critères d'évaluation :

Compréhensibilité du message

oui/non

Pertinence et respect des consignes

oui/non

Si la réponse est non à un des deux critères ci-dessus, tu obtiendras au maximum 8/20

1° Pertinence et respect des consignes

3 /4

2° Cohérence

3 /4

3° Grammaire

2 /6

4° Vocabulaire

3 /6

1
confusion

➤ Texte :

Hi! In my new article I will talk about ~~the~~ stress, ^{it} ~~they~~ have 2 parts. Part 1, are you ^{ed} stressed? and part 2 what can I do for being less ^{ed} stressful? stressful = stressed

Part 1, are you stressed?

Stressful people do some strange things like biting ^{ing} their nails,

fiddling

~~fidgeting~~ with their hair or ~~fidgeting~~ with her pencil. By the way if you ~~fidgeting~~ with something you're stressed. If you ~~do~~ do's just do's move on you that, if you need to move on ~~do~~ something, you're done a stressful people. If you have insomnia but you ~~do~~ know why it's maybe the fault of ~~the~~ stress.

Part 2, what can I do for being less stressful?

For being less stressful you can do a lot of things. When you are stressed, if I hear you, I ^{would} ~~will~~ listen ^{to} some music of album's tracks, music helps to find our inner peace. You can also ~~do~~ some sports, for some people it's a good way for being you.

So I wish this article can help you for being less stressful, and I hope if you enjoy reading my article.

600 words

GRILLE D'ÉVALUATION – EXPRESSION ÉCRITE – 4A1 / 4A2(4h) / 4NL1 / 4NL2(4h) / 5A2(4h) / 5NL2(4h)

Les deux critères suivants sont des critères de base et doivent tous les deux être respectés :

<p>Compréhensibilité du message : ✓ ou</p> <p><u>Indicateur</u> : chaque passage est compréhensible sans effort à la 1^è lecture.</p>	<p>Respect des consignes et pertinence : ✓ ou</p> <p><u>Indicateur</u> : le type de tâche réalisée correspond à ce qui a été demandé en termes de longueur, de contenu et de type de présentation (nature du document, type de production langagière, domaines à traiter).</p>
--	---

Si ces 2 critères de base sont respectés, l'élève se voit attribuer une note sur 20 en additionnant les points obtenus pour chacun des critères ci-dessous :

	Cohérence :	Grammaire :	Vocabulaire :
<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect parfait des consignes (pertinence) : <u>Indicateurs</u> : o Nature du document o Type de production langagière o Domaines à traiter - L'ensemble de la production est personnalisé (originalité) <u>Indicateurs</u> : o L'élève formule des idées personnelles et/ou o L'élève reformule des idées de manière personnelle. 	<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect de tous les éléments ci-dessous : <u>Cohérence des idées</u> : o les idées sont développées de manière logique ; un fil conducteur est présent ; pas de contradictions <u>Cohérence textuelle</u> : o Présentation adéquate du document o Division en paragraphes o Présence d'une intro/ccl o Utilisation correcte et adéquate de la ponctuation et de mots-liens o Aucune redondance de sens 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emploi correct de structures variées du niveau de langue simple et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière. <u>Indicateurs</u> : o Utilisation de structures plus complexes et variées que SVC o Utilisation de phrases autres que des phrases avec être/avoir - Emploi correct des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation correcte d'un vocabulaire spécifique et varié du niveau de langue simple - Très peu ou pas de répétitions de mots <p>4-5/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation d'un vocabulaire le plus souvent spécifique et varié du niveau attendu. - Quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la bonne compréhension du message.
<p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bon respect des consignes (pertinence) - Plusieurs passages de la production sont personnalisés (originalité) 	<p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect de tous les éléments précités sauf un ou deux. 	<p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emploi de structures variées du niveau attendu et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière, mais quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la compréhension du message. - Utilisation correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation d'un vocabulaire peu ou pas spécifique et varié, compte tenu du niveau attendu. - Quelques erreurs de choix de termes et/ou d'orthographe mais ces erreurs ne nuisent pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture.
<p>2/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect des consignes, mais traitement limité de certains domaines (pertinence) - Peu ou pas de passages personnalisés (originalité) 	<p>2/4 à 0/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect d'une partie des éléments précités mais faiblesses ne nuisant pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture. 	<p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation de peu de structures variées, voire aucune, du niveau attendu et erreurs grammaticales plus nombreuses en nuisant pas à la compréhension du message. - Utilisation rare ou rarement correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	

I find learning languages (is) interesting and important to speak with ~~very~~ ^{many} people. But I don't like to learn them because I'm not very good. I haven't a good accent. I ~~know~~ ^{can} study vocabulary and grammar but I don't know how to apply them in real life when I want ^{to} speaking or writing ^e.

The last year, I went to England during one week with my boyfriend. We went to a restaurant and we asked a glass of juice but we received a alcoholic fruit cocktail. ^{ordered} It was still delicious but it wasn't what we (asked). So we understood that we didn't speak good English. We laughed a lot (still) ^{though}.

~~The~~ next year, I will not study languages. I will perhaps become a physiotherapist or speech therapist but I don't ~~know~~ ^{really} yet. ^{Earlier} Before, I wanted to ~~do~~ ^{study} the law but there are very languages and ^{besides / more over} it's an intense work and I don't know if I am capable. So science are more for me I think. ^{So are} (And) children ^{too} also.
the emphasis on languages is strong

I think English will become more and more important in the future (in the world). So I would like ^{to} progress ^{more} ~~still~~ because English starts to be all over: in computers, ^{for} holidays and ^{many} very people speak this language. So I would ~~like~~ ^{also} know to speak English.
to be able

① attention à l'usage de still: encore, toujours
la place or tout de même

① attention: very = très // many/much = beaucoup

① attention: know = savoir, connaître
can/be able to = être capable

① belles réflexions / anecdotes mets: 215.

Mathias

Lemmas

I like learning English because it's a global language and I like travelling. ~~So~~ it's ^{useful} beneficial. I find some English ^{to} vocabulary pretty easy. You can work your English at school, with ~~(the)~~ music, ^{movies} ~~(the)~~ cinema,...

I prefer English than Dutch because ~~Dutch is~~ ^{for me} a weird language and in Belgium the French and Dutch-speaking ~~are~~ communicating ⁱⁿ English. ^{with each other}

My main difficulties ~~are~~ listening and speaking. The best way to solve them ~~is~~ ^{for me} the ^{trips to} journey ^{on} a foreign country. We're ~~in~~ ^{all} immersion ^{meets an plural} with local people and we have to practice the language. ^{immersed}

I've practiced my English when I went to London last year. Outside the classroom I don't use English a lot. I'm ^{used} to practicing Dutch nearly every day because I play Basketball in Courtrai. I'm growing up in this language but I don't like ~~him~~ ^{it}.

In the future ~~in a part of~~ ^{from} English and maybe French, foreign languages ^{logique} will be less studied because ~~it~~ ^{may} isn't global languages and now we've got ^{to} applications on our phones ^{for} to translate ~~(some)~~ words ^{and phrases}.

^{jamaïs de futur donc temporelle avec WHEN}
When I ~~will be~~ ^{am going to} an adult, I don't think I'm ^{gonna} study other foreign languages. I ~~will~~ 've already got French, English and Dutch and ⁱⁿ ~~on~~ our region we can be understood with ^{these} ~~(that)~~. And ^{for the} ^{trips} ~~(for the journeys)~~, English is a global language. ^{when travelling}

- ① attention aux structures de phrase (influence NL?)
- ② attention aux temps
- ③ belle réflexion

name : *Delphine*
form : 54

surname : *Nglemien*
date : *30/11/2020*

/20

Writing test on English File (Upper Intermediate)
Part 1A *Questions and answers*
(key moment #1)

CONTEXTE

Tu as un correspondant anglais. Pour le journal de son école, il désire avoir l'avis d'un Belge concernant le thème des entretiens d'embauche. Afin de t'aider dans l'écriture de ton texte, ton correspondant voudrait que tu axes ta production écrite sur des éléments tels la pression subie lors de ces entretiens, le type de questions posées, l'intérêt réel de poser des questions en apparence absurdes, la stratégie qui se joue derrière un entretien extrême, la façon dont il faut réagir lors de tels entretiens, jusqu'où faut-il garder sa vraie personnalité, la façon de faire bonne impression par rapport à un recruteur que l'on ne connaît pas et qui ne nous connaît pas, etc.

TÂCHE

- Ecris un texte argumentatif (**PAS** une lettre !) de **minimum 150 mots (maximum 200 mots)** conformément au contexte décrit ci-dessus. Les divers éléments proposés ne sont que des pistes d'inspiration de départ ;
- Tu indiques en haut à gauche de la page de retranscription de ton texte (=page suivante) le nombre de mots écrits ;
- Des interlignes de 1½ sont déjà présents. Tu ne dois par conséquent pas écrire une ligne sur deux **ni jamais passer de ligne** ;
- N'oublie pas de rédiger une production ordonnée, à savoir une introduction, un corps et une conclusion, et de présenter de façon structurée les différents paragraphes au moyen de mots-liens variés ;
- Fais attention au soin en général et **tout particulièrement à ton écriture** (la négligence de ces divers éléments sera également sanctionnée).

CRITERES D'EVALUATION

critères de base devant être TOUS LES TROIS respectés sinon maximum de 8/20	
compréhensibilité du message	<input type="checkbox"/> OK
respect des consignes (pertinence)	<input type="checkbox"/> OK
langue standard (adaptée aux exigences)	<input type="checkbox"/> OK ✓

évaluation si "OK" pour les TROIS critères ci-dessus	
pertinence et originalité	3 / 4
cohérence (idées et texte)	1 / 4
grammaire	2 / 6
vocabulaire	3 / 6

TOTAL / 20

This is my think about the question for looking a job.

The external question it's a ^{SR} good idea because the people who say this question would or fast answer because the answer says if you would really or not the job and if you have prepared this introduction.

For the bigger question, it's a question for look your reaction.

The most important is stay your personality ^{SR} because if you don't stay your personality to answer already in the same optio to question and if you stay your personality, you know if really you going to want the job. You don't know the people and he don't know you so it's to down's like you it's not answer, you should stay you and for you you pass and it's the most important.

So, stay your personality and brain-stem if you would or not the job.

SR

name : *Duthy*
form :

surname : *Gwen*
date : *30/11/20*

/20

Writing test on English File (Upper Intermediate)
Part 1A Questions and answers
(key moment #1)

CONTEXTE

Tu as un correspondant anglais. Pour le journal de son école, il désire avoir l'avis d'un Belge concernant le thème des entretiens d'embauche. Afin de t'aider dans l'écriture de ton texte, ton correspondant voudrait que tu axes ta production écrite sur des éléments tels la pression subie lors de ces entretiens, le type de questions posées, l'intérêt réel de poser des questions en apparence absurdes, la stratégie qui se joue derrière un entretien extrême, la façon dont il faut réagir lors de tels entretiens, jusqu'où faut-il garder sa vraie personnalité, la façon de faire bonne impression par rapport à un recruteur que l'on ne connaît pas et qui ne nous connaît pas, etc.

TÂCHE

- Ecris un texte argumentatif (**PAS** une lettre !) de **minimum 160 mots (maximum 200 mots)** conformément au contexte décrit ci-dessus. Les divers éléments proposés ne sont que des pistes d'inspiration de départ ;
- Tu indiques en haut à gauche de la page de retranscription de ton texte (=page suivante) le nombre de mots écrits ;
- Des interlignes de 1½ sont déjà présents. Tu ne dois par conséquent pas écrire une ligne sur deux **ni jamais passer de ligne** ;
- N'oublie pas de rédiger une production ordonnée, à savoir une introduction, un corps et une conclusion, et de présenter de façon structurée les différents paragraphes au moyen de mots-liens variés ;
- Fais attention au soin en général et tout particulièrement à ton écriture (la négligence de ces divers éléments sera également sanctionnée).

CRITERES D'EVALUATION

critères de base devant être TOUS LES TROIS respectés sinon maximum de 8/20	
compréhensibilité du message	<input type="checkbox"/> OK
respect des consignes (pertinence)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OK
langue standard (adaptée aux exigences)	<input type="checkbox"/> OK

évaluation si "OK" pour les TROIS critères ci-dessus	
pertinence et originalité	<i>2</i> /4
cohérence (idées et texte)	<i>2</i> /4
grammaire	<i>2</i> /6
vocabulaire	<i>3</i> /6

TOTAL /20

117 mats

Hello,

How are you?

I'm going to give some advice for your recruitment.
First, it's important to be kind with the recruiter.
He ask you with extreme questions for see how
you react. To keep your calm and answer
normally. Show your personality to the end
for show how you are.

Then, talk SM he about your plan and why you
want the job. Talk SM he about you do in your
life too. Talk about your interest. Talk
he about the job too and why you will
be important for this job. Talk he about your
quality and your default. Will be a funny
person.

I know it's not easy. Don't be stress.
See you soon.

1147

10
27

13.20 Appendix 20

Nom :

Prénom :

TÂCHE

- Rédiger un **article** informel de min. 200 mots.
- Utiliser dans ce texte des outils de communication abordés en classe.
- Prouver par cet exercice de composition que tu maîtrises ces outils et que tu es capable de faire passer des idées correctement en anglais.
- Utiliser des structures variées.
- Un dictionnaire peut être consulté pendant 5 minutes.

CRITÈRES

<i>RESPECT DE LA TÂCHE ET COMPÉTENCE D'ÉCRITURE</i>	21	/40
Structure du texte	5	/5
Cohérence du récit : il y a une logique dans ton texte	4	/10
Respect des consignes	4	/5
Qualité de l'argumentation : ce que tu écris est <u>varié</u> et intéressant	4	/10
Lisibilité du message: on comprend ce que tu écris	4	/10
<i>RESPECT DES CARACTÉRISTIQUES DE LA LANGUE ÉCRITE</i>	18	/60
<i>GRAMMAIRE</i>	10 ⁵	/30
Utilisation structures complexes	1	/10
Utilisation de structures adéquates	5 ⁵	/10
Correction des constructions	4	/10
<i>LEXIQUE</i>	7 ⁵	/30
Orthographe	3	/5
Présence d'un vocabulaire riche	1	/15
Vocabulaire utilisé à bon escient	3 ⁵	/10
TOTAL	39	/100

38/100
F/B.

Partie 2

Situation 1

little?

1 ~~Hello~~ → not relevant
CV 10 In my life, very much things are important for me.

12 I think what the most important for me is my family and
AV 11 my friends. I had groomed with my family and my friends.

VA 13 I laugh very much with them. I can all for them to do.

VA 10 I can speak over all with them. I love them.

5 They define me very much.

62

country

SVC 10 My land define me because I'm praised of Belgium.

AV 12 When the red birds played, it look them and I'm very

CV 9 enthusiasm. The Belgians are define like people who are

SV 8 funny, friendly, ?, who have a big culture.

AV 10 The Belgians know the party to do. I like party.

AV 11 Belgium is a little land but we have a big heart.

C 8 The life in Belgium define me very much.

68

obviously---

AV 9 French is too important, I speak with my language

12 and it is the first impression what the people see in me.

SA 10 Full people think what French is a beautiful language but

C 9 very complicated. I think what all languages are complicated

CV 5 My language integrate my life.

43

c 9 But what define the most ~~for me~~, IS ME!
VC?? 11 My experience define me because is my life and I bought
5 my life with my experience.

CV 11 On year in the past, I lost my grandma and my
AC 13 dog in little bit laps of time. That is very difficult for me

C 14 But I have having one thing, we live one time, so

V 7 I took advantage with my family, my friends, ... only once

4 I took advantage to travel.

?a 10 So very much things define me but the most is
2 my experience. ?

83

258 words
Words

13.21 Appendix 21

TÂCHE	
a.	Rédiger un article informel de min. 200 mots .
b.	Utiliser dans ce texte des outils de communication abordés en classe.
c.	Prouver par cet exercice de composition que tu maîtrises ces outils et que tu es capable de faire passer des idées correctement en anglais.
d.	Utiliser des structures variées.
e.	Un dictionnaire peut être consulté pendant 5 minutes.

CRITÈRES	
<i>RESPECT DE LA TÂCHE ET COMPÉTENCE D'ÉCRITURE</i>	23 /40
Structure du texte	4 /5
Cohérence du récit : il y a une logique dans ton texte	4 /10
Respect des consignes	4 /5
Qualité de l'argumentation : ce que tu écris est varié et intéressant	4 /10
Lisibilité du message: on comprend ce que tu écris	7 /10
<i>RESPECT DES CARACTÉRISTIQUES DE LA LANGUE ÉCRITE</i>	16 /60
<i>GRAMMAIRE</i>	9 /30
Utilisation structures complexes	2 /10
Utilisation de structures adéquates	5 /10
Correction des constructions	2 /10
<i>LEXIQUE</i>	7 /30
Orthographe	4 /5
Présence d'un vocabulaire riche	2 /15
Vocabulaire utilisé à bon escient	1 /10
TOTAL	33 /100

Situation 3: Identity

title?

Method

Hello! I'm da, I've seen an questions, and I'll answer the one so, if I have understood, you'll know what is important for me, in my life?

by?

Oh yes! here we go.

by

First, I live in Belgium, and Belgium, my country is very important for me. Why? because

C =

Belgium has some many things incredible, like chocolate, the Belgium chocolate is the best chocolate

v

a v c

I never ate in my life, Belgium has too bars, bunsels, and the Manikens. Well, even the Belgians are seen

by v s a

like people eat mussels with chips and mayonnaise, the Belgians have a big heart. My mother tongue

p

is very important too, French isn't easy, I know, but

C v

this tongue is easy, even to I really like English!

C

Travel is important for me, I would like to travel

v c

around the world. I hope one day, I'll go to

by v

London. London is a very beautiful country, and the English people are very stereotyped like,

C

never live without dog, live in the past, and

a v

I want to see if it's really or not.

v

For the end, my family and my friends of course,

a

this is the most important in my life I never

C

can live without them. I need them everytime

)

(no yes, music is very important to for me)

not relevant
a
I hope we'll publish my answer in the Guardian (this is my favourite newspaper).
Thank you, have a good day!

use the passive voice instead!
237 words

20

Unit 1 "Friends & Famous People" – Writing skills

→ Dictionnaire autorisé pendant un temps limité, au signal du professeur.

Contexte : Tu décides de participer à un concours en anglais sur Internet intitulé « Tell us about your best friend » et dont les conditions de participation sont données ci-dessous.

Tâche : Ecris le message que tu vas poster sur le forum internet pour valider ta participation au concours.

Writing Competition « Tell us about your best friend » !!!

Pour participer à notre concours et espérer ainsi gagner un séjour d'un weekend à Londres pour toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e), tu dois remplir les conditions suivantes :

- Écrire un message de 120-150 mots que tu vas poster sur le forum et dans lequel tu donnes quelques infos sur toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e) et où parles de ta relation avec lui/elle (rencontre, intérêts, etc.)
- Ecrire cinq questions originales sur l'amitié, qui seront posées par notre jury aux participants pour permettre de départager les ex-æquo.

Critères d'évaluation :

Compréhensibilité du message	oui/non
Pertinence et respect des consignes	oui/non
<i>Si la réponse est non à un des deux critères ci-dessus, tu obtiendras au maximum 8/20</i>	
1° Pertinence et respect des consignes	/4
2° Cohérence	/4
3° Grammaire	/6
4° Vocabulaire	/6

?

What ~~is~~ instruction for stop your stress.

You should ~~do~~ ~~x~~ yoga, a massage, ~~to~~ rest, ~~to~~ read a book every day.

Think you should ~~to~~ ~~x~~ listen ~~x~~ classical music, ~~to~~ play with your friend, You shouldn't

?

play ~~x~~ video games, ~~that~~ to get worse the situation, go to lots of sport with

your friend, ~~to~~ walk, ~~to~~ run, ~~to~~ play football with a friend, basketball

~~x~~ play team sport, ~~to~~ have a map and to ~~to~~ lie in, ~~to~~ eat that every day.

fin?

?

17/20

Au moins un des 2 critères mentionnés ci-dessous n'est PAS respecté :

- Caractère compréhensible du message (problèmes de langue et/ou cohérence)
- Respect des consignes de la tâche (type/longueur /pertinence)

Une des notes suivantes est alors attribuée à l'élève :

<p>8/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Un des domaines précisés ci-dessous n'est pas traité (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La longueur est inférieure au produit demandé (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Le nombre d'erreurs grammaticales et lexicales ou le manque de cohérence (textuelle ou des idées) empêche(nt) la compréhension d'un passage significatif à la 1^{ère} lecture (caractère compréhensible). 	<p>6/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plusieurs domaines cités ci-dessous n'ont pas été traités (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La longueur du document est nettement inférieure au produit demandé (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Le nombre d'erreurs grammaticales et lexicales ou le manque de cohérence (textuelle ou des idées) empêche(nt) la compréhension de plusieurs passages significatifs à la 1^{ère} lecture (caractère compréhensible). 	<p>4/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La production écrite ne correspond pas du tout à ce qui a été demandé (pertinence). - Le document produit ne comporte que quelques éléments disparates. 	<p>0/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impossibilité ou refus de communiquer quoi que ce soit.
--	---	--	---

Unit 1 "Friends & Famous People" – Writing skills

→ Dictionnaire autorisé pendant un temps limité, au signal du professeur.

Contexte : Tu décides de participer à un concours en anglais sur Internet intitulé « Tell us about your best friend » et dont les conditions de participation sont données ci-dessous.

Tâche : Ecris le message que tu vas poster sur le forum internet pour valider ta participation au concours.

Writing Competition « Tell us about your best friend » !!!


Pour participer à notre concours et espérer ainsi gagner un séjour d'un weekend à Londres pour toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e), tu dois remplir les conditions suivantes :

- Écrire un message de 120-150 mots que tu vas poster sur le forum et dans lequel tu donnes quelques infos sur toi et ton/ta meilleur(e) ami(e) et où parles de ta relation avec lui/elle (rencontre, intérêts, etc.)
- Ecrire cinq questions originales sur l'amitié, qui seront posées par notre jury aux participants pour permettre de départager les ex-æquo.

Critères d'évaluation :

Compréhensibilité du message	oui/non
Pertinence et respect des consignes	oui/non
<i>Si la réponse est non à un des deux critères ci-dessus, tu obtiendras au maximum 8/20</i>	
1° Pertinence et respect des consignes	/4
2° Cohérence	/4
3° Grammaire	/6
4° Vocabulaire	/6

Text:

Hi, my name's Hugo. I live in Belgium, I'm 15 years old. My best friend is Baptiste he also lives in Belgium and he's 14. 

Well, we like play ^{at} every thing about video games, ~~the~~ ^{first} bike cycling we were in the same class at primary school and secondary school. We also like animals.

We met at primary school when we were 8 years old we have a lot laugh^{ed} and we hit it off straightaway.

Because we have a lot ~~x~~ in common, we live in the same village and my parents are friends with their parents

Sens??
 } yes but hardly ever I think the last it was when we were 10 years old.

7
 } Yes, when we are more older we would like to rent a flat for the university at Brussels
 in Brussels

? Student room

Questions:

- ✓ What do you have in common?
- When ^{did} you first meet?
- Why are you such good friends?
- ✓ Do you have a room?
- Do you have projects for the future

GRILLE D'EVALUATION – EXPRESSION ECRITE – 4A1 / 4A2(4h) / 4N1 / 4N2(4h) / 5A2(4h) / 5N2(4h)

Hugo L.
8/20

Les deux critères suivants sont des critères de base et doivent tous les deux être respectés :

<p>Compréhensibilité du message :</p> <p>Indicateur : chaque passage est compréhensible sans effort à la 1^è lecture.</p> <p><i>A passer</i></p>	<p>Respect des consignes et pertinence :</p> <p>Indicateur : le type de tâche réalisée correspond à ce qui a été demandé en termes de longueur, de contenu et de type de présentation (nature du document, type de production langagière, domaines à traiter).</p>
---	---

Si ces 2 critères de base sont respectés, l'élève se voit attribuer une note sur 20 en additionnant les points obtenus pour chacun des critères ci-dessous :

Pertinence et originalité :	Cohérence :	Grammaire :	Vocabulaire :
<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect parfait des consignes (pertinence) : <u>Indicateurs :</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Nature du document o Type de production langagière o Domaines à traiter - L'ensemble de la production est personnalisé (originalité) <u>Indicateurs :</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o L'élève formule des idées personnelles et/ou o L'élève reformule des idées de manière personnelle. <p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bon respect des consignes (pertinence) - Plusieurs passages de la production sont personnalisés (originalité) <p>2/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect des consignes, mais traitement limité de certains domaines (pertinence) - Peu ou pas de passages personnalisés (originalité) 	<p>4/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect de tous les éléments ci-dessous : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Cohérence des idées :</u> les idées sont développées de manière logique ; un fil conducteur est présent ; pas de contradictions <u>Cohérence textuelle :</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Présentation adéquate du document o Division en paragraphes o Présence d'une intro/cc o Utilisation correcte et adéquate de la ponctuation et de mots-liens o Aucune redondance de sens <p>3/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect de tous les éléments précités sauf un ou deux. <p>2/4 à 0/4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Respect d'une partie des éléments précités mais faiblesses ne nuisant pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emploi correct de structures variées du niveau de langue simple et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière. <u>Indicateurs :</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Utilisation de structures plus complexes et variées que SVC o Utilisation de phrases autres que des phrases avec être/avoir o Emploi correct des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. <p>4-5/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emploi de structures variées du niveau attendu et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière, mais quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la compréhension du message. - Utilisation correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. <p>3/6 à 0/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Emploi de structures variées du niveau attendu et emploi de structures adéquates au type de production langagière, mais quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la compréhension du message. - Utilisation correcte des pronoms pour éviter les répétitions. 	<p>6/6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation correcte d'un vocabulaire spécifique et varié du niveau de langue simple - Très peu ou pas de répétitions de mots 4-5/6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation d'un vocabulaire le plus souvent spécifique et varié du niveau attendu. - Quelques erreurs qui ne nuisent pas à la bonne compréhension du message. 3/6 à 0/6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Utilisation d'un vocabulaire peu ou pas spécifique et varié, compte tenu du niveau attendu. - Quelques erreurs de choix de termes et/ou d'orthographe mais ces erreurs ne nuisent pas à la compréhension globale du message à la 1^è lecture.

Au moins un des 2 critères mentionnés ci-dessous n'est PAS respecté :

- Caractère compréhensible du message (problèmes de langue et/ou cohérence)
- Respect des consignes de la tâche (type/longueur / pertinence)

Une des notes suivantes est alors attribuée à l'élève :

<p>8/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Un des domaines précisés ci-dessous n'est pas traité (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La longueur est inférieure au produit demandé (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Le nombre d'erreurs grammaticales et lexicales ou le manque de cohérence (textuelle ou des idées) empêche(nt) la compréhension d'un passage significatif à la 1^{ère} lecture (caractère compréhensible). 	<p>6/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plusieurs domaines cités ci-dessous n'ont pas été traités (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La longueur du document est nettement inférieure au produit demandé (pertinence) <p>Et/ou</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Le nombre d'erreurs grammaticales et lexicales ou le manque de cohérence (textuelle ou des idées) empêche(nt) la compréhension de plusieurs passages significatifs à la 1^{ère} lecture (caractère compréhensible). 	<p>4/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - La production écrite ne correspond pas du tout à ce qui a été demandé (pertinence). - Le document produit ne comporte que quelques éléments disparates. 	<p>0/20</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impossibilité ou refus de communiquer quoi que ce soit.
--	---	--	---

14 Appendices: answers to the questionnaire

14.1 Teacher A's answers

GERM2MD

Master thesis

2020-2021

Lucie Vermoeren

Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (WCF)

Pourriez-vous répondre aux questions suivantes en surlignant le chiffre correspondant à votre pratique?

(1= toujours; 2= souvent ; 3= parfois ; 4= rarement ; 5= jamais).

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
2	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute individuellement avec chaque élève en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
3	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute collectivement avec les élèves en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
4	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
5	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
6	Je rends les corrections écrites le plus rapidement possible (dans un délai de moins d'une semaine).	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
7	Je rends les corrections écrites plus d'une semaine après la production.	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
8	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves. Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre à la question 9.	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
9	J'ai tendance à donner plus de feedback écrit lorsque l'élève est faible.	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive d'utiliser des couleurs différentes.	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes. Si oui, quelle est leur signification ? Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre aux questions 12 et 13 . C = conjugaison G = Grammaire L = Logique ML = Mot-lien O = Orthographe	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5

	<p>P = Ponctuation</p> <p>S = Syntaxe</p> <p>V = Vocabulaire</p>					
12	Mes élèves connaissent la signification de mes lettres/codes, car je leur en ai parlé au préalable. J'explique en rendant la première EE corrigée.	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
13	J'indique ces lettres et/ou codes dans la marge de la feuille.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
14	J'écris le nombre total d'erreurs d'une ligne sur la même ligne dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
15	<p>Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise d'autres moyens non mentionnés ci-dessus. Si oui, lesquels ?</p> <p>Pour la grammaire, j'entoure la lettre G si la faute est « grave ». Ensuite je compte toutes les lettres G : une lettre non entourée compte pour 1, tandis qu'une lettre entourée compte pour 2. Une grille indique combien de points l'élève reçoit pour la grammaire : 0 à 3 G = 2,5/2,5 ; 4 ou 5 G : 2/2,5 ; etc. Il y a une grille aussi pour l'orthographe et la ponctuation. Pour le vocabulaire, je survole le texte et évalue la richesse du vocabulaire (en fonction du thème).</p>	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
16	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
17	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
18	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
19	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
20	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
21	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en fin de texte.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
22	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en anglais.	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
23	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en français.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
24	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige toutes les fautes.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5

25	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
26	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
27	Il m'arrive de changer de méthode de correction d'un texte écrit à l'autre. Si oui, dans quelles circonstances ? <i>S'il y a un aménagement pour dyslexie par exemple (officiel, c'est-à-dire diagnostiqué), j'exclus l'orthographe.</i>	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
28	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
29	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
30	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je leur propose de réécrire leur production écrite en tenant compte de ma correction.	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
31	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je m'attarde d'avantage sur les points qui viennent d'être abordés en classe.	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
32	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je suis conscient(e) de la portée de mes commentaires et fais attention à leur formulation.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
33	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris des commentaires sous formes de questions ; par exemple, « Quel est le sujet de ton verbe ? ».	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
34	Après l'épreuve écrite effectuée, je propose aux élèves de corriger la copie de leur voisin.	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
35	Avant de corriger un production écrite, je la lis d'abord en entier sans rien corriger	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>

b. Le feedback correctif écrit et les élèves

36	Je constate que les élèves sont en demandes de feedback.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
37	Je constate chez les élèves une amélioration dans les tests/travaux suivants grâce au feedback.	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
38	Les élèves me demandent de leur fournir un <u>certain</u> type de feedback correctif.	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
39	Les élèves posent des questions ou demandent des explications complémentaires concernant le feedback reçu.	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5

c. Questions complémentaires (mes réponses en rouge)

1. Après quelques corrections écrites, j'ai déjà eu le sentiment que des élèves ont tendance à éviter des formes qui ont fait l'objet d'une correction dans une épreuve précédente. **OUI / NON**

2. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment que mes élèves attachent plus d'importance aux points qu'au feedback.
OUI / NON

3. Je dis systématiquement à mes élèves qu'il est indispensable d'analyser la correction et/ou de s'autocorriger. **OUI / NON**

4. Durant ma carrière, j'ai entendu/pris connaissance des recherches effectuées sur le feedback correctif écrit. **OUI / NON**

5. Durant ma carrière, je me suis déjà dit qu'il serait bien de mettre en place des séminaires durant lesquels les professeurs pourraient en apprendre d'avantage sur le feedback correctif écrit (i.e. comment fournir un bon feedback, par où commencer, etc.). **OUI / NON**

6. Je trouve que je passe trop de temps à corriger. **OUI / NON**

7. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment (durant ma carrière) que fournir un feedback écrit à mes élèves était une perte de temps et/ou inutile. **OUI / NON**
 - i. Si oui, parce que...
 1. Vous pensez que les élèves ne tiennent pas compte de la correction.
 2. Vous trouvez que cela n'aide pas à progresser.
 3. Vous trouvez que la perfection n'est pas le but recherché.

8. Ce que j'ai appris durant mes années d'études supérieures (notamment les cours de linguistique anglaise: la morphologie, la syntaxe, la pragmatique) m'aide dans la façon de corriger et de donner du feedback correctif écrit. **OUI / NON (je détiens un Master en traduction)**

9. Mon choix du type de feedback correctif écrit est influencé par certains facteurs tels que ... (vous pouvez cocher plusieurs options si nécessaire)
 - i. Le temps

- ii. Les parents
- iii. La société
- iv. Certaines habitudes
- v. Le programme à suivre
- vi. La méthode de correction de vos anciens professeurs

10. Si **oui**, pourriez-vous préciser.

Ce qu'on a apprécié chez un prof, ou au contraire ce par quoi on a été marqué négativement, influence indubitablement (même si peut-être inconsciemment) la manière dont on opère quand on passe de l'autre côté de la barrière. J'essaye de garder le côté encourageant de certain.e.s profs que j'ai eu.e.s et de m'éloigner des profs qui étaient cassants ou dénigrants. La manière dont on donne du feedback dénote la vision qu'on a de la fonction d'enseignant.

Bon courage pour la suite !

Merci infiniment pour votre aide¹

Lucie Vermoeren

¹ Les réponses à ce questionnaire resteront anonymes.

14.2 Teacher B's answers

GERM2MD

Master thesis

2020-2021

Lucie Vermoeren

Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER


Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (WCF)

Pourriez-vous répondre aux questions suivantes en surlignant le chiffre correspondant à votre pratique?

(1= toujours; 2= souvent ; 3= parfois ; 4= rarement ; 5= jamais).

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).	1	2	3	4	5
2	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute individuellement avec chaque élève en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
3	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute collectivement avec les élèves en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
4	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Je rends les corrections écrites le plus rapidement possible (dans un délai de moins d'une semaine).	1	2	3	4	5
7	Je rends les corrections écrites plus d'une semaine après la production.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves. Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre à la question 9.	1	2	3	4	5
9	J'ai tendance à donner plus de feedback écrit lorsque l'élève est faible.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive d'utiliser des couleurs différentes.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes. Si oui, quelle est leur signification ? Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre aux questions 12 et 13.	1	2	3	4	5
	✓ = <i>vocabulaire</i>					
	G = <i>grammaire</i>					
	St = <i>structure</i>					
	Conj = <i>conjugaison</i>					
	⊕ = <i>performance</i>					

  = <i>Code</i>					
 =					
 =					
12	Mes élèves connaissent la signification de mes lettres/codes, car je leur en ai parlé au préalable.	1	2	3	4	5
13	J'indique ces lettres et/ou codes dans la marge de la feuille.	1	2	3	4	5
14	J'écris le nombre total d'erreurs d'une ligne sur la même ligne dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise d'autres moyens non mentionnés ci-dessus. Si oui, lesquels ?	1	2	3	4	5
16	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».	1	2	3	4	5
20	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».	1	2	3	4	5
21	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en fin de texte.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en anglais.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en français.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige toutes les fautes.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
26	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	1	2	3	4	5

27	Il m'arrive de changer de méthode de correction d'un texte écrit à l'autre. Si oui, dans quelles circonstances ?	1	2	3	4	5
28	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).	1	2	3	4	5
29	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).	1	2	3	4	5
30	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je leur propose de réécrire leur production écrite en tenant compte de ma correction.	1	2	3	4	5
31	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je m'attarde d'avantage sur les points qui viennent d'être abordés en classe.	1	2	3	4	5
32	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je suis conscient(e) de la portée de mes commentaires et fais attention à leur formulation.	1	2	3	4	5
33	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris des commentaires sous formes de questions ; par exemple, « Quel est le sujet de ton verbe ? ».	1	2	3	4	5
34	Après l'épreuve écrite effectuée, je propose aux élèves de corriger la copie de leur voisin.	1	2	3	4	5
35	Avant de corriger un production écrite, je la lis d'abord en entier sans rien corriger	1	2	3	4	5

b. Le feedback correctif écrit et les élèves

36	Je constate que les élèves sont en demandes de feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
37	Je constate chez les élèves une amélioration dans les tests/travaux suivants grâce au feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
38	Les élèves me demandent de leur fournir un <u>certain</u> type de feedback correctif.	1	2	3	4	5
39	Les élèves posent des questions ou demandent des explications complémentaires concernant le feedback reçu.	1	2	3	4	5

c. Questions complémentaires

- Après quelques corrections écrites, j'ai déjà eu le sentiment que des élèves ont tendance à éviter des formes qui ont fait l'objet d'une correction dans une épreuve précédente. OUI / ~~NON~~

2. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment que mes élèves attachent plus d'importance aux points qu'au feedback.
 OUI / NON
3. Je dis systématiquement à mes élèves qu'il est indispensable d'analyser la correction et/ou de s'autocorriger. OUI / NON
4. Durant ma carrière, j'ai entendu/pris connaissance des recherches effectuées sur le feedback correctif écrit. OUI / NON
5. Durant ma carrière, je me suis déjà dit qu'il serait bien de mettre en place des séminaires durant lesquels les professeurs pourraient en apprendre d'avantage sur le feedback correctif écrit (i.e. comment fournir un bon feedback, par où commencer, etc.) OUI / NON
6. Je trouve que je passe trop de temps à corriger. OUI / NON
7. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment (durant ma carrière) que fournir un feedback écrit à mes élèves était une perte de temps et/ou inutile. OUI / NON
- i. Si oui, parce que...
1. Vous pensez que les élèves ne tiennent pas compte de la correction.
 2. Vous trouvez que cela n'aide pas à progresser.
 3. Vous trouvez que la perfection n'est pas le but recherché.
8. Ce que j'ai appris durant mes années d'études supérieures (notamment les cours de linguistique anglaise: la morphologie, la syntaxe, la pragmatique) m'aide dans la façon de corriger et de donner du feedback correctif écrit. OUI / NON
9. Mon choix du type de feedback correctif écrit est influencé par certains facteurs tels que ... (vous pouvez cocher plusieurs options si nécessaire)
- i. Le temps
 - ii. Les parents
 - iii. La société
 - iv. Certaines habitudes

v. Le programme à suivre

vi. La méthode de correction de vos anciens professeurs

10. Si oui, pourriez-vous préciser.

- ① le temps ; surtout en période d'examen
- ② l'information aux parents en période de bulletins.
-
-

Merci infiniment pour votre aide¹
Lucie Vermoeren

¹ Les réponses à ce questionnaire resteront anonymes.

14.3 Teacher C's answers

GERM2MD
Lucie Vermoeren
Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Master thesis
Université catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

2020-2021

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (WCF)

Pourriez-vous répondre aux questions suivantes en surlignant le chiffre correspondant à votre pratique?
(1= toujours; 2= souvent ; 3= parfois ; 4= rarement ; 5= jamais).

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).	1	2	3	4	5
2	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute individuellement avec chaque élève en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
3	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute collectivement avec les élèves en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
4	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Je rends les corrections écrites le plus rapidement possible (dans un délai de moins d'une semaine).	1	2	3	4	5
7	Je rends les corrections écrites plus d'une semaine après la production. ¹	1	2	3	4	5
8	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves. Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre à la question 9.	1	2	3	4	5
9	J'ai tendance à donner plus de feedback écrit lorsque l'élève est faible.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive d'utiliser des couleurs différentes.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes. Si oui, quelle est leur signification ? Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre aux questions 12 et 13 . vert = utilisation d'outils lexicaux ou de grammaire, outils abordés en classe rouge = erreurs 'O' dans la marge, en vert = utilisation d'un outil de grammaire	1	2	3	4	5

¹ Cela dépend de la charge de travail à faire pendant la semaine (préparations, autres tests à corriger, etc.) ainsi que du nombre d'élèves (certains groupes = 28 élèves)

	<p>mots entourés en vert = utilisation d'un mot de vocabulaire abordé en classe</p> <p>'v' en rouge = erreur lexicale</p> <p>a en rouge = utilisation non adéquate d'outils</p> <p>c en rouge = « correction des structures » ; << forme erronée</p> <p>s en rouge = erreur d'orthographe</p> <p>log en rouge (dans la marge)/accolade barrée dans le texte pour indiquer l'endroit précis: incohérence</p> <p>? (en rouge) dans la marge/ 'vaguelettes' (en rouge) dans le texte: incompréhensible</p>					
12	Mes élèves connaissent la signification de mes lettres/codes, car je leur en ai parlé au préalable.	1	2	3	4	5
13	J'indique ces lettres et/ou codes dans la marge de la feuille.	1	2	3	4	5
14	J'écris le nombre total d'erreurs d'une ligne sur la même ligne dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
15	<p>Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise d'autres moyens non mentionnés ci-dessus. Si oui, lesquels ?</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p> <p>.....</p>	1	2	3	4	5
16	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».	1	2	3	4	5
20	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».	1	2	3	4	5
21	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en fin de texte.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en	1	2	3	4	5

	anglais. ²				
23	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en français.	1	2	3	4 5
24	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige toutes les fautes.	1	2	3	4 5
25	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	1	2	3	4 5
26	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	1	2	3	4 5
27	Il m'arrive de changer de méthode de correction d'un texte écrit à l'autre. Si oui, dans quelles circonstances ? <i>Il m'arrive de donner une tâche écrite à faire en classe, par deux, sans que les élèves n'aient étudié au préalable ; pour les inciter à utiliser un outil de grammaire en particulier par ex. Dans ces circonstances, j'adapte ma grille critériée.</i>	1	2	3	4 5
28	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).	1	2	3	4 5
29	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).	1	2	3	4 5
30	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je leur propose de réécrire leur production écrite en tenant compte de ma correction.	1	2	3	4 5
31	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je m'attarde davantage sur les points qui viennent d'être abordés en classe.	1	2	3	4 5
32	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je suis conscient(e) de la portée de mes commentaires et fais attention à leur formulation.	1	2	3	4 5
33	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris des commentaires sous formes de questions ; par exemple, « Quel est le sujet de ton verbe ? ».	1	2	3	4 5
34	Après l'épreuve écrite effectuée, je propose aux élèves de corriger la copie de leur voisin.	1	2	3	4 5
35	Avant de corriger un production écrite, je la lis d'abord en entier sans rien corriger	1	2	3	4 5

b. Le feedback correctif écrit et les élèves

36	Je constate que les élèves sont en demande de feedback.	1	2	3	4 5
----	---	---	---	---	-----

² cela dépend du niveau de l'élève

37	Je constate chez les élèves une amélioration dans les tests/travaux suivants grâce au feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
38	Les élèves me demandent de leur fournir un <u>certain</u> type de feedback correctif.	1	2	3	4	5
39	Les élèves posent des questions ou demandent des explications complémentaires concernant le feedback reçu.	1	2	3	4	5

c. Questions complémentaires

1. Après quelques corrections écrites, j'ai déjà eu le sentiment que des élèves ont tendance à éviter des formes qui ont fait l'objet d'une correction dans une épreuve précédente. **OUI / NON**

Cela dépend toutefois d'un élève à l'autre: les élèves plus rigoureux tiennent compte de mes commentaires. D'autres refont systématiquement les mêmes erreurs, malgré mes commentaires.

2. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment que mes élèves attachent plus d'importance aux points qu'au feedback.

OUI / NON

3. Je dis systématiquement à mes élèves qu'il est indispensable d'analyser la correction et/ou de s'autocorriger. **OUI / NON**

4. *Durant ma carrière*, j'ai entendu/pris connaissance des recherches effectuées sur le feedback correctif écrit. **OUI / NON**

Durant mes études, OUI

5. Durant ma carrière, je me suis déjà dit qu'il serait bien de mettre en place des séminaires durant lesquels les professeurs pourraient en apprendre davantage sur le feedback correctif écrit (i.e. comment fournir un bon feedback, par où commencer, etc.). **OUI / NON**

6. Je trouve que je passe *trop* de temps à corriger. **OUI / NON**

10 à 15 minutes en moyenne par copie (en fonction du nombre de mots). Cela me semble cependant normal.

7. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment (durant ma carrière) que fournir un feedback écrit à mes élèves était une perte de temps et/ou inutile. **OUI / NON**

i. Si oui, parce que...

1. **Vous pensez que les élèves ne tiennent pas compte de la correction.**

2. Vous trouvez que cela n'aide pas à progresser.

3. Vous trouvez que la perfection n'est pas le but recherché.

« Inutile » pour les élèves qui ne tiennent pas compte des commentaires. Cela ne concerne cependant **pas tous** les élèves. Certains ne commettent plus les mêmes erreurs et s'améliorent sensiblement grâce au feedback collectif/aux remarques individuelles inscrites sur la copie.

8. Ce que j'ai appris durant mes années d'études supérieures (notamment les cours de linguistique anglaise: la morphologie, la syntaxe, la pragmatique) m'aide dans la façon de corriger et de donner du feedback correctif écrit. **OUI / NON**

9. Mon choix du type de feedback correctif écrit est influencé par certains facteurs tels que ... (vous pouvez cocher plusieurs options si nécessaire)

i. **Le temps**

ii. Les parents

iii. La société

iv. **Certaines habitudes**

v. Le programme à suivre

vi. La méthode de correction de vos anciens professeurs

10. Si **oui**, pourriez-vous préciser.

Temps (+ le nombre d'élèves) : *lors des sessions d'examens, nous sommes tenus par un délai de correction relativement court*

Certaines habitudes : *je fais une différence entre l'évaluation certificative de juin et l'évaluation formative. Comme son nom l'indique, l'évaluation formative 'forme' à l'évaluation certificative de juin. D'où l'importance des commentaires et du feedback pendant l'année.*

GERM2MD
Lucie Vermoeren
Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Master thesis
Université catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

2020-2021

Lors d'évaluations certificatives, j'utilise uniquement des symboles et des codes couleurs (voir supra), je n'écris pas de commentaires. L'élève ne reçoit en effet pas sa copie d'examen. Par contre, s'il souhaite la consulter, je parcours sa copie d'examen avec lui/elle et je la commente oralement.

Merci infiniment pour votre aide³
Lucie Vermoeren

³ Les réponses à ce questionnaire resteront anonymes.

14.4 Teacher D's answers

GERM2MD
Lucie Vermoeren
Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Master thesis
Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

2020-2021

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (WCF)

Pourriez-vous répondre aux questions suivantes en surlignant le chiffre correspondant à votre pratique?

(1= toujours; 2= souvent; 3= parfois; 4= rarement; 5= jamais).

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
2	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute individuellement avec chaque élève en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
3	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discute collectivement avec les élèves en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	<u>3</u>	4	5
4	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte. <i>pas uniquement → toujours</i>	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
5	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
6	Je rends les corrections écrites le plus rapidement possible (dans un délai de moins d'une semaine).	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
7	Je rends les corrections écrites plus d'une semaine après la production.	1	2	3	<u>4</u>	5
8	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves. Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre à la question 9.	<u>1</u>	2	3	4	5
9	J'ai tendance à donner plus de feedback écrit lorsque l'élève est faible.	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive d'utiliser des couleurs différentes.	1	2	3	4	<u>5</u>
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes. Si oui, quelle est leur signification? Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre aux questions 12 et 13. <i>I = insuffisant</i> <i>S = suffisant</i> <i>B = bien</i> <i>TB = très bien</i> <i>↳ codes correspondants à ce qui est attribué aux compétences / OAA dans les bulletins</i>	1	<u>2</u>	3	4	5

 =					
 =					
 =					
12	Mes élèves connaissent la signification de mes lettres/codes (car je leur en ai parlé au préalable.)	1	2	3	4	5
13	J'indique ces lettres et/ou codes dans la marge de la feuille.	1	2	3	4	5
14	J'écris le nombre total d'erreurs d'une ligne sur la même ligne dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise d'autres moyens non mentionnés ci-dessus. Si oui, lesquels ?	1	2	3	4	5
	abréviations / mots-clés (ex. aux)					
	flèches					
	explications succinctes					
16	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».	1	2	3	4	5
20	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».	1	2	3	4	5
21	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en fin de texte.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en anglais.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs en français.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige <u>toutes</u> les fautes.	1	2	3	4	5
25	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
26	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte »)	1	2	3	4	5
	Si oui, combien en moyenne?					

27	Il m'arrive de changer de méthode de correction d'un texte écrit à l'autre. Si oui, dans quelles circonstances ? <i>selon le fait d'être en apprentissage ou évaluation</i> <i>selon ce sur quoi je veux insister</i>	1	2	3	4	5
28	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).	1	2	3	4	5
29	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).	1	2	3	4	5
30	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je leur propose de réécrire leur production écrite en tenant compte de ma correction.	1	2	3	4	5
31	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je m'attarde d'avantage sur les points qui viennent d'être abordés en classe.	1	2	3	4	5
32	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je suis conscient(e) de la portée de mes commentaires et fais attention à leur formulation.	1	2	3	4	5
33	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris des commentaires sous formes de questions ; par exemple, « Quel est le sujet de ton verbe ? ».	1	2	3	4	5
34	Après l'épreuve écrite effectuée, je propose aux élèves de corriger la copie de leur voisin.	1	2	3	4	5
35	Avant de corriger un production écrite, je la lis d'abord en entier sans rien corriger	1	2	3	4	5

b. Le feedback correctif écrit et les élèves

36	Je constate que les élèves sont en demandes de feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
37	Je constate chez les élèves une amélioration dans les tests/travaux suivants grâce au feedback. <i>si le feedback est lu & utilisé</i>	1	2	3	4	5
38	Les élèves me demandent de leur fournir un <u>certain</u> type de feedback correctif.	1	2	3	4	5
39	Les élèves posent des questions ou demandent des explications complémentaires concernant le feedback reçu.	1	2	3	4	5

c. Questions complémentaires

- Après quelques corrections écrites, j'ai déjà eu le sentiment que des élèves ont tendance à éviter des formes qui ont fait l'objet d'une correction dans une épreuve précédente. OUI / NON

2. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment que mes élèves attachent plus d'importance aux points qu'au feedback.

!!! OUI / NON

3. Je dis systématiquement à mes élèves qu'il est indispensable d'analyser la correction et/ou de s'autocorriger OUI / NON

4. Durant ma carrière, j'ai entendu/pris connaissance des recherches effectuées sur le feedback correctif écrit. OUI / NON

5. Durant ma carrière, je me suis déjà dit qu'il serait bien de mettre en place des séminaires durant lesquels les professeurs pourraient en apprendre d'avantage sur le feedback correctif écrit (i.e. comment fournir un bon feedback, par où commencer, etc.). OUI / NON

6. Je trouve que je passe trop de temps à corriger OUI / NON

7. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment (durant ma carrière) que fournir un feedback écrit à mes élèves était une perte de temps et/ou inutile. OUI / NON

i. Si oui, parce que...

1. Vous pensez que les élèves ne tiennent pas compte de la correction.

2. Vous trouvez que cela n'aide pas à progresser.

3. Vous trouvez que la perfection n'est pas le but recherché.

8. Ce que j'ai appris durant mes années d'études supérieures (notamment les cours de linguistique anglaise: la morphologie, la syntaxe, la pragmatique) m'aide dans la façon de corriger et de donner du feedback correctif écrit. OUI / NON

9. Mon choix du type de feedback correctif écrit est influencé par certains facteurs tels que ... (vous pouvez cocher plusieurs options si nécessaire)

i. Le temps

ii. Les parents

iii. La société

iv. Certaines habitudes

v. Le programme à suivre

vi. La méthode de correction de vos anciens professeurs

le moment de l'apprentissage ou évaluation

10. Si oui, pourriez-vous préciser.

- Si je corrige un écrit formatif pour aider l'élève à progresser, la méthode sera différente d'une évaluation finale à valeur certificative.
- Selon le temps imparti pour certains exs, je m'adapterai aussi
- Si la visée est plutôt grammaticale ou lexicale, méthodes différentes utilisées.

Merci infiniment pour votre aide¹

Lucie Vermoeren

¹ Les réponses à ce questionnaire resteront anonymes.

14.5 The retired teacher's answers

GERM2MD
Lucie Vermoeren
Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Master's thesis
Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

2020-2021

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (WCF)

Pourriez-vous répondre aux questions suivantes en surlignant le chiffre correspondant à votre pratique?

(1= toujours; 2= souvent ; 3= parfois ; 4= rarement ; 5= jamais).

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

1	Durant ma carrière, j'ai donné du feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève recevait son propre feedback).	1	2	3	4	5
2	Durant ma carrière, ma manière de donner du feedback à chacun de mes élèves n'a cessé d'évoluer.	1	2	3	4	5
2	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discutais individuellement avec chaque élève en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
3	Une fois les corrections distribuées, j'en discutais collectivement avec les élèves en classe (précisions, explications, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5
4	Durant ma carrière, je donnais un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.	1	2	3	4	5
5	Durant ma carrière, je donnais un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	1	2	3	4	5
6	Je rendais les corrections écrites le plus rapidement possible (dans un délai de moins d'une semaine).	1	2	3	4	5
7	Je rendais les corrections écrites plus d'une semaine après la production.	1	2	3	4	5
8	Mon feedback était adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves. Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre à la question 9.	1	2	3	4	5
9	J'avais tendance à donner plus de feedback écrit lorsque l'élève est faible.	1	2	3	4	5
10	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, il m'arrivait d'utiliser des couleurs différentes.	1	2	3	4	5
11	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, j'utilisais des lettres/codes. Si oui, quelle était leur signification ? Si vous surlignez « 5 », ne pas répondre aux questions 12 et 13 = =	1	2	3	4	5

 =					
 =					
 =					
 =					
 =					
 =					
12	Mes élèves connaissaient la signification de mes lettres/codes, car je leur en ai parlé au préalable.	1	2	3	4	5
13	J'indiquais ces lettres et/ou codes dans la marge de la feuille.	1	2	3	4	5
14	J'écrivais le nombre total d'erreurs d'une ligne sur la même ligne dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
15	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, j'utilisais d'autres moyens non mentionnés ci-dessus. Si oui, lesquels ? J'ajoutais un commentaire mettant l'élève sur la bonne voie de la correction	1	2	3	4	5
16	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, j'écrivais directement la forme corrigée.	1	2	3	4	5
17	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je ne faisais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	1	2	3	4	5
18	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je rédigeais des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.	1	2	3	4	5
19	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, il m'arrivait de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».	1	2	3	4	5
20	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je ne mettais pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».	1	2	3	4	5
21	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je rédigeais des commentaires correctifs en fin de texte.	1	2	3	4	5
22	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je rédigeais des commentaires correctifs en anglais.	1	2	3	4	5
23	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je rédigeais des commentaires correctifs en français.	1	2	3	4	5
24	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je corrigeais toutes les fautes. → Important de corriger l'élève si on veut qu'il s'améliore. C'est essentiel surtout dans ses années supérieures si el/elle est confronté à de l'anglais	1	2	3	4	5
25	Lorsque je donnais une épreuve écrite, je prévenais les élèves le type d'erreur que j'ai corrigé(ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	1	2	3	4	5

26	Je ne corrigeais qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	1	2	3	4	5
27	Il m'arrivait de changer de méthode de correction d'un texte écrit à l'autre. Si oui, dans quelles circonstances ?	1	2	3	4	5
28	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournissais aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).	1	2	3	4	5
29	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décidais parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaissait).	1	2	3	4	5
30	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je leur proposais de réécrire leur production écrite en tenant compte de ma correction.	1	2	3	4	5
31	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, je m'attardais d'avantage sur les points qui venaient d'être abordés en classe.	1	2	3	4	5
32	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, j'étais conscient de la portée de mes commentaires et faisais attention à leur formulation.	1	2	3	4	5
33	Lorsque je corrigeais les textes écrits, j'écrivais des commentaires sous forme de questions ; par exemple, « Quel est le sujet de ton verbe ? ».	1	2	3	4	5
34	Après l'épreuve écrite effectuée, je proposais aux élèves de corriger la copie de leur voisin.	1	2	3	4	5
35	Avant de corriger une production écrite, je la lisais d'abord en entier sans rien corriger.	1	2	3	4	5

b. Le feedback correctif écrit et les élèves

36	Durant ma carrière, j'ai constaté que les élèves étaient en demande de feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
37	Je constatais chez les élèves une amélioration dans les tests/travaux suivants grâce au feedback.	1	2	3	4	5
38	Les élèves me demandaient de leur fournir un certain type de feedback correctif.	1	2	3	4	5
39	Les élèves posaient des questions ou demandaient des explications complémentaires concernant le feedback reçu. Pq ?	1	2	3	4	5

c. Questions complémentaires

1. Après quelques corrections écrites, j'ai déjà eu le sentiment que des élèves avaient tendance à éviter des formes qui avaient fait l'objet d'une correction dans une épreuve précédente. **OUI / NON**

2. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment que mes élèves attachaient plus d'importance aux points qu'au feedback.

OUI / NON

3. Je disais systématiquement à mes élèves qu'il est indispensable d'analyser la correction et/ou de s'autocorriger. **OUI / NON**

4. Durant ma carrière, j'ai entendu/pris connaissance des recherches effectuées sur le feedback correctif écrit. **OUI / NON**

5. Durant ma carrière, je me suis déjà dit qu'il serait bien de mettre en place des séminaires durant lesquels les professeurs pourraient en apprendre d'avantage sur le feedback correctif écrit (i.e. comment fournir un bon feedback, par où commencer, etc.). **OUI / NON**

6. Je trouvais que je passais trop de temps à corriger. **OUI / NON**

7. J'ai déjà eu le sentiment que fournir un feedback écrit à mes élèves était une perte de temps et/ou inutile. **OUI / NON**

i. Si oui, parce que...

1. Vous pensez que les élèves ne tiennent pas compte de la correction.

2. Vous trouvez que cela n'aide pas à progresser.

3. Vous trouvez que la perfection n'est pas le but recherché.

8. Ce que j'ai appris durant mes années d'études supérieures (notamment les cours de linguistique anglaise: la morphologie, la syntaxe, la pragmatique) m'a aidé dans la façon de corriger et de donner du feedback correctif écrit. **OUI / NON**

9. Mon choix du type de feedback correctif écrit était influencé par certains facteurs tels que ... (vous pouvez cocher plusieurs options si nécessaire) **NON**

i. Le temps

- ii. Les parents
- iii. La société
- iv. Certaines habitudes
- v. Le programme à suivre
- vi. La méthode de correction de vos anciens professeurs

10. Si **oui**, pourriez-vous préciser.

/

Merci infiniment pour votre aide¹
Lucie Vermoeren

¹ Les réponses à ce questionnaire resteront anonymes.

15 Appendices: selected answers to the questionnaire

15.1 Teacher A's selected answers

GERM2MD

Master's thesis

2020-2021

Lucie Vermoeren

Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (*WCF*)

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

	Y a-t-il une incohérence entre les croyances et la pratique ?	oui	non
1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).	X	
2	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.	X	
3	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	X	
4	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves.	X	
5	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes.		X
6	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.		X
7	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	X	
8	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.		X
9	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».		X
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».		X
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige toutes les fautes.		X
12	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	X	
13	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « <i>je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte</i> ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	X	
14	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).	X	
15	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).	X	

15.2 Teacher B's selected answers

GERM2MD

Master's thesis

2020-2021

Lucie Vermoeren

Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (*WCF*)

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

	Y a-t-il une incohérence entre les croyances et la pratique ?	oui	non
1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).		X
2	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.		X
3	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	X	
4	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves.	X	
5	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes.		X
6	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.		X
7	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	X	
8	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.		X
9	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».		X
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».		X
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige toutes les fautes.		X
12	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	X	
13	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	X	
14	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).	X	
15	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).	X	

15.3 Teacher C's selected answers

GERM2MD

Master's thesis

2020-2021

Lucie Vermoeren

Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (WCF)

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

	Y a-t-il une incohérence entre les croyances et la pratique ?	oui	non
1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).	X	
2	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.	X	
3	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	X	
4	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves.		X
5	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes.	X	
6	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.	X	
7	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	X	
8	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.	X	
9	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».		X
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».		X
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige toutes les fautes.		X
12	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).		X
13	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	X	
14	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).		X
15	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).		X

15.4 Teacher D's selected answers

GERM2MD

Master's thesis

2020-2021

Lucie Vermoeren

Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve

Supervisor: Prof. Fanny MEUNIER

Questionnaire concernant la pratique du feedback correctif écrit (*WCF*)

a. Donner du feedback correctif écrit.

	Y a-t-il une incohérence entre les croyances et la pratique ?	oui	non
1	Je donne un feedback écrit individuel (chaque élève reçoit son propre feedback).	X	
2	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit uniquement lorsque les erreurs empêchent la bonne compréhension du texte.	X	
3	Je donne un feedback correctif écrit portant sur les erreurs n'impliquant pas une difficulté de compréhension du texte ; par exemple, une faute d'orthographe.	X	
4	Mon feedback est adapté au niveau et/ou aux besoins de chacun de mes élèves.		X
5	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'utilise des lettres/codes.		X
6	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, j'écris directement la forme corrigée.	X	
7	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne fais que souligner l'erreur et je laisse le soin à l'élève de la corriger.	X	
8	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je rédige des commentaires correctifs dans la marge.		X
9	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, il m'arrive de rédiger des commentaires correctifs encourageants ; par exemple, « Tu es sur la bonne voie ».		X
10	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je ne mets pas que l'accent sur les faiblesses/les erreurs de l'élève mais aussi sur les points positifs ; par exemple, « Bravo, tu as utilisé le Present Perfect à bon escient ».		X
11	Lorsque je corrige les textes écrits, je corrige toutes les fautes.	X	
12	Lorsque je donne une épreuve écrite, je communique aux élèves le type d'erreur que je vais corriger (ex. la grammaire, le vocabulaire, etc.).	X	
13	Je ne corrige qu'un nombre maximal de fautes (ex. « je ne corrige que 10 fautes importantes/graves par texte ») Si oui, combien en moyenne?	X	
14	Lors de la distribution des épreuves écrites à effectuer, je fournis aussi une « boîte à outils » (i.e. une liste de tous les outils de communication devant être utilisés par les élèves dans leur production écrite).		X
15	Lors du rendu des épreuves écrites corrigées, je décide parfois de ne donner que du feedback (en d'autres termes, aucune cote n'apparaît).		X

UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN
Faculté de philosophie, arts et lettres

Place Blaise Pascal, 1 bte L3.03.11, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique | www.uclouvain.be/fial