

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA
MINISTRY OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH
UNIVERSITY OF BEJAIA
FACULTY OF LETTERS AND LANGUAGES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

**The Effect of Teachers' Corrective Feedback on
Learners' Oral Fluency Practice**

The case of 2nd year LMD Students in the department of English,
University of Bejaia

**Dissertation submitted to the department of English in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Master Degree in Didactics of English**

Submitted by:

Miss. BELHADI Karima

Supervised by:

Mr. OUALI

Board of Examiners:

Chairperson1: Mr. MEDJKOUNE

Chairperson2: Mrs. HALIL

Supervisor: Mr. OUALI

Examiner: Mrs. KACI

June 2013

Acknowledgements

First, praise be to Allah who guided us to do this work.

Then, I would like to thank my supervisor Mr. OUALI for his continuous supportive guidance and for his insightful feedback throughout this research work, without his encouragement and advice I would not have pursued this topic.

I am grateful to second year teachers and students who have welcomed me in their classrooms during my observation and who answered the two questionnaires.

I am also grateful to the members of the jury for the time and the efforts they spent in reading and examining this work.

Finally, I would like to thank my classmates and my friends who provided me with help all along the preparation of this work.

Dedication

I dedicate this work to my dearest parents, my brother and my sisters who have been my source of strengths and counsel. Thanks to them for providing me with their care, attention and unending support.

I also dedicate this work to my dear friends Louiza, Malia, Dalila and Kenza who helped me during the different steps of the present work.

Finally, I dedicate this work to all my teachers and to all my classmates from the first year till now.

Abstract

The present research is an attempt to discover the effect of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice. Our particular interest in conducting this dissertation on this issue is triggered by the important function that teachers' corrective feedback plays in determining the learners' language level. Indeed, teachers' error correction has the power of altering the students' level, but in some situations it can affect some aspects of learning negatively. This is why we want to know whether this important aspect has a negative effect on learners' oral fluency practice, i.e. does teachers' corrective feedback give students more opportunities to practice and improve their oral fluency. The significance of this research lies in the fact that it provides with descriptions of the reality of teachers' error correction and measures the extent to which this aspect of teaching and learning can affect the learners' oral fluency practice. This research project is based on a review of the relevant literature on the two variables of our research work which are teachers' corrective feedback and learners' oral fluency practice, and on data collected through the classroom observation as well as the students' questionnaire. The findings show that the way teachers provide corrective feedback does not allow or give students a lot of opportunities to speak and practice their oral fluency which is the main goal of speaking. The main conclusion to be drawn from this research work is that teachers' corrective feedback affects negatively learners' oral fluency practice.

Key words: teachers' corrective feedback, learners' oral fluency, oral fluency practice.

Table of contents

Acknowledgements.....	I
Dedication.....	II
Abstract.....	III
Table of contents.....	IV
List of abbreviations.....	X
List of tables.....	XI
Glossary of terms.....	XIII
General introduction	
Introduction.....	XIV
1. Statement of the problem.....	XIV
2. Research Questions.....	XV
3. Hypothesis.....	XV
4. Significance of the study.....	XV
5. Aims of the study.....	XVI
6. Population and sample.....	XVI
7. Procedures and tools of data collection.....	XVI
8. Organization of the study.....	XVII
Chapter I: Literature Review	
Introduction.....	1
Section I: Corrective feedback.....	
1	
I. 1. Definitions of feedback.....	1
I. 2. The importance of corrective feedback in the language classroom.....	2

I. 3. The criteria for correction.....	3
I. 4. Different views about when and how to correct.....	4
I. 4. 1. Ur' s view.....	4
I. 4. 2. Nunan' s and Lamb' s view.....	5
I. 4. 3. Ancker' s view.....	5
I. 4. 4. Harmer' s view.....	6
I. 4. 5. Thornbury' s view.....	6
I. 5. Types of corrective feedback.....	7
I. 5. 1. Explicit correction.....	7
I. 5. 2. Recasts.....	7
I. 5. 3. Clarification requests.....	7
I. 5. 4. Metalinguistic feedback.....	8
I. 5. 5. Elicitation.....	8
I. 5. 6. Repetition.....	9
I. 5. 7. Multiple feedback.....	9
I. 6 Problems with feedback.....	9
I. 6. 1. Imprecision of teachers' corrective feedback.....	9
I. 6. 2. The ambiguity of corrective feedback.....	10
I. 6. 3. The inconsistency of teachers' corrective feedback.....	10
I. 6. 4. The several meanings of correction.....	11
I. 7. Errors and communication in the classroom.....	11
I. 8. The disadvantages of corrective feedback.....	12

I. 8. 1. Breaking the flow of communication and focusing on accuracy more than fluency.....	12
I. 8. 2. Decreasing learners' motivation.....	13
I. 8. 3. Discouraging risk-taking.....	13
I. 8. 4. Increasing learners' anxiety.....	14
I. 8. 5. Decreasing learners' self-confidence.....	14
Section II: Oral fluency practice.....	15
II. 1. The nature of speaking.....	15
II. 2. What makes speaking difficult?.....	16
II. 2. 1. Clustering.....	16
II. 2. 2. Redundancy of language.....	16
II. 2. 3. Reduced forms.....	17
II. 2. 4. Performance variables.....	17
II. 2. 5. Colloquial language.....	17
II. 2. 6. Rate of delivery.....	17
II. 2. 7. Stress, rhythm, and intonation.....	18
II. 2. 8. Interaction.....	18
II. 3. The role of output and interaction in the classroom.....	18
II. 4. Definitions of fluency.....	19
II. 5. The features of oral fluency.....	21
II. 5. 1. Rate of speech.....	21
II. 5. 2. Frequency and length of pauses.....	21

II. 5. 3. Location of pauses.....	22
II. 5. 4. Length of run between pauses.....	22
II. 5. 5. Pause fillers.....	23
II. 6. Principles used for designing fluency activities.....	23
II. 6. 1. Repetition.....	24
II. 6. 2. Increase the amount of speaking time.....	24
II. 6. 3. Allow time to prepare before speaking.....	24
II. 6. 4. Use familiar and motivating topics.....	25
II. 6. 5. Ensure appropriate language level.....	25
II. 6. 6. Set time limits.....	25
II. 6. 7. Teach formulaic sequences.....	26
II. 7. Correction strategies and techniques that help learners maximize their oral fluency practice.....	26
II. 7. 1. Recording.....	26
II. 7. 2. Listen and then let students correct themselves.....	27
II. 7. 3. Fingers.....	28
II. 7. 4. Self and peer correction.....	29
Conclusion.....	30
 Chapter two: Research design and data analysis	
Introduction.....	31
 I. Section one: Research design and methodology.....	
I. 1. Design and methodology.....	31

II. Section two: Implications, Limitations and suggestions for further research.....	69
II. 1. Implications.....	69
II. 2. Limitations of the study.....	70
II. 3. Suggestions for further research.....	71
Conclusion.....	72
General conclusion.....	73
Bibliography.....	75
Appendices	

I. 1.1. Overview of the method.....	31
I. 1. 2. The research participants.....	32
I. 1. 2. 1. The student participants.....	32
I. 1. 2. 2. The teacher participants.....	32
I. 1. 3. Data collection Procedures.....	32
I. 1. 3. 1. The Students’ Preliminary Questionnaire.....	33
I. 1. 3. 2. The Classroom Observation Checklist.....	33
I. 1. 3. 3. The Students’ Questionnaire.....	33
I. 2. Data analysis.....	34
I. 2. 1. Analysis of the results of the Students’ Preliminary Questionnaire.....	34
I. 2. 1. 1. Aim of the Students’ Preliminary Questionnaire.....	34
I. 2. 1. 2. Description of the Students’ Preliminary Questionnaire.....	34
I. 2. 1. 3. Analysis and discussion of the results of the Students’ Preliminary Questionnaire.....	35
I. 2. 2. Analysis of the results of the Classroom Observation Checklist.....	38
I. 2. 2. 1. Aim of the Observation Checklist.....	38
I. 2. 2. 2. Description of the Observation Checklist.....	38
I. 2. 2. 3. Analysis and discussion of the results of the Observation Checklist.....	39
I. 2. 3. Analysis of the results of the Students’ Questionnaire.....	49
I. 2. 3. 1. Aim of the Students’ Questionnaire.....	49
I. 2. 3. 2. Description of the Students’ Questionnaire.....	50
I. 2. 3. 2. Analysis and discussion of the results of the Students’ Questionnaire.....	50
I. 2. 4. Summary of the major findings of the research.....	66

List of abbreviations

B.A students: Bachelor of Arts students

EC: Error correction

EFL: English as a foreign language

ESL: English as a second language

FL: Foreign language

L2: Second language

TL: Target language

List of tables and figures

Table 1: The handed preliminary questionnaire.....	35
Table 2: Teachers' correction of errors while speaking.....	35
Table 3: students' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback.....	36
Table 4: the consideration of corrective feedback as a barrier to practice speaking.....	36
Table 5: problems that teachers' corrective feedback causes for students.....	37
Table 6: peer correction.....	37
Table 7: the classroom observation checklist of the sub-group A ₁	39
Table 8: The classroom observation of the second sub-group A ₂	42
Table 9: The classroom observation checklist of the group B ₁	44
Table 10: The classroom observation checklist of the group B ₂	46
Table 11: The handed questionnaire.....	50
Table 12: Teachers' correction of all students' errors.....	50
Table 13: The effect of teachers' correction.....	51
Table 14: Teachers' intervention to correct.....	51
Table 15: Students providing corrective feedback to each other.....	52
Table 16: Loosing the idea when the teacher corrects a student's error.....	52
Table 17: Continue speaking after the teacher corrects a student's error.....	53
Table 18: disturbing students when correcting them frequently.....	53
Table 19: Feeling less competent when the teacher corrects students' errors several times....	54
Table 20: Encouraging students to participate and to speak more when correcting.....	54
Table 21: Reducing students' chances to speak by correcting a large number of errors.....	55

Table 22: Interrupting students discourages students to speak.....	56
Table 23: Feeling comfortable when the teacher neglects students' errors.....	56
Table 24: Feeling disturbed and losing the idea when the teacher corrects a student error....	57
Table 25: The teacher's intervention to correct students' errors.....	57
Table 26: The consideration of the teacher's correction as worthless.....	57
Table 27: Feeling anxious and making more errors when the teacher corrects a student's error.....	58
Table 28: Becoming unwilling to speak after the teacher's correction of a student's error....	58
Table 29: Students' preference of the correction of all their errors.....	59
Table 30: Students' preference of the use of non verbal communication.....	59
Table 31: Students' preference of asking their classmates to correct their errors.....	60
Table 32: Students' preference of recording their errors and correcting them at the end of the activity.....	60
Table 33: Students' preference of telling them about what is wrong and asking them to reproduce the correct form.....	61
Table 34: Students' preference of the use of recasts.....	61
Table 35: Students' preference of the use of their errors as a starting point for the next lesson.....	62
Table 36: Students' preference of correcting their errors just after their occurrence.....	62
Table 37: Students' preference of correcting their errors after finishing their messages.....	63
Table 38: Students' preference to correct their own errors.....	63
Table 39: Students' preference of the correction of their errors by their classmates.....	64
Figure 01: Categorizing and remembering students' errors.....	27

Glossary of terms

Interlanguage: it refers to “*the version of the language which a learner has at any one stage of development, and which is continually reshaped as he or she aims towards full mastery*”. (Harmer, 2001: 100)

Input: It refers to “*(in language learning) language which a learner hears or receives and from which he or she can learn*”. (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 261)

Output: It is “*the language a learner produces*”. (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 261)

Interaction: According to the Longman dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, this refers to “*the way in which a language is used by interlocutors*”. (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 263)

Communicative competence: “*knowledge of not only if something is formally possible in a language, but also the knowledge of whether it is feasible, appropriate, or done in a particular speech community*”. It includes the grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competences. (Richards and Schmidt, 2002: 90)

General introduction

General Introduction

Introduction.....	XIV
1. Statement of the problem.....	XIV
2. Research Questions.....	XV
3. Hypothesis.....	XV
4. Significance of the study.....	XV
5. Aims of the study.....	XVI
6. Population and sample.....	XVI
7. Procedures and tools of data collection.....	XVI
8. Organization of the study.....	XVII

Introduction

Learning a second or a foreign language requires communication; communication asks for speaking, speaking then is a complex process which demands a lot and a lot of sub skills to be involved. Shumin (2002: 210) points out that “*Speaking is one of the central elements of communication. In EFL teaching, it is an aspect that needs special attention and instruction*”. And then for Shumin (2002) learning to speak a foreign language needs more than knowledge of its grammar and semantics. In our present study, we have chosen the speaking skill (oral expression classes) simply because it is the only place where oral fluency is practiced and thus is minimized by the teachers’ correction.

All Students make errors when learning an L2 or FL (Foreign language) because of the complexity of that language they are learning and for the significance of such errors, Scrivener (2005) states that errors occur because students try out ideas, attempt to communicate, take risks and indeed this means that students are progressing.

To make these errors work for the learners not against them, teachers provide learners with the feedback they need to correct them. “*The way teachers deal with students’ errors*” according to Nunan and Lamb (1996: 68) “*depends basically on their own beliefs on the nature of the learning process, an awareness of students’ needs, and the objectives of the course [i.e. fluency and accuracy]*”. During communicative activities which are designed to improve language fluency, Harmer (2001) believes that teachers should not interrupt students in mid-flow to correct their grammatical, lexical, or pronunciation errors, because this interrupts the communication and drags the activity back to the study of language form or precise meaning.

1. Statement of the problem

From the preliminary questionnaire that was distributed to two groups of 2nd year university students in the department of English, we have concluded that the majority of our student informants find error correction a hindrance in their oral expression classes. For this and through our research we want to know the impact of teachers’ corrective feedback on learners’ oral fluency practice, and then we will try to find our student informants’ preferences of their teachers’ corrective feedback provision that we hope by using them students’ oral fluency practice will increase.

Through our research and our literature review we are going to extend the notions of corrective feedback and learners' oral fluency by investigating their different components. By doing our research in the university of Bejaia, we hope that it will help second year students in improving their English language in general and for making progress in the speaking skill.

2. Research questions

For the sake of our research, we devised the following questions that we seek to answer through it.

Q1. What are the factors that make the teachers' corrective feedback a problem?

Q2. How can teachers deal with corrective feedback in a way that does not influence negatively students' oral fluency practice?

Q3. What are our student informants' preferred ways of teachers' corrective feedback delivery?

3. Hypothesis

Throughout our present study which is about the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice we seek to verify the following hypothesis:

We hypothesize that teachers' corrective feedback affects negatively learners' oral fluency practice.

4. Significance of the study

In oral expression classes, teachers' correction seems to interrupt the students, disturb them and decrease their opportunities to practice their oral fluency. Thus this problem may be facilitated through investigating the impact of the teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice and through the selection of some techniques that we hope to be affective and may help learners in improving their oral fluency practice. By using such techniques, teachers will provide students with corrective feedback without hindering their oral fluency practice and in general their speaking skill.

5. Aims of the study

Our main concern through this present investigation is to identify the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on 2nd year students' oral fluency practice.

We also aim at finding out our student informants' preferences in terms of feedback provision in order for us to suggest suitable feedback strategies and techniques that will likely be more conducive to a more effective oral fluency practice in their oral expression classes.

6. Population and sample

In the present study, we are concerned with 2nd year students (577 students) and their teachers (11) who will be the population of the present investigation. The sample will be limited to two groups from the population with 90 students that represent 15.60 % of the whole population with their two teachers that represent 18.18% of the whole population.

7. Procedures and tools of data collection

To achieve the aims mentioned above, the suitable method that can be used for this research is a hybrid method where both the qualitative and the quantitative methods are going to be used. The qualitative method is used to describe the teachers' error correction, and the quantitative method is required to measure its effectiveness, to measure the students' reactions, perceptions and preferences and on the whole to measure the impact of this teachers' corrective feedback on the learners' oral fluency practice. Concerning data collection procedures, classroom observation and two questionnaires will be used. Questionnaires according to Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 172) "*are used mostly to collect data on phenomena which are not easily observed, such as attitudes, motivation and self-concepts*". Indeed, the questionnaire is the adequate data collection tool that we are going to use to collect data on our student informants' reactions, perceptions and preferences. Also, an observation checklist will be used throughout our investigation with the aim of recording the occurrence of behaviours related to the teachers' corrective feedback. According to Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 162) "*observations have always been considered a major collection tool in qualitative research*". A detailed description of those research tools is provided in the second chapter of this research which represents the practical part of our study.

8. Organization of the study

Our study falls into two main parts. The first part is theoretical in its nature, while the second is rather of a practical orientation. The literature review as its name indicates provides an overview of the theoretical underpinnings of the teachers' corrective feedback and oral fluency. The first chapter is divided into two sections, the first section is about teachers' corrective feedback and the second presents some definitions and features and other elements related to oral fluency. The second chapter comprises two sections, the first section deals with a description of the procedures and tools we have used in our research together with an analysis and discussion of the findings and the second one discusses the implications, the limitations and some suggestions for further research. Lastly our dissertation ends with a general conclusion which gives a summary of all the parts and elements discussed in our research work and also it summarizes the main research findings of this investigation.

Chapter one
Literature review

Chapter I: Literature Review

Introduction.....	1
Section I: Corrective feedback.....	1
I. 1. Definitions of feedback.....	1
I. 2. The importance of corrective feedback in the language classroom.....	2
I. 3. The criteria for correction.....	3
I. 4. Different views about when and how to correct.....	4
I. 5. Types of corrective feedback.....	7
I. 6. Problems with corrective feedback.....	9
I. 7. Errors and communication in the classroom.....	11
I. 8. The disadvantages of corrective feedback.....	12
Section II: Oral fluency practice.....	15
II. 1. The nature of speaking.....	15
II. 2. What makes speaking difficult?	16
II. 3. The role of output and interaction in the language classroom.....	18
II. 4. Definitions of oral fluency.....	19
II. 5. The features of oral fluency.....	21
II. 6. Principles used for designing fluency activities.....	23
II. 7. Correction strategies and techniques that help learners maximize their oral fluency practice.....	26
Conclusion.....	30

Introduction

This first chapter is devoted to the two variables of our research which are teachers' corrective feedback and learners' oral fluency practice. Section one sheds light on the major concepts related to the teachers' corrective feedback, introducing definitions, disadvantages, problems and importance of corrective feedback and types that help for a better understanding of this complicated term. Next, section two presents definitions; features of oral fluency, some principles that are used to design activities and finally some techniques which aim at helping learners maximize their oral fluency practice in their classrooms.

Section I: Corrective feedback

I. 1. Definitions of feedback

Feedback is a key element in classroom interaction, and it is a very important aspect of the learning process in that it helps learners develop their interlanguage form. Many definitions of this term are provided by a number of researchers. According to Penny Ur (1991: 242) "*feedback is information that is given to the learner about his or her performance of a learning task, usually with the objective of improving this performance*".

Some examples of feedback that are provided by Ur (1991) are like the following: the words 'Yes, right!' said to a learner who has answered a question; a grade of 70% on an exam; a raised eyebrow in response to a mistake in grammar, comments written in the margin of an essay.

Additionally, Wajnryb (1992) defines the language of feedback as the responses that teachers give to what their learners produce in the classroom but in its narrow definition, the same author refers to feedback as the teacher response to error. Similarly, Lightbown and Spada (1999) in Chu (2011: 454) define corrective feedback as "*any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect*". This is the narrow meaning of feedback as Wajnryb states and this is the one we refer to in our dissertation. Moreover, corrective feedback according to Chaudron (1977: 31) in

Panova and Lyster (2002) refers to any reaction of the teacher which clearly indicates that improvement of the learner utterance is needed.

For the sake of not relating feedback only to error correction and for the sake of criticizing the view that feedback refers solely to correction, Harmer (1998) states that giving feedback does not involve only correcting students' errors but also praising and encouraging them to do things better in subsequent performances. Then Harmer (2001) confirms that feedback encompasses not only correcting students, but also assessing their performances, in other words, offering them positive assessment.

I. 2. The importance of corrective feedback in the language classroom

Corrective feedback is of a very essential role in teaching and learning as many writers point out, this importance lies mainly in developing the learners competences, and changing their interlanguage for the better, For this reason, Chaudron (1988: 152) points out that "*feedback in L2 classrooms lies at the core of research on teacher-student and student-student interaction*". According to Jeremy Harmer (1998: 62) "*correction helps students to clarify their understanding of the meaning and construction of language*".

The importance of correction also lies in the type of feedback the teacher is providing, whether it is negative or positive feedback. Thornbury (1999) and Brown (2000) in Hill and Flynn (2006) contend that it would not be useful if students get only positive messages about their output, since this discourages them to make attempts to restructure their grammar and encourages the fossilization of those incorrect forms. In the same sense, Tsui (1995) also emphasizes the fact that without correction, the erroneous output will pave the way for students to internalize these errors or to change their correct hypotheses about the target language to accommodate these incorrect forms.

Similarly, Allwright and Bailey (1991) write about the significance of correction in that it helps learners alter their output for the better, pointing out that:

“ if one of our goals as language teachers is to help our learners move along the interlanguage continuum, getting closer and closer to the target language norm,

then, the thinking goes, we must provide with the feedback they need to modify their hypotheses about the functions and linguistic forms they use. (Notice that there is an assumption here- the assumption that providing feedback will help learners to alter their output in constructive and long-lasting ways). However, we are often faced with difficult choices about how best to do this without discouraging the learners". (Allwright and Bailey, 1991: 99)

The above quotation is a proof that corrective feedback can alter learners' interlanguage form for the better when teachers provide their learners with the feedback they need to modify their hypotheses about the functions and linguistic forms they use and when doing this in a way that does not discourage them.

I. 3. The criteria of correction

A number of criteria should be mentioned, and taken into consideration before venturing into correcting the learners' errors. Those criteria are set by researchers in order to facilitate and manage the task of correction. To begin with, Nunan and Lamb (1996: 68) set three main criteria of correction. They state that "*the way teachers deal with students' errors depends basically on their own beliefs on the nature of the learning process, an awareness of students' needs, and the objectives of the course*".

Thereafter, Tsui (1995) set two dimensions in deciding whether errors should be corrected. The first dimension is the nature of the error and the second one is the focus of the lesson. According to Tsui, if the error significantly hinders communication, correction is necessary. Then Tsui adds that it is important to distinguish whether the focus is on accuracy or fluency, if the focus of the lesson is on form, that is accuracy, teachers should correct errors related to linguistic form, as well as those that hinder communication but when the focus is on content, i.e. fluency, errors that do not hinder communication often go uncorrected. To emphasize the point of the objective of the lesson, Jim Scrivener (2005) states that an important criterion is the aim of the activity. Scrivener points out that correction may be helpful if it will improve the learners' accurate use of English (i.e. when the aim of the activity is developing students' accuracy) and it will not be recommended if the aim of the activity is to encourage fluency.

Another very essential criterion is the gravity of errors. Johnson (2008) in Hall (2011) suggests evaluating the seriousness or gravity of the error. Additionally, Hendrickson (1978) in Johnson (2008) asserts that teachers should deal with those errors that affect communication and meaning (i.e. global errors rather than local errors); those that stigmatize learners, for example, by not attending to politeness and appropriacy in interaction; and those that are particularly frequent Hall (2011).

We deduce from what we have mentioned above that, the errors which need more focus from teachers during communicative activities are global errors, the ones that stigmatize learners and frequent ones.

I. 4. Different views about when and how to correct

Different views about when and how to correct learners' errors during communicative activities (fluency activities) are shown in what follows including Ur (1991), Nunan and Lamb (1996), Ancker (2000), Harmer (2001 and 2007), Thornbury (2005).

I. 4. 1. Ur' s view

According to Ur, teachers give feedback on oral work through speech. According to her, correcting students in some unsuitable situations can affect them negatively. For example, in fluency work and when students are in mid-speech, it is better that teachers not correct students' errors since this disturbs and discourages them more than help. But there are other situations where correction is helpful. (Ur, 1991)

As for the solution to the problem of correcting or not correcting learners during communicative activities, the same author (1991: 247) urges teachers to:

“The recommendation not to correct a learner during fluent speech is in principle a valid one, but perhaps an over-simplification. There can be places where to refrain from providing an acceptable form where the speaker is obviously uneasy or floundering can actually be demoralizing, and gentle, supportive intervention can help”.

We think that as a solution to the problem of correction in communicative activities, it is not advisable to do not correct all the time simply because this can lead students to fossilize the incorrect forms that the teacher ignored for not interrupting the

learners in mid-speech. For this, she asserts that the way this correction is expressed is given a paramount importance; either it is done gently or assertively, supportively or as a condemnation, tactfully or rudely. Thus, Ur points out that “*On the whole, of course we should go for encouraging tactful correction*”. (1996: 248)

So for Ur the solution to this problem is to correct students’ errors tactfully. This simply can be realized by the use of the principles and the techniques we are going to mention in the second section.

I. 4. 2. Nunan’ s and Lamb’ s view

Nunan and Lamb (1996) share the same view as Thornbury (2005). For them (1996: 68-69) “*the seriousness of the error and the kind of the correction strategy to be used depends on the objective of the lesson and the context in which the instruction takes place*”.

To make it clear, Nunan and Lamb (1996) show that if the focus is on accuracy, the teacher should provide feedback on the relationship between the accuracy of the structure and the meaning conveyed within the discourse. However, if the focus is on fluency, many alternatives should be taken into account.

I. 4. 3. Ancker’ s view

Together with Nunan and Lamb (1996), Ancker (2000) also agree on the point that deciding the objective of the activity determines the way the teacher is going to use to correct his or her students’ errors.

To emphasize this point, Ancker (2000: 23) observes that, “*if the objective is to develop accuracy, then of course correction is necessary*”, and for Ancker, this can be first by giving the opportunity to the student who made the error to correct his/her error or to another member of the class. In contrast, “*if the objective of the activity is to develop fluency, then correction may not be necessary or desirable*” (2000: 23). As an alternative, Ancker suggested that teachers take notes about the students’ errors (in the case of frequent errors) and after the activity he/she corrects. (Ancker, 2000)

I. 4. 4. Harmer' s view

Jeremy Harmer is one among the researchers who supports the idea of focusing on fluency more than accuracy when correcting language learners' errors in communicative activities. Harmer (2001: 101) claims that: "*It is sometimes tempting to concentrate all our feedback on the language which students use such as incorrect verb tenses, pronunciation, or spelling for example, and to ignore the content of what they are saying or writing*". This is what oral expression teachers should avoid since this sometimes drags the communication back to the study of the language form.

Harmer (2001) views that distinguishing between accuracy and fluency leads to differentiating between non-communicative activities and communicative ones and that the former intended to ensure correctness whereas the later is intended to improve language fluency. For Harmer teachers need first to decide whether a particular activity in the classroom is designed to expect the students' complete accuracy or expects them to use the language as fluently as possible.

Furthermore, Harmer (2001) defends his view by asserting that the teachers' tolerance of errors will be much greater in fluency sessions than it is during more controlled or accuracy sessions. Again, Harmer (2007: 348) explains that "*Everything depends upon our tact and the appropriacy of the feedback we give in particular situations*". This denotes that it is preferable that teachers use some strategies and techniques when correcting for better results (i.e. for more oral fluency practice).

I. 4. 5. Thornbury' s view

Thornbury (2005) takes the same position like Harmer (2001) and Ur (1991) in emphasizing on fluency more than accuracy in communicative activities. Thornbury considers correction as a difficult matter teachers deal with since it requires a lot of decisions to be taken. He (2005: 91) claims that "*it is often a delicate decision as to how to provide learners with feedback on their errors when their attention is primarily focused on the content of what they are saying, rather than on the way they are saying it*". It is now obvious that providing corrective feedback in fluency work is not an easy task that teachers should manage for an optimized oral fluency practice.

Thornbury (2005) asserts that beside the negative effect that correction has on experiencing autonomy, it also has the counterproductive effect of inhibiting fluency by forcing learners' attention on to accuracy.

I. 5. Types of corrective feedback

According to a study conducted by Lyster and Ranta (1997) six different types of feedback were distinguished. (Lyster and Ranta, 1997: 46)

I. 5. 1. Explicit correction

Explicit correction According to Lyster and Ranta (1997) refers to the explicit provision of the correct form where the teacher provides the correct version by simply indicating that what the student had said was incorrect. Some examples of this type of correction are the following: "Oh, you mean," or "You should say". The corrector or the teacher in this case according to Ellis (2009: 9) "*indicates an error has been committed, identifies the error and provides the correction*".

I. 5. 2. Recasts

What we can say about recasts is that most researchers consider it as the most used type of corrective feedback. Lyster and Ranta (1997: 46) refer to recasts as "*the teacher's reformulation of all or part of a student's utterance, minus the error*". And for the sake of differentiating recasts from repetition, Lyster and Ranta (1997) claim that Chaudron (1977) includes such moves in the categories of repetition with change and repetition with change and emphasis.

Recasts from the point of view of Lyster and Ranta (1997) are generally implicit in that they are not introduced by phrases such as "You mean," "Use this word," and "You should say."

I. 5. 3. Clarification requests

This type of corrective feedback according to Spada and Froehlich (1995) in Lyster and Ranta (1997: 47) indicates that the student's utterance is either misunderstood by the teacher or is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition or a reformulation is required.

A clarification request includes phrases such as “Pardon me”, it may also include a repetition of the error as in “What do you mean by X?”, other examples are provided by Tedick and Gortari (1998) like "Excuse me?" or "I don't understand,"

I. 5. 4. Metalinguistic feedback

Metalinguistic feedback for Lyster and Ranta (1997) is done without the explicit provision of the correct form through comments, information, or questions. To be specific, metalinguistic comments, information and questions are illustrated by Lyster and Ranta (1997: 47) like the following:

“Metalinguistic comments generally indicate that there is an error somewhere. Metalinguistic information generally provides either some grammatical metalanguage that refers to the nature of the error or a word definition in the case of lexical errors and Metalinguistic questions also point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student”.

(Lyster and Ranta, 1997: 47)

Ellis (2009) calls this type of corrective feedback “Paralinguistic signal” when the teacher indicating that the learner has made an error uses a gesture or a facial expression.

I. 5. 5. Elicitation

Eliciting a right answer from the learner who made the error or from other learners according to Tedick and Gortari (1998) is done through directly eliciting the correct form from the student by asking questions, also by pausing to allow the student to complete the teacher's utterance, or finally by asking students to reformulate the utterance. Again, Ellis (2009) points out that eliciting a right answer requires the teacher to repeat part of the learner’s utterance (not the erroneous part) and use a rising intonation to signal to the learner that he/she should complete it.

To differentiate between elicitation questions and metalinguistic questions, Tedick and Gortari (1998) explains that elicitation questions require more than a yes/no response.

I. 5. 6. Repetition

For repetition, Lyster and Ranta (1997: 48) refer to this kind of feedback as “*the teacher’s repetition, in isolation, of the student’s erroneous utterance*”. To do so, the same authors assert that in most cases teachers adjust their intonation so as to highlight the error.

I. 5. 7. Multiple feedback

In addition to the preceding six feedback types, Lyster and Ranta (1997) assert that there is another category of corrective feedback which is called multiple feedback and defining it as a combination of more than one type of feedback in one teacher turn.

I. 6. Problems with corrective feedback

Corrective feedback is an essential aspect in language learning and teaching but many problems are ascribed to it. These different problems are discussed by many researchers like Chaudron (1988), Panova and Lyster (2002), Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005), and then by Lightbown and Spada (2006).

For Chaudron (1988) the problems that most occur when teachers provide corrective feedback are the inconsistency, ambiguity, and ineffectiveness of teachers’ corrections. Moreover, a study conducted by Allwright (1975) cited in Panova and Lyster (2002) reveals that error treatment in the classroom is imprecise, inconsistent, and ambiguous. Thus, four kinds of problems that are related to the teachers’ corrective feedback are distinguished and discussed in the following:

I. 6. 1. Imprecision of teachers’ corrective feedback

For the imprecision of teachers’ corrective feedback, Chaudron (1988: 145) claims that “*one of the most noted problems with corrective feedback is that ‘repetition’ of a speakers’ utterance can serve several functions, of either a negative (correcting) or a positive nature (agreeing, appreciating, understanding. These terms are from Gaskill 1980)*”. In this sense, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) observes that this imprecision of teachers’ error correction practices occurs because teachers use the same behavior (for

example repetition) to indicate that an error has been made and also to reinforce a correct response.

I. 6. 2. The ambiguity of corrective feedback

For the sake of what we have mentioned above, the use of such repetitions creates a sense of ambiguity in the mind of language learners since they can not know either this is a confirmation of their utterance or it is the correct version of the utterance they have produced. Thus, the ambiguity of error correction is another problem. Chaudron (1988: 145/149) claims that:

“For L2 learners, whose grammar may not encompass the target rule, the modification or emphasis may be imperceptible, or perceived as merely as an alternative to their own utterance, because accepting, approving, confirming repetitions occur frequently in the same contexts”.

As a solution to this problem, Lightbown and Spada (2006) urge teachers to adjust their tone of voice, use gestures or facial expressions that say to the student, ‘I think I understand what you are saying, and I’m telling you how you can say it better’.

I. 6. 3. The inconsistency of teachers’ corrective feedback

In addition to the two problems mentioned above, another problem which is very frequent in second and foreign language classrooms is the inconsistency of this corrective feedback. Again, Chaudron (1988) states that the problem occurs since teachers do not follow a consistent rule when correcting, sometimes they accept a faulty TL form for the sake of the communicative purpose, at times they correct the same or similar error, and at times they correct minor errors and so on and so forth. To be clear, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) point out that *“such inconsistency is not necessarily undesirable”*. This is true when the objective of the lesson is to develop the learners’ fluency, thus teachers will normally correct global errors and neglect local ones or deal with frequent ones and ignore others.

In answer to this kind of problem, Chaudron (1988: 149) states that *“research is not clear as to the solution to this problem, although the consensus among various studies is that correction should be kept consistent within a focused domain of types of errors”*.

I. 6. 4. The several meanings of correction

Generally for us as language learners, correction refers to the provision of the correct form by the teacher when we commit errors. Chaudron (1977a) cited in Chaudron (1988) points out that there are several increasingly narrow denotations of the term correction of errors.

For the first meaning of this word which is treatment of error, Chaudron shows that it is the most widely employed meaning; this refers to any teacher behavior following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error. Such treatment according to Chaudron (1988) may not pursue correction further and may be evident only to the outside observer or only to the teacher providing it. The next most general meaning for Chaudron (1988: 149) refers to “*some treatment which is explicit enough to elicit (or which makes great efforts to elicit) a revised student response*”. And finally, he shows that the last meaning is “*the true correction which succeeds in modifying the learner’s interlanguage rule so that the error is eliminated from further production*”. (Chaudron, 1988: 149-150)

To make a difference between the three meanings is not an easy task, for this Chaudron (1988: 150) points out that “*these three meanings are not clearly or consistently distinguished at times, leading to assumptions about the "explicitness" or "implicitness" of treatments and their subsequent effects*”.

In short, the solution to all these problems of corrective feedback depends on the ways that teachers follow to point out and correct errors. For this, Chaudron (1988) asserts that teachers should first verify whether the student who made the error understood and perceived the correction and will not fossilize the uncorrected form and then moves to something else.

I. 7. Errors and communication in the classroom

For the sake of not interrupting the flow of communication and for developing interaction and communication as well in the language classroom, it is advisable to decide which errors to correct, when and how to correct. Johnson (2008: 337) points out that “*EC really is a medicine where an overdose can kill*”. This can be when the teacher

does not take into account the question of which, when and how to correct, for this reason, Johnson points out that some means of selection needs to be used.

Johnson (2008) asserts that Hendrickson views that three sorts of errors should receive priority. These errors are ones that impair communication, those that stigmatize the learner, and particularly frequent ones. Rod Ellis (1997) confirms this view saying that some errors can be considered more serious than others; also they interfere with the intelligibility of what someone says so that they need more attention from the language teacher.

A distinction thus is often made between global and local errors. Johnson (2008: 337) states in defining global and local errors that “*global errors affect the whole sentence structure and often lead to lack of understanding. Local errors come in specific parts of sentences and often do not significantly hinder communication*”.

For the best type of treatment to provide to help learners progress, Allwright and Bailey (1991) point out that teachers should deliver feedback in a way to provide affective support, at the same time the negative cognitive information is transmitted.

I. 8. The disadvantages of corrective feedback

Regarding the important role that the teachers’ corrective feedback plays in developing the learners’ interlanguage, also disadvantages of this aspect of learning and teaching can be found. The disadvantages of EC lie in the fact that it sometimes decreases the learners’ motivation, increases their anxiety, breaks the flow of communication, discourages risk-taking and finally focuses more on students’ accuracy and neglects their fluency.

I. 8. 1. Breaking the flow of communication and focusing on accuracy more than fluency

Communicative activities aim mainly at fostering the learners’ communicative competences thus helping them to develop their oral fluency. But sometimes the teachers’ corrective feedback breaks the flow of communication and turns out to the study of language form. This can be caused by the immediate treatment of learners’ errors and also by the excessive EC. In fact, William Littlewood (1981) sees that

excessive correction encourages learners to shift their focus from meanings to forms, and for that teachers should withhold structural correction, or postpone it until after the activity. The same view is shared by Lindsay and Knight (2006) stating that the disadvantage of immediate treatment is that it can break the flow of communication and also can demotivate or embarrass the learner.

Harmer (2001) by his side encourages the fact of not correcting structural errors during communicative activities since this interrupts the communication and drags an activity back to the study of language form or precise meaning.

I. 8. 2. Decreasing learners' motivation

Motivation is the heart of learning as most researchers observed and without it no learning takes place. Excessive feedback on error can have a negative effect on learners' motivation. Rod Ellis (1997: 75) points out that "*motivation is the cause of L2 achievement*". This means that when learners achieve, their motivation will certainly increase and when they fail to achieve good results, their motivation will decrease. Tsui (1995) claims about the consequence of correcting every error when students get the message right but commit some errors about the language form is that students will have no sense of achievement despite the fact that they know the answer to the teacher's question, and they are likely to be discouraged from answering questions in the future.

In fact, learners' motivation can also be decreased because of the teachers' correction of errors immediately after their occurrence. The research quoted in support of corrective feedback as a factor in decreasing learners' motivation is that by Allwright and Bailey. They (1991) point out that immediate error treatment and interrupting the learner in mid-sentence discourages the learners' willingness to speak in class at all.

I. 8. 3. Discouraging risk-taking

Corrective feedback also discourages risk taking which is very important for learners to raise their speaking opportunities and then developing their oral fluency. Unfortunately, for the sake of providing corrective feedback teachers minimize and sometimes kill this risk-taking. This is what led Brown (2001: 63-64) to state that "*many instructional contexts around the world do not encourage risk-taking; instead they encourage correctness, right answers, and withholding guesses until one is sure to*

be correct". Nation and Newton (2009) share the same view that this corrective feedback affects the learners' creative use of language in that it discourages them from trying new constructions and taking risks.

I. 8. 4. Increasing learners' anxiety

Language anxiety is one of the factors that corrective feedback sometimes pushes to increase. To emphasize, Tsui (1991: 87) claims that "*the anxiety is further exacerbated by the fact that in the language classroom the teacher often focuses not only on the correctness of student performance in terms of content but also in terms of form*". With this in mind, Young (1999) states that this happens because teachers feel the responsibility to make their students not only to communicate but to do this with a certain degree of linguistic accuracy. This means that teachers want and try to develop the two capacities at the same time, but we think it had better to focus on one of them and try to develop it fully rather than focusing on the two and not improving anyone of them.

Again, Tsui (1991: 89) points out that "*the avoidance of participation is an attempt to protect one's self-image by avoiding the risk of making mistakes, being laughed at by peers and being negatively evaluated by the teacher*". This fear of making mistakes and also the fear of the teachers' negative evaluation is what leads students to become more anxious which in turn leads them to make more errors. More errors means more corrective feedback and thus less oral fluency practice.

I. 8. 5. Decreasing learners' self-confidence

Among the factors that error correction affects negatively, we find self-confidence. To clarify this point, Jeremy Harmer (1998) shows that teachers have to be careful when correcting because if they do it in an insensitive way, they can upset their students and dent their confidence. Indeed, a learner who have a high confidence on him/herself can take more risks to speak and to practice the language he/she is learning, consequently, his/her oral fluency will develop.

Section II: Oral fluency practice

II. 1. The nature of speaking

Learning a foreign language requires learners to master a number of skills. In addition to grammar, vocabulary and others, the four language skills are of a very important role. Speaking as observed by many researchers is the most important one. Indeed, Broady (2005) observes that speaking is considered the core skill in language learning, but it needs a lot of practice since it is demanding in that it requires production of language knowledge under severe time pressures.

Richards and Renandya (2002) see that most language learners study English in order to develop their speaking skill. This task which is considered by them as a complex task because of the nature of what it involves is used for many purposes and that each purpose entails different skills.

Traditionally, the complexity of speaking was not taken into account since this skill is seen just from the view of grammar and vocabulary. To illustrate, Thornbury (2005: 1) comments that:

“For a long time it was assumed that the ability to speak fluently followed naturally from the teaching of grammar and vocabulary, with a bit of pronunciation thrown in. We now know that speaking is much more complex than this and that it involves both a command of certain skills and several different types of knowledge”.

Other researchers who comment on this complicated skill are Lindsay and Knight. They did this by relating it to spoken messages, interaction and then to fluency and accuracy, and finally, they provided with what can help language learners improve this ability. Lindsay and Knight (2006: 68) argue that:

“Speaking is a complex process which involves constructing a message in a form that other people can understand, and delivering the message using the correct pronunciation, stress, and intonation. Speaking also involves interaction –communicating with other people. To do this learners need to be able to respond to what other people say, and use the language appropriate for the situation they are in and the person they are talking to. At the same time they need to be accurate and fluent enough for the other person to

understand and to fit into the flow of conversation. To be able to do all of these learners need lots and lots of practice, encouragement, and correction”.

From the above quotation, we deduce that speaking is a complex skill which involves a lot of sub-skills and for this learners need to use the language they are learning both accurately and fluently which is in fact requires practice, encouragement, and correction.

II. 2. The factors that make speaking difficult

Speaking as we have seen is a hard task that demands knowledge about different skills. It is a difficult task in itself since it involves a lot of aspects like stress, intonation and others, and more importantly interaction between speakers. The following are some characteristics of spoken language that according to Brown (2001) can make oral performance easy as well as, in some cases, difficult.

II. 2. 1. Clustering

The first characteristic that makes speaking difficult is clustering. Brown (2001: 270) explains that “*fluent speech is phrasal, not word by word. Learners can organize their output both cognitively and physically through such clustering*”. In other words, to speak, learners should form phrases and sentences by linking words together using prepositions, relative pronouns, and other devices in order to transmit messages to the listeners (i.e. other learners).

II. 2. 2. Redundancy of language

Besides clustering, redundancy of language can also cause a problem. According to Brown (2001) redundancy of language enables learners to make their meaning clearer. To make it clear, the Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics (2002) refers to the redundancy of language as the degree to which a message contains more information than is necessary for comprehension and understanding. For example, the ‘s’ of plural is a redundant form since when we omit it inside of a sentence, the meaning of the sentence is still clear. All language learners find difficulties regarding the redundancy of language since they say only what is necessary or less than this and that they do not provide more information for more understanding.

II. 2. 3. Reduced forms

Along with redundancy of language, reduced forms are the ones that sometimes make learners in difficult situations when they speak. For this reason, Brown (2001: 270) says in emphasizing the importance of these forms *“Contractions, elisions, reduced vowels, etc., all form special problems in teaching spoken English. Students who don’t learn colloquial contractions can sometimes develop a stilted, bookish quality of speaking that in turn stigmatizes them”*. For instance, *mustn’t, I’ve, I’d, won’t* are some contractions that learners find difficulty in pronouncing.

II. 2. 4. Performance variables

Sometimes second and foreign language learners find difficulties in making pauses when they speak, thus the number of hesitations will increase. Brown (2001: 270) asserts that:

*“One of the advantages of spoken language is that the process of thinking as you speak allows you to manifest a certain number of performance hesitations, pauses, backtracking and corrections. Learners can actually be taught how to pause and hesitate. For example, in English our thinking time is not silent; we insert certain “fillers” such as *uh, um, well, you know, I mean, like, etc.* One of the most salient differences between native and nonnative speakers of a language is in their hesitation phenomena”*.

What we can say about the quotation above is that pauses and pause fillers are variables that make speaking more complex and difficult to fulfill, this is what makes learners more hesitant when speaking.

II. 2. 5. Colloquial language

The use of idioms, slang, and colloquial speech can be very difficult for learners when learning an L2 or FL. So, for the solution to this problem, Brown (2001) recommends for teachers to make sure that their learners know the different words, idioms and phrases of colloquial language and make sure that they get enough practice in producing them.

II. 2. 6. Rate of delivery

As well, Brown comments on another characteristic of speaking or more precisely a characteristic of fluency that causes obstacles to speakers sometimes when they speak. He

(2001: 271) points out that “*One of your tasks [i.e. teacher’s tasks] in teaching spoken English is to help learners achieve an acceptable speed along with other attributes of fluency*”. To illustrate, Brown emphasizes the fact that fluency is a very important aspect of speech that students must develop in order to improve their speaking skill.

II. 2. 7. Stress, rhythm, and intonation

According to Brown (2001) stress, rhythm, and intonation are the most important characteristics of English pronunciation and that they convey important messages, at the same time they are very difficult to achieve. Truly, different types of stress exist and intonation occurs at different levels and in different situations, what makes speaking very challenging for language learners.

II. 2. 8. Interaction

Interaction in language learning plays a very important role since it helps learners to produce comprehensible output, to receive comprehensible input and to negotiate meaning. Brown (2001: 271), in highlighting the significance of interaction, asserts that “*learning to produce waves of language in a vacuum without interlocutors would rob speaking skill of its richest component: the creativity of conversational negotiation*”. To illustrate, interaction gives learners more opportunities to negotiate meaning and then more chances to practice their fluency and develop their spoken language in general, but it is sometimes hard to be achieved since learners can not find enough output to share with the other learners, what causes learners to be reluctant when speaking.

II. 3. The role of output and interaction in the language classroom

Traditionally, comprehensible input was seen as the most important source for acquiring a second or a foreign language, after that, the notion of comprehensible output was introduced. For this reason, Coleman and Klapper (2005) state that input is necessary for the acquisition of a second language but it is not sufficient, that is output is necessary since it leads to interaction with speakers of the target language, and subsequently to further input.

Output is seen as having a number of values for language learning, but for the sake of our research, we have just provided the one that is linked to it. To illustrate, Swain points out in Johnson (2008: 91) that “*output is generally accepted having value as a way of providing*

practice, and hence contributes to the development of fluency". Also Swain (1995: 247-49) in Coleman and Klapper (2005) argues that sustained speaking (and writing) enables learners to produce comprehensible output and thus gives them the opportunity to test hypotheses about language and to notice gaps in their competence.

A number of specific ways in which learners can learn from their own output are suggested by Swain highlighting its importance for raising learners' consciousness, testing their hypotheses and eliciting feedback from the teacher. Swain in (Ellis, 1997: 49) points out that:

"Output can serve a consciousness-raising function by helping learners to notice gaps in their interlanguages... Second, output helps learners to test hypotheses when it elicits negative feedback from the teacher. ..Third, learners sometimes talk about their own output, identifying problems with it and discussing ways in which they can be put right".

Without interaction, a language learner can not provide the necessary information provided that other learners will understand the message he/she wants to convey. Moreover, Brown (2001: 165) comments that *"in the era of communicative language teaching, interaction is, in fact, the heart of communication; it is what communication is all about"*. Truly, interaction between language learners gives them a lot of chances to develop their oral fluency and to practice their language as a whole.

II. 4. Definitions of oral fluency

Communicating and transmitting messages to other language learners in different communicative activities requires the speaker to be fluent as much as possible. For this, Byrne (1986: 9-10) in Hughes (2002) states that oral fluency is the main goal in teaching the speaking skill. For the sake of emphasizing what we have said above, a number of definitions of this term are provided.

First of all, Rossiter et al (2010: 584) see oral fluency as *"one of the most important markers of proficiency in a second language"*. This indicates that a fluent speaker is a proficient one. Also, Lennon (1990); Schmidt (1992) and Wood (2001) assert that oral fluency refers to an aspect of overall speaking ability: Cited in Harlan Kellern (2009).

Moreover, Hedge (2000) considers that the term fluency is related to speaking as a productive skill with which learners are able to link units of speech easily and without strain or inappropriate slowness, or undue hesitation.

Again, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005: 139) also define fluency as “*the production of language in real time without undue pausing or hesitation*”. Other researchers who support this idea are Stillwell et al (2000: 448) who define fluency as “*a capacity to use language in real time*”. This means that being fluent is being able to use language in real situations. To do so requires learners to take into consideration some characteristics.

This is what Byrne (1986: 9-10) is trying to comment on in Hughes (2002) by stating that fluency is a speaking ability where the speaker is going to use the language to express him/herself intelligibly, reasonably, accurately and without too much hesitation and that being non-fluent causes listeners to lose interest and get impatient.

To add, the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (2002) defines oral fluency as the different features encompassing native-like use of pausing, rhythm, intonation, stress, rate of speaking, and use of interjections and interruptions that qualify speech as being normal and natural.

We can not define fluency without distinguishing it from accuracy which is according to Richards and Schmidt refers to “*the ability to produce grammatically correct sentences but may not include the ability to speak or write fluently*”. It is true that accuracy and fluency are interrelated and are required for conveying messages in the right way, but sometimes accuracy is contrasted to fluency.

Finally, indeed the fluent speaker and the non-fluent one differ in many points. Bress (2006: 44) points out that the fluent speaker is characterized by the following:

- Looks confident when he/she speaks;
- Connects words together into fully formed sentences (and groups of sentences);
- Speaks with reasonable phonology;
- Speaks reasonably quickly.

Meanwhile, the non-fluent speaker:

- Doesn't look confident when he/she speaks;
- Doesn't connect words together into fully formed sentences;
- Speaks with incomprehensible phonology;
- Speaks very slowly.

II. 5. The features of oral fluency

Regarding the complexity of defining fluency, this term has a lot of features that can help us to distinguish it from other aspects of language, for example accuracy. The diverse features of fluency are introduced by Lennon (1990), Schmidt (1992) and Wood (2001) who state in Harlan Kellern (2009: 9) that *one way to define this term is by temporal aspects of speech: speech rate, pauses (including their location, length, and frequency), and length of speech runs between pauses*. Thus, the features of fluency can be summarized as the following:

II. 5. 1. Rate of speech

All the variables that we are going to deal with are related only to speech, but this one according to Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) can be applied both to speech and writing. To emphasize, they (2005: 156) state that *“Speech rate provides a combined measure of two temporal aspects of spoken production; online planning time and rate of articulation”*. The same authors state that the difference between the speech rate of learners (even advanced ones) and native speakers is generally highly statistically significant, and that this variable or this feature of fluency can be improved markedly when learners spend a period of time in a country where the language is spoken.

II. 5. 2. Frequency and length of pauses

To begin with, Thornbury (2005: 6-7) states highlighting the significance of such pauses that *“...all speakers pause, they have to, to draw breath. And even proficient speakers need to stop from time to time to allow the formulation of an utterance to catch up with its conceptualization”*.

To be clear, the two major features of oral fluency are the frequency and the length of pauses. We have mentioned both frequency and length of pauses together because they are very related to each other more than the others. Thornbury (2005: 7), points out that “*pauses may be long but not frequent*”. This means that a fluent speaker should not use a lot of pauses but only the suitable number, and that he/she ought to keep a certain length between those pauses. For more emphasis on the two features, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005: 156) show that *the number of pauses and pause length provide an indication of the extent to which learners need to disengage from speaking in order to plan their spoken messages*.

The question of whether one feature of the two is more important than the other is dealt with by Thornbury (2005: 7) showing that *in terms of how listeners rate a speakers’ fluency, the frequency of pausing is more significant than the length of the pauses*.

What is more essential to focus on is that the number of pauses and the duration of length of those pauses should fit with the message the speaker (i.e. the language learner) is trying to convey. In other words, pauses should not be frequent but should be long. Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005) emphasize this point and claimed that more fluent speakers are the ones who spend less time pausing. To repeat, Thornbury (2005) also claims that a struggling speaker pauses frequently and that a speaker who produces one word at a time will not be considered a fluent speaker even if the results are accurate.

II. 5. 3. Location of pauses

Another important feature to consider is that of the location or the placement of pauses. Accordingly, Thornbury (2005: 7) indicates the right placement of pauses by stating that “*Natural-sounding pauses are those that occur at the intersection of clauses, or after groups of words that form a meaningful unit. Unusual pauses, on the other hand, occur midway between related groups of words*”. What we can deduce from the quotation above is that pauses had better be placed after a set of words not between the words themselves since this can be considered by the listeners as not being fluent.

II. 5. 4. Length of run between pauses

In addition to the location of pauses, the length of run between pauses is also seen as a feature of fluency. Thornbury (2005) refers to the length of run as the number of syllables

between pauses. Consequently, becoming a more fluent speaker according to Thornbury (2005) requires making longer runs.

And for the role that the length of run plays in language learning, Ellis and Barkhuizen (2005: 156) comment that “*length of run provides information about the extent to which learners are able to produce segments of a message without pausing. Length of run may reflect the extent to which learners access ready-made chunks of language*”. Like its predecessors, length of run between pauses is a salient characteristic of oral fluency that learners should use to keep their messages understood.

II. 5. 5. Pause fillers

The last feature of fluency according to Thornbury is that of pause fillers. He (2005) points out that speakers of English use a number of tricks or production strategies to compensate for the attentional demands involved in speech production. One strategy among these production strategies is the use of pause fillers.

The most common pause fillers that language learners or in general speakers use to fill pauses according to him are sounds like *uh* and *um* (also spelt *er* and *erm*, respectively) and also some expressions such as *sort of* and *I mean*.

Another kind of pause fillers according to Thornbury (2005) is the use of repeats where speakers repeat a single word to gain the formulation time when this later is temporarily paused.

II. 6. Principles used for designing fluency activities

We have seen before that the main goal of speaking is that of achieving oral fluency. To attain this goal, teachers should give their students more opportunities where they can use the language freely to express their own ideas. Thus a number of principles to consider when designing and doing fluency building activities are suggested by Harlan Kellern to help language learners fulfill this purpose.

II. 6. 1. Repetition

Repetition can be an effective principle that can be used to enhance learners' oral fluency practice. According to Kellem (2009) using the same language over and over can be very useful to increase oral fluency. For Kellem, this principle has nothing to do with substitution drills or with the repetition of what the teacher says or doing, instead, it can be incorporated into many speaking activities. Then, two techniques to benefit from this principle have been suggested by Kellem (2009). One technique often used is interview and report, where Students are going to interview each other asking some questions and reporting the answers to the others(student A to student B and student B to student C and so on) and this is repeated many times. Another technique or activity is class photo where the teacher asks the students to manage the task of taking a group of photo directing each other where to stand without using gestures and students must go where they are told.

II. 6. 2. Increase the amount of speaking time

Always teachers and students find problems with the amount of time they consume in doing the activities, thus raising talking time provides learners with more opportunities to develop their oral fluency. For this, Harlan Kellem (2009) suggests these ways of helping students converse as much as possible:

- Putting students in pairs or in small groups doing interviews, information gaps, role plays, and group discussions.
- Encouraging English free-conversation that pushes students to speak and recording those conversations is another technique that gives students more fluency practice
- Promote English use outside of class.

II. 6. 3. Allow time to prepare before speaking

Preparation before starting any oral activity helps learners to be engaged and involved in what they are going to do by planning what they are going to say. A kind of planning according to Kellem (2009) is written planning which needs to be done silently because this enables language learners to focus more on the act of speaking. To illustrate, some examples of this kind of planning have been proposed by Kellem (2009) in what follows:

“Examples of planning include taking notes on a topic for homework, composing written answers to interview questions before discussing them, and writing potential questions other students might ask about a topic and the subsequent answers. A technique as simple as giving students a few minutes to silently read and think before engaging in conversation lightens the cognitive load and allows for improved attention to communication”. Kellem (2009: 10)

II. 6. 4. Use familiar and motivating topics

The choice of topic is very important principle that encourages learners to discuss and communicate with ease. Topics which students are familiar with find it easy to talk about. To emphasize, Kellem provides teachers with how they can choose topics and how they can help in maximizing learners’ oral fluency practice. Kellem (2009) asserts that, topics which are far from the students’ lives and the ones they have not enough knowledge on decrease their oral fluency practice, thus relevant, interesting and motivating topics to the learners such as describing recent events and activities can help.

II. 6. 5. Ensure appropriate language level

As with the comprehensible input which should be a bit beyond the learners’ level, also the language they are asked to produce. Teachers ought to suggest topics which are not demanding since this can complicate things for them and therefore this will decrease the chances to speak and interact, consequently, this will not improve the learners’ oral fluency practice. To avoid this kind of obstacle which is hindering, Kellem (2009: 10-11) points out that, *“Fluency promotion activities should be at an appropriate level of difficulty in order to reduce the necessity of over-thinking while speaking...The ideal level should be at or just below the students’ current level”.*

II. 6. 6. Set time limits

Setting time limits will really put language learners in a situation where they must finish their messages before time finishes, this obliges them to say what they can say and go ahead without turning around a certain phrases or sentences. One way of doing this according to Kellem is to set a timer and to tell students to complete a task before the timer goes off, this forces students to speak faster and pause less. This technique according Kellem (2009) should

be used with recording students' speeches and comparing them to see whether fluency does improve since setting time can push students to say less as time decreases.

II. 6. 7. Teach formulaic sequences

Teaching formulaic sequences is very beneficial for language learners. Wood (2007) in Kellem (2019: 11) states that, "*It is important for fluency building that learners are taught chunks, collocations, and formulaic sequences*". Achieving this expects learners to master the use of communication strategies. Indeed, Kellem (2009: 11) confirms that "*Mastering communication strategies involves developing the ability to automatically plug set phrases into conversations at appropriate moments*".

One such strategy is making frequent use of classroom English phrases such as Can you repeat that? and what does ~ mean?, other examples are agreeing/disagreeing or stating opinions. Thus Kellem (2009) points out that the use of such strategies will give language learners more opportunities to use already learned language and thus to build their oral fluency more efficiently.

II. 7. Correction strategies and techniques that help learners maximize their oral fluency practice

The following techniques are of a very essential role since they consider the fact of not interrupting learners in mid-flow and of giving them more chances to speak. Such techniques, of course, are the outcome of some prominent studies carried out by specialists in the field of ESL and EFL teaching. It is now obvious that teachers' corrective feedback affects negatively learners' oral fluency in that it minimizes their opportunities to practice it fully. Thus a number of techniques are recommended as a solution to this problem.

II. 7. 1. Recording

Recording can be an effective technique when we consider that it does not interrupt learners in the middle of their utterances, and that it gives them more opportunities to practice speaking, and thus promoting their oral fluency.

Brown (2000) suggests that teachers record their students' oral production and then let them catch and correct each other's errors; also he encourages learners to make their lists of

errors after listening to the recording and then work on them on their own. This way according to Brown help students make their errors work for them.

Another researcher who suggests this way of correction is Thornbury (2005: 93):

“An alternative to on-the-spot correction is to postpone it until the end of the activity. This means that the teacher needs to keep a record of errors while the speaking activity is in progress. These can either be given to individual learners as feedback notes, or dealt with orally in open class. In either case, it is generally more motivating if the learners’ successes as well as their failures are recorded. One way of doing this is in the form of a feedback sheet”.

Dealing with errors orally in the class or giving learners feedback notes after recording, will give them more opportunities to speak since recording does not interrupt them while doing this and that it enables them to work on their errors after the class which prevents the fossilization of the different errors student have made.

II. 7. 2. Listen and then let students correct themselves

For this technique, we can say that teachers will act as observers noticing the learners’ errors and after the activity has finished they can provide them with corrective feedback. To emphasize the point, Harmer (2001) comments that teachers frequently act as observers watching and listening to their students and then give feedback on how well they have performed.

This is also a correction technique that promotes the learners’ oral fluency practice in that it does not interrupt the learner who is speaking in mid-flow. But, using this technique sometimes makes teachers forget the errors that their students have made, thus Harmer (2001: 108) suggested the following chart to help them remember and categorize the different errors.

Grammar	Words and phrases	Pronunciation	Appropriacy

Figure 01: Categorizing and remembering students’ errors.

To complete this table, teachers can note down things they have heard, whether it is particularly good or especially incorrect or inappropriate.

Other suggestions for the same technique are offered by Scrivener Jim (2005: 301) stating that *“one strategy used by many teachers during fluency activities is to listen in discreetly and collect a list of overheard errors. Later on, you can use this list to provide sentences to discuss, to set an exercise, to plan the next lesson, etc”*.

To use the students’ errors as a starting point for the next lesson according to Allwright and Bailey (1991) is recommended when the errors are patterned and are shared by a group of students. Then, To set an exercise using the students’ errors is a technique of correction work after a fluency activity that enables learners to practice more their oral fluency. For instance, teachers can note down the students’ errors during the activity and then invent and write a story that includes these errors, hand it to the students to find and correct the errors doing this in pairs or as a whole group. (Scrivener, 2005)

II. 7. 3. Fingers

This technique according to Scrivener (2005) is simple but effective technique used for error correction. Scrivener (2005: 321-322) explains the way this technique is used:

“Each finger in your hand will represent a word in the sentence. A learner says a sentence wrongly. You get her to repeat the sentence while you indicate with your fingers each word as it is said. When the error is reached, indicate that this word is the problem by facial expression or a gesture”.

To clarify, while correcting students’ errors using this technique, a teacher can do this by means of more specific signs that are suggested by Scrivener (2005: 321-322).

- These two words are in the wrong order(draw a small circle above the two appropriate fingers).
- You don’t need this word (fold down the finger corresponding to the extra word).
- There should be an extra word here (point to the gap between the appropriate fingers).
- Say it quickly (hold out spread fingers, and with the other hand close them together).
- Third syllable is wrong (use the joints of your finger to represent the syllables).

- Contraction(e.g. I am> I'm) (hold the appropriate fingers apart and then move them together).

For the effectiveness of this kind of correction, Scrivener (2005) claims that this technique will not hold positive effect on the learners' oral fluency practice until they accustom it and use it frequently since it takes time for the learners to recognize the error.

II. 7. 4. Self and peer correction

What we have noticed from the majority of the above techniques is that self and peer corrections are recommended. Lynch (1996) says that more attention now is given to the feedback provided from learner to learner, i.e. peer correction.

The following are among the usual reasons for getting learners to take on the role of corrector and adviser according to Lynch (1996: 118):

- It increases learners' speaking opportunities.
- It develops a conscious focus on language form.
- It encourages them to express their own judgments on language points.
- It is an acknowledgment that different individuals know more about specific areas than others.
- It provides an opportunity for real communication.

For self-correction, Scrivener (2005) emphasizes its importance by stating that teachers should look for correction techniques that, rather than simply give students the answer on a plate, help them to make their own corrections. This technique according to him may raise learners own awareness about the language they are using, for this Scrivener used the following idiom to indicate the importance of this way of correction: "*What you tell me, I forget; what I discover for myself, I remember*". This means that letting students correct their own errors will help them remember them.

All in all, what we can say is that before correcting any error, teachers should think about the learners, their preferences and about the results or amelioration that a particular technique brings. Therefore, we will conclude these techniques by a quotation provided by Lynch (1996: 121) who asserts that:

“No single feedback technique has yet been shown to be the key to more effective learning. Even those techniques that have produced positive results in the form of learning may have done so only in the short term. On the other hand, we cannot assume that if no learning effect is immediately obvious, no learning is taking place. Some learners simply take longer to learn the new item. Since speaking is so complex and learning is hard to measure, a reasonable conclusion is that we should use a variety of types of feedback in the classroom”.

For the different treatments that exist, Allwright and Bailey (1991) point out that teachers must observe the results of implementing the different techniques and then make decisions about the appropriate ones which promote language learning and the ones learners prefer, also they should offer learners the greatest possible variety of treatments since different learners need to be treated differently.

Conclusion

The conclusion that can be reached from all what was discussed in this chapter is that teachers’ corrective feedback is an important aspect of learning and teaching that determines in some way the opportunities given to language learners to practice their oral fluency which is also very essential in developing one of the most important language skills which is the speaking skill.

Chapter two

**Research design and data
analysis**

Chapter two: Research design and data analysis

Introduction.....31

I. Section one: Research design and methodology.....31

I. 1. Design and methodology.....31

I. 1.1. Overview of the method.....31

I. 1.2. The research participants.....32

I. 1. 3. Data collection Procedures.....32

I. 1. 3. 1. The Students’ Preliminary Questionnaire.....33

I. 1. 3. 2. The Classroom Observation Checklist.....33

I. 1. 3. 2. The Students’ Questionnaire.....33

I. 2. Data analysis.....34

I. 2. 1. Analysis of the results of the Students’ Preliminary Questionnaire.....34

I. 2. 2. Analysis of the results of the Classroom Observation Checklist.....38

I. 2. 3. Analysis of the results of the Students’ Questionnaire.....49

I. 2. 4. Summary of the major findings of the research.....66

II. Section two: Implications, Limitations and suggestions for further research.....69

II. 1. Implications.....69

II. 2. Limitations of the study.....70

II. 3. Suggestions for further research.....71

Conclusion.....72

Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the description of the methods and procedures of data collection and then to the analysis and discussion of the results reached during the investigation. After that the implications, limitations and some suggestions for further research are introduced. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section provides both a description of the methods, procedures and tools used in this research, also our research participants, accompanied with an analysis and discussion of the findings. The second section presents the implications of the results of this research work, the limitations that we have encountered all along our investigation, and finally, some suggestions for further research.

I. Section one: Research design and methodology

This section provides an overview about the methodology used in this research together with the analysis and then a summary of the major results that we have reached throughout this research.

I. 1. Design and methodology

Aiming at identifying the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice, we have adopted a descriptive study which seeks to provide some descriptions and measurements of this key element of interaction and its impact on learners' oral fluency practice. The methodology we have opted for in this research work is a hybrid one (i.e. using both qualitative and quantitative methods), using different procedures and tools to collect data about the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice.

I. 1. 1. Overview of the method

As we have mentioned above, the method that we have adopted is a hybrid one encompassing both qualitative and quantitative methods. The qualitative research according to Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 124) "*is a useful approach wherever an investigator is concerned with discovering or describing second language acquisition in its natural state or context...*", this means that this approach is suitable for our research since it enables us to

discover and describe one key aspect of second language acquisition which is teachers' corrective feedback. But some quantification is required to measure the effectiveness and the impact of the teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice.

I. 1. 2. The research participants

Our research participants include second year B.A students and their oral expression teachers in the department of English, the University of Bejaia.

I. 1. 2. 1. The student participants

The target population of this research is the second year B.A students in the University of Bejaia. There are twelve groups with 577 students. Among the twelve groups, two groups with 90 students are our student participants with whom the problem has been identified. Second year B.A students have been chosen to be our target population since this category is expected to have had enough input in the target language (i.e. English) to practice oral fluency and thus oral expression teachers who teach this level can give less importance to some types of errors for the sake of communication.

I. 1. 2. 2. The teacher participants

On the whole there are eleven teachers of oral expression who teach second year students in the university of Bejaia, but our teacher participants are two teachers of oral expression. The selection of the two teacher participants is the result of the random selection of the two groups of student participants.

I. 1. 3. Data collection procedures

Our aim in the research at hand is to discover the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on language learners' oral fluency practice. To reach this aim, we have used a questionnaire and observation as procedures of data collection. Thus, a students' preliminary questionnaire, a classroom observation checklist and a students' questionnaire are the data collection tools we have used to collect data that we need to carry out our research.

I. 1. 3. 1. The Students' Preliminary Questionnaire

First of all, to collect data necessary for our research and to identify the research problem, we have used a preliminary questionnaire which was distributed to two groups of second year B.A students (90 students) on December during their oral expression sessions.

I. 1. 3. 2. The Classroom Observation Checklist

Then, we have opted for the use of observation to collect qualitative data necessary for describing the reality of teachers' corrective feedback with our research participants who are two groups of second year students of English during their sessions of oral expression. Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 162) see that "*in second language acquisition research, observations are most often used to collect data on how learners use language in a variety of settings; to study language learning and teaching processes in the classroom; and to study teachers' and students' behaviors*". According to Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 162) "*the main use of observations is for examining a phenomenon or a behavior while it is going on*". This will help us to build our research work on data collected by observing the different behaviours that are related to which errors do our teacher participants correct, when and how they correct.

To do that an observation checklist is required to collect valid data in real classroom situations and which is constructed relying on the relevant literature. For this we have observed eight sessions where we have recorded the occurrence of the needed items (behaviours) and then additional information about the errors made by the students and their types were mentioned.

I. 1. 3. 2. The Students' Questionnaire

For the sake of collecting more information about the issue addressed in this study, we have opted for the use of the students' questionnaire which is distributed to the same two groups with whom the problem has been identified. This questionnaire was handed to these groups on April during their sessions of oral expression and after observing the students' behaviours and their teachers' ones.

Questionnaires have a number of advantages. According to Seliger and Shohamy (1989: 172) questionnaires are self- administered and can be given to large groups of subjects at the same time, thus the data are more uniform, standard and accurate. But also a number of problems that are related to questionnaires are found, according to Seliger and Shohamy

(1998: 172), using questionnaires is of no assurance that students have understood the different questions asked and consequently they have not answered properly; also a researcher can face a low return rate that may therefore influence the validity of the findings. To avoid these problems the researcher will simplify the questions asked and will use some details where necessary.

I. 2. Data analysis

This section provides an analysis of the data collected by the use of the observation checklist and by the two questionnaires.

I. 2. 1. Analysis of the results of the Students' Preliminary Questionnaire

In what follows, the aim, the description of the preliminary questionnaire, together with the analysis of the results are provided.

I. 2. 1. 1. Aim of the Students' Preliminary Questionnaire

A preliminary questionnaire is used at the beginning of our investigation and which aims at identifying our research problem; to find whether second year B.A students face difficulties to maximize their oral fluency practice when their oral expression teachers provide them with corrective feedback.

I. 2. 1. 2. Description of the Students' Preliminary Questionnaire

This questionnaire was distributed to two groups of second year university students (90 students) on December during their oral expression sessions and returned during the same sessions. The questionnaire contains four questions; all of them are close questions. The first question was asked to know whether oral expression teachers correct students' errors while speaking, the second one was about the students' perceptions of their teachers' corrective feedback, i.e. whether they feel comfortable when their teachers of oral expression provide them with correction. Then, the third question seeks to discover whether the teachers' error correction stands as a barrier for students to practice speaking and if this is true, what are the different problems that it causes. And finally, the fourth question was about peer correction.

I. 2. 1. 3. Analysis and discussion of the results of the Students' Preliminary Questionnaire

The questionnaire was distributed to 90 students but only 71 of them answered the questions as the following table indicates.

	The handed questionnaires	The questionnaires returned	Have not been returned
The number of students	90	71	19
percentage	100%	78.89%	21.11%

Table1: The handed preliminary questionnaire

Q1: During oral expression sessions and while speaking, does your teacher correct your errors?

Whether oral expression teachers correct their students' errors while speaking is the first question we have asked our student informants about, and the answers are as follows:

	The total	yes	no	No answer
The number of the students	71	68	03	00
Percentage	100%	95.77%	4.23%	00%

Table2: Teachers' correction of errors while speaking

For the first question that was asked, 68 students that constitute 95.77% answered by yes, that is, their teachers correct their errors when they are speaking, but 03 students have answered by no (i.e. 4.23%). What we have noticed from our student informants' answers to this question is that a large number of students' errors are corrected during oral expression classes and when students are speaking and transmitting their messages, what can lead to less practice of learners' oral fluency.

Q2: Do you feel at ease (relaxed and comfortable) when your teacher interrupts you and corrects your errors?

Then another question was about the students' perceptions of their teachers' corrective feedback, that is to say if they feel comfortable when their teachers interrupt them to correct their errors. The answers were as follows:

	The total	yes	no	No answer
The number of students	68	37	31	00
Percentage	100%	54.41%	45.59%	00%

Table3: students' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback

From this table we notice that the answers to this question are slightly different since 37 students feel comfortable when their teacher interrupts them to correct errors they have committed whereas the other 31 students do not. Even if there is a slight difference between those who answered by yes and the ones those answer is no but we should take into consideration that there are students who feel comfortable when being corrected and others who do not feel like that.

Q3: Does the teachers' feedback (correction of errors) stand as a barrier for you to practice speaking?

The third question was introduced to know whether teachers' corrective feedback stand as a barrier for second year students to practice speaking and the answers are shown in the following table:

	The total	yes	no	No answer
The number of students	68	40	28	00
Percentage	100%	58.82%	41.18%	00%

Table4: the consideration of corrective feedback as a barrier to practice speaking

As it is mentioned in the table above, the majority of our participants answered by yes (i.e. 58.82%) and only 41.18% answered by no. Since our student informants' answers tell us that their teachers' corrective feedback stands for them as a barrier to practice speaking, this means that oral expression teachers ought to think about the solution of this problem and provide corrective feedback in a way that gives more opportunities to the students to practice their oral fluency.

All of the informants whose answer to question 3 is yes answered this sub question which seeks for the problems that this error correction causes except one student who has not answered. The answers are shown in the following table:

	The total	Feel less competent	Stop speaking and becoming unwilling to speak again	Be shy and embarrassed	Lose the idea you want to transmit	No answer
The number of students	40	14	08	17	13	01
Percentage	100%	35%	20%	42.5%	32.5%	2.5%

Table5: problems that teachers' corrective feedback causes for students

We notice from the above table that out of the 68 students who answered the question, 14 of them (i.e. 35%) feel less competent when their teachers correct their errors, then 08 students react differently, that is to say, they stop speaking and becoming unwilling to speak again. From the answers, we conclude that teachers' corrective feedback can affect students cognitively and psychologically.

Q4: Do your classmates give you feedback (correct your errors) while speaking?

The fourth category of our student informants who form 42.5 % (17 students) of the whole students become shy and embarrassed when they are corrected and finally, the reaction of 13 participants is that they lose the idea they want to transmit.

To know whether second year students of English provide each other with corrective feedback, we have asked this fourth question for which the answers are as follows:

	The total	yes	no	No answer
The number of students	68	36	30	02
Percentage	100%	52.94%	44.12%	2.94%

Table6: peer correction

The majority of our student informants (i.e. 36 students) answered this question by yes, others (44.94%) answered by no, and two students have not answered this question. Since the two categories (i.e. yes and no) are nearly the same we can not say that peer correction is practiced or not in these two classes.

After analyzing the data gathered through the use of the students' preliminary questionnaire we have reached the following results.

The data analysis has shown that most of our student informants recognize that their teachers' corrective feedback acts as a barrier for them to practice speaking. Thus some of

them feel comfortable when their teachers correct their errors but others on the other hand do not feel like that. Also for that we have concluded that our student informants react differently when their teachers provide them with corrective feedback; some feel less competent; others stop speaking and become unwilling to speak again; others become shy and embarrassed and others lose the ideas they want to transmit. From this, we can say that this correction of errors can affect a number of factors, including psychological and cognitive ones. This means that it can affect students' motivation, anxiety, risk taking and then their oral fluency.

I. 2. 2. Analysis of the results of the Classroom Observation Checklist

To collect data necessary for our research, we have opted for the use of an observation checklist. In what follows, we are going to analyze the observation checklist we have used to record the occurrence of particular behaviours that are related to teachers' corrective feedback.

I. 2. 2. 1. Aim of the Observation Checklist

Simply, the classroom observation checklist aims at describing the reality of teachers' corrective feedback in oral expression classes and how this help and push learners' oral fluency practice to be maximized. This observation checklist enabled us to record the occurrence of our teacher participants' behaviours that we can not effectively get through the use of the questionnaire.

I. 2. 2. 2. Description of the Observation Checklist

The observation checklist is composed of three categories. The first one is about which errors that teachers correct, this category contains six items or behaviours which are types of errors. Then the second category is about when teachers correct their students' errors and it is composed of three items, and the last category is about how oral expression teachers correct their learners' errors and it is composed of six items. This observation checklist is filled by observing two groups of second year B.A students with whom the problem has been identified during their oral expression sessions. Thus, eight sessions of oral expression are observed, i.e. twelve hours on the whole. Fifteen items or behaviours are presented in the observation checklist and which are categorized into three categories. The first category is from item 1 to 6, the second one is from item 7 to 9, and the last category is from item 10 to 15. This observation checklist is constructed from the relevant literature of this research work.

I. 2. 2. 3. Analysis and discussion of the results of the Observation Checklist

To analyze the results of the classroom observation checklist, we have randomly selected one observation checklist from each sub-group from the two groups observed (group A and B). The results reached from the first observation checklist are like the following:

Item		occurrence
Which errors to correct	1. The teacher corrects every error that occurs.	
	2. The teacher corrects a phonological (pronunciation) error.	
	3. The teacher corrects a grammatical error.	
	4. The teacher corrects a lexical error.	X X
	5. The teacher corrects frequent errors.	
	6. The teacher corrects the error that interferes with communication (global error).	
When to correct	7. Immediately after the error occurs.	X X
	8. After the student finishes the message he/she is trying to convey.	
	9. After the activity has finished.	
How to correct	10. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the form of the student's utterance (accuracy)	X X
	11. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the content of the student's utterance (fluency).	
	12. Asking another student to correct the error.	
	13. Asking the student who made the error for repetition (to reproduce the correct version).	
	14. The teacher provides the correct version (directly).	X X
	15. Notices the errors and at the end of the activity he/she will correct the errors together with the students.	

Table 7: the classroom observation checklist of the sub-group A₁

The above observation checklist has been recorded while observing teachers of one sub-group (A₁) during their oral expression session which took one hour and half and was about constructing stories. Our teacher participant started the lesson first by forming a sentence in a story, and then every student is asked to form a sentence and carry on the story till they arrive to the end.

1, 2 and 3: As this observation checklist indicates, these three behaviours have not occurred at all since our teacher participant have not corrected neither grammatical nor phonological errors, which means that the teacher have not corrected every error that occurs. Not correcting every error that occurs is the best choice since doing that will not give students a chance for more practice of oral fluency but some selection need to be made.

4: What we have noticed from our observation checklist, is that unlike grammatical and phonological errors, lexical errors are given more importance by our teacher participant. One example of this type of errors is:

A student uttered the phrase “forbidden woods” and the teacher corrected and said “dangerous woods”. It is true that lexical errors should be corrected from time to time but more focus on them can lead to the study of language form and language rules which is not the main aim of oral expression classes.

5 and 6: These behaviours are like their predecessors in that they were ignored by the oral expression teacher we have observed. Our teacher participant neglected correcting frequent and global errors that were made by the students. A lot of errors were made by the students and the teacher still ignore them and have not even give the students some advice to avoid those errors. Examples of some frequent errors are large in number and the teacher has not corrected them.

- Using double subject.
- The ignorance of the “s” of verbs and plurals.
- Some pronunciation errors which were frequent.
- Using the present simple instead of the past simple.

7: This behavior is the most occurring one among the others in that it is used by our teacher participant and with all the errors that were corrected. Correcting the error immediately can avoid the fossilization of that error, but perhaps will lead to less practice of oral fluency since this interrupts the student who speaks in mid-flow and does not give him/her an opportunity to carry on his/her message.

8 and 9: Unlike the above behaviour, these ones have not occurred with the class observed since the first was the sole way our teacher participant used to correct the students’ errors.

10: From our observation checklist, we have noticed that our teacher participant was focusing on the form of the students' utterances when correcting errors they have made, focusing more on parts of students' utterances (lexical errors in this case) and neglects the whole message which students want to transmit.

11. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the content of the students' utterances (fluency). As we have mentioned above, the focus was on the form of students' utterances and the content of those utterances was not taken into account. Sometimes the content of the students' utterances was right but students make some errors concerning the structure and the teacher corrects those errors. As our literature review indicates, oral fluency is the goal of communicative activities (fluency activities) where the focus should be on the content of the students' utterances, and what we have observed is totally the contrary.

12 and 13: These items or behaviours of how to correct students' errors have not occurred since the teacher observed do not ask students for repetition or ask other students to correct, instead the teacher did that by himself. Perhaps asking the student who made the error to reproduce the correct form can lead the student to remember the errors and avoid its fossilization, but at the same time it can provoke less practice of oral fluency.

14: All what we can say about this item is that it is the only one who has occurred concerning how teachers correct their students' errors.

15: As the above table shows, this item has not occurred at all; instead the teacher provides directly the correct form.

Moreover, another classroom observation checklist that has been recorded while observing other students from another sub-group (A_2) during their oral expression class is presented. This session took one hour and half and which was about bearing situations, where students are asked to work in groups and bear real situations and then perform in the front of the other students.

Item		occurrence
Which errors to correct	1. The teacher corrects every error that occurs.	
	2. The teacher corrects a phonological (pronunciation) error.	
	3. The teacher corrects a grammatical error.	X
	4. The teacher corrects a lexical error.	X X
	5. The teacher corrects frequent errors.	
	6. The teacher corrects the error that interferes with communication (global error).	
When to correct	7. Immediately after the error occurs.	X X X
	8. After the student finishes the message he/she is trying to convey.	
	9. After the activity has finished.	
How to correct	10. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the form of the student's utterance (accuracy)	X X X
	11. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the content of the student's utterance (fluency).	
	12. Asking another student to correct the error.	
	13. Asking the student who made the error for repetition (to reproduce the correct version).	X
	14. The teacher provides the correct version (directly).	X X X
	15. Notices the errors and at the end of the activity he/she will correct the errors together with the students.	

Table 8: The classroom observation checklist of the sub-group A₂

1 and 2: The two behaviours have not occurred during our observation of this session. Our teacher participant did not correct every error that occur and also has not corrected any phonological error.

3: Unlike 1 and 2 mentioned above, our teacher participant corrected one grammatical error which is about the use of possessive case. One student uttered the utterance /it depends on my father work/ and the teacher corrected by providing the correct version /my father's work/.

4: Lexical errors are the ones that our teacher participant has corrected during the session of oral expression, correcting two errors of this type.

5 and 6: These two behaviours have not occurred as the above classroom observation shows. Normally our teacher participant corrects more serious errors, i.e. the ones that interfere with communication and frequent ones but what we have observed is the contrary.

7: To go further and to discover when our teacher participant corrects the students' errors we have recorded the occurrence of this item where we have noticed that the behaviour (i.e. correcting immediately after the error occurs) occurred three times with all the errors corrected.

8 and 9: As the above checklist indicates, our teacher participant corrects the students' errors immediately after their occurrence, not after the students finish what they want to say and not at the end of the activity.

10: The focus on form when correcting students' errors is a behaviour that occurred three times during the oral expression session with this sub-group.

11 and 12: Because the focus was on the form of students' utterances, the content of those utterances was not taken into consideration as the observation checklist shows. Also, asking other students to give the correct form (i.e. peer correction) is a behaviour that our teacher participant did not encourage.

13: Asking students to reproduce the correct version after the teacher provides the correction occurred one time while observing this session.

14: This item about how to correct students' errors is the one that characterizes the sub-group observed. This behaviour occurred three times. It is true that this behaviour does not take a long time but it is still interrupting the students in the middle of their utterances and reduces their chances to speak.

15: Like 11 and 12, this behaviour has not occurred even one time during the whole session. Even if this way of error correction gives students more freedom to speak and practice their oral fluency but our teacher participant did not use it and instead he provides the correct form directly.

In addition to the two classroom observation checklists that we have recorded with the two sub-groups of the group A, now two other observation checklists which were recorded after observing two sub- groups of the group B are provided in what follows:

Item		occurrence
Which errors to correct	1. The teacher corrects every error that occurs.	
	2. The teacher corrects a phonological (pronunciation) error.	
	3. The teacher corrects a grammatical error.	X
	4. The teacher corrects a lexical error.	X
	5. The teacher corrects frequent errors.	
	6. The teacher corrects the error that interferes with communication (global error).	
When to correct	7. Immediately after the error occurs.	
	8. After the student finishes the message he/she is trying to convey.	
	9. After the activity has finished.	X
How to correct	10. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the form of the student's utterance (accuracy)	X X
	11. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the content of the student's utterance (fluency).	
	12. Asking another student to correct the error.	
	13. Asking the student who made the error for repetition (to reproduce the correct version).	
	14. The teacher provides the correct version (directly).	
	15. Notices the errors and at the end of the activity he/she will correct the errors together with the students.	X

Table 9: The classroom observation checklist of the sub-group B₁

To go further in describing which errors do our teacher participants correct, when and how they correct, we have used this observation checklist with the sub-group B₁, where the topic was oral presentations. The results are shown in the above checklist:

1 and 2: The two behaviours of correcting every error that occurs and correcting phonological errors have not occurred while observing this sub-group. It is true that correcting every student's error can cause many problems for students and does not give them the needed opportunities to develop their oral fluency.

3: During this observation, our teacher participant corrected one grammatical error. The error that was corrected by the student was when one student uttered: I have friend and the teacher corrected to say: friends.

4: As the above classroom observation checklist indicates, this item (i.e. correcting lexical errors) occurred only one time where our teacher participant corrected an error that a student has made. The student uttered the word “politic” where she should say “political” and the teacher corrected the error.

5, 6, 7 and 8: Unlike the above behaviours, this one occurred one time with the sub-group observed since the next behaviour (i.e. correcting students’ errors at the end of the activity) was the only one that occurred.

9: On the contrary to the above behavior, this one occurred one time and it is the only behaviour about how to correct students’ errors. While students perform the teacher noted down their errors and at the end of the activity the teacher gave corrective feedback implicitly to the class as a whole. The teacher told them about some types of errors the students have made without mentioning the students who have made the errors and then corrected mentioning only two errors as an illustration of two types of errors (the errors mentioned above). This behaviour and the previous one are sometimes the solution to the problem of interruption and less practice of oral fluency but unfortunately they are not given more importance and practice.

10: This behaviour occurred with all the errors corrected since our teacher participant focuses more on the form of students’ utterances and gives less attention to students’ fluency.

11, 12, 13 and 14: These four behaviours about how to correct students’ errors have not occurred while observing this sub-group since our teacher participant correct the students’ errors only by noticing the errors and correct them at the end of the activity.

15: This behavior occurred one time as the above observation checklist shows. The teacher was noting down the errors made by the students and has corrected some of them (two errors) at the end of the activity and has discussed the types of the errors which have made by the students. Together with correcting students’ errors after finishing the messages they want to transmit, this behaviour is seen also as the solution to the problem of less practice of oral fluency during oral expression classes.

The following is the classroom observation checklist that was recorded after observing the sub-group B₂ during their oral expression class. The results that are reached from this checklist are discussed in what follows:

Item		occurrence
Which errors to correct	1. The teacher corrects every error that occurs.	
	2. The teacher corrects a phonological (pronunciation) error.	X
	3. The teacher corrects a grammatical error.	X
	4. The teacher corrects a lexical error.	
	5. The teacher corrects frequent errors.	
	6. The teacher corrects the error that interferes with communication (global error).	
When to correct	7. Immediately after the error occurs.	X X
	8. After the student finishes the message he/she is trying to convey.	
	9. After the activity has finished.	
How to correct	10. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the form of the student's utterance (accuracy)	X X
	11. While correcting, the teacher focuses on the content of the student's utterance (fluency).	
	12. Asking another student to correct the error.	
	13. Asking the student who made the error for repetition (to reproduce the correct version).	
	14. The teacher provides the correct version (directly).	X X
	15. Notices the errors and at the end of the activity he/she will correct the errors together with the students.	

Table 10: The classroom observation checklist of the sub-group B₂

Concerning this classroom observation checklist, the topic was oral presentations where every student chose a topic to discuss with the other students and the time devoted to this session was one hour and half.

1: The first behaviour in this observation checklist has not occurred because our teacher participant corrected only three types of errors during the whole session.

2: In contrast to the first behavior in this category, this one occurred twice where our teacher participant corrected students' errors that concern pronunciation. An example of this item is when the student mispronounced the word /again/ and the teacher corrected the student but without the use of any supplementary support (the board for example to transcribe the word). Since students can check the right pronunciation in their dictionaries, we think that it is better that oral expression teachers tell students that they have made an error of pronunciation by

using non-verbal communication and then let them check after to avoid interrupting them in mid-flow.

3: As it is shown in the classroom observation checklist of the sub-group B₂, our teacher participant corrected only one grammatical error made by a student of this sub-group.

4: During the observation of this session, this item or behaviour (i.e. correcting lexical errors) has not occurred at all.

5: This behaviour has not occurred during the session of oral expression with this sub-group. Sometimes students make the same errors all the time and sometimes teachers do not correct those errors what can lead students to fossilize those errors thinking that they are the correct forms. As the solution to this problem, oral expression teachers can correct these errors at the end of the activity or the lesson and give students some pieces of advice to avoid those errors.

6: The teacher corrects the error that interferes with communication (global error): This behaviour is like its predecessors (i.e. correcting every error that occurs and frequent errors) in that it is ignored by our teacher participant. As the relevant literature indicates, this type of errors is the most serious one in that it can lead to confusion in the mind of the learners (i.e. listeners), so it is better to give this type of errors the priority.

7: As the above table indicates, all the errors that the students have made, have been corrected immediately after their occurrence. This behaviour as the results show was shared nearly by all the sub-groups observed.

8 and 9: Since the only way of error correction that has been used by our teacher participants during the session is the one mentioned above, letting students to finish what they want to say and correcting their errors after the activity has finished are two behaviours that have not occurred at all.

10: The way our teacher participant correct the students' errors with this sub-group goes to develop their accuracy, thus giving less attention and importance to their fluency, which is the aim of communicative activities.

11, 12 and 13: These three behaviours of how our teacher participant correct students' errors have not occurred all along the session of oral expression.

14: The use of recasts or providing the correct form by the teacher is the behaviour that has occurred with all the errors corrected. It is true that providing the correct version directly to the student can perhaps avoid the problem of the fossilization of errors, but this can at the same time interrupt the flow of communication, thus minimizing the opportunities to practice oral fluency.

15: As the above table shows, this item has not occurred since our teacher participant correct the students' errors immediately after their occurrence and not let them at the end of the activity.

The data that we have reached through the use of the classroom observation checklist enabled us to arrive to these findings:

Even if our teacher participants correct their students' errors from time to time but what characterizes more the two classes observed is that these teachers do not correct their students' errors. No technique of corrective feedback provision is used except the one mentioned above (i.e. noting errors and correcting them at the end of the activity) and which occurred only one time. This technique was used by the teacher but without the use of any supplementary support like the board which may help students remember their errors by writing them, thus they will not fossilize these wrong forms (students may not benefit from the correction).

Errors are of paramount importance in that they indicate that students are developing themselves (their interlanguage form), but not correcting can lead to the fossilization of these errors and will not enable students to develop neither their accuracy nor their fluency, taken into consideration that most of our student participants prefer all their errors to be corrected. Our teacher participants do not correct in order to encourage their students participate and speak a lot, to decrease their anxiety and to increase risk taking, but this would be better if they use some techniques that enable them provide corrective feedback without hindering their oral fluency practice.

Taken into account that we speak to convey messages, not correcting global errors will lead the listeners (i.e. other students) to do not understand what the speaker wants to say. As the literature review tell us, when the teacher is not correcting the errors the speaker make other students will think that it is the correct forms and will fossilize them.

Furthermore, it is mentioned in the relevant literature that more concern with accuracy inhibits fluency which is the main goal of oral activities and what we have observed from the two classes (the observation checklists) is that our teacher participants focus more on accuracy while fluency is given less attention.

Moreover, the most type of corrective feedback used with the classes observed is recasts, i.e. the teacher repeats the student's utterance with correction. Coming back to our literature review, this type of corrective feedback is the most used when correcting learners 'errors.

All in all, from our observation of these classes we have arrived to the following:

1. Correcting lexical, phonological and grammatical errors (neglecting global errors).
2. Focusing on accuracy.
3. Ignoring fluency which is the goal of speaking.
4. Not correcting most of the time.
5. Using recasts as a type of corrective feedback which means not giving students a chance for self and peer correction.
6. Correcting immediately thus interrupting students in mid-flow.

I. 2. 3. Analysis of the results of the Students' Questionnaire

A questionnaire is used during our investigation as a data collection tool to collect data on teachers' corrective feedback, on students' reactions and perceptions and finally on their preferences of teachers' error correction. Thus the analysis of this questionnaire is realized in this section.

I. 2. 3. 1. Aim of the Students' Questionnaire

The students' questionnaire is used in our research to emphasize the facts mentioned in the observation checklist; also to give the students a chance to describe their reactions, perceptions and preferences. The use of the observation checklist alone will not enable us to know and to discover our student participants' perceptions and preferences which are very important for our research. The questions asked in this questionnaire are constructed from the different elements of the two variables of our research work.

I. 2. 3. 2. Description of the Students' Questionnaire

The questionnaire was delivered by the end of the second semester (on April) to ninety second year students in the university of Bejaia. The questionnaire comprises four sections where both closed and open questions were introduced. Some of the closed questions require a 'yes' or 'no' answer, whereas others comprise a number of options from which our respondents could choose those that represent their answer (s). The first section (from Q1 to Q4) was about teachers' corrective feedback; i.e. how teachers provide correction. The second section (from Q5 to Q 11) was about the students' perceptions and reactions of their oral expression teachers' correction of errors. Then, the third and the last section (from Q12 to Q22) was about the students' preferences of error correction where students are going to choose their favourite ways of error correction delivery.

I. 2. 3. 2. Analysis and discussion of the results of the Students' Questionnaire

- **Section one: teachers' corrective feedback**

The questionnaire is distributed to ninety second year students in the University of Bejaia, only 68 questionnaires have been returned and 22 have not been returned as the following table indicates:

	The handed questionnaires	The returned questionnaires	Have not been returned
The number of students	90	68	22
Percentage	100%	75.56%	24.44%

Table 11: The handed questionnaire

Q1. Does your teacher of oral expression correct all your errors?

When students asked whether their teachers of oral expression correct all their errors, their answers were as follows:

	The total	Always	sometimes	Never
The number of students	68	38	28	2
Percentage	100%	55.88%	41.18%	2.94%

Table12: Teachers' correction of all students' errors

55.88% of our participants answered that their oral expression teacher always corrects their errors, then 41.18 answered that their teachers sometimes correct all their errors and for

the other category, 2 students have answered by never, i.e. their teachers do not correct all their errors. In contrast to what we have observed with the two oral expression classes (i.e. our teacher participants do not correct all students' errors), most of our student participants' answer to this question is that their oral expression teachers always correct all their errors.

Q2. Does your teacher's correction of errors affect you negatively or positively?

To know how students consider the effect of this correction, we have asked them this question, and the results are shown in the following table:

	The total	Negatively	Positively	No answer (NA)
The number of students	68	2	64	2
Percentage	100%	2.94%	94.12%	2.94%

Table 13: The effect of teachers' correction

Most of the students (94.12%) consider that this correction affects them positively and only 2.94 consider that this corrective feedback affects students negatively. 2 students have not answered the question. It is true that teachers' corrective feedback affects students positively but only when it develops their accuracy, when it increases their motivation and reduces their anxiety and when it gives them more opportunities to practice their oral fluency.

Q3. Does your teacher of oral expression interrupt you in the middle of your utterance (sentence) to correct your errors?

This third question has been asked to know whether teachers of oral expression interrupt their students in the middle of their utterances to correct their errors and the answers are as this table indicates:

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never
The number of students	68	15	44	9
Percentage	100%	22.06%	64.71%	13.23%

Table 14: Teachers' intervention to correct

Most of our student informants (44 students) answered that their teacher of oral expression sometimes interrupt them to correct their errors and 15 students answered that always their teacher interrupt them to correct and the other 9 students answered that their oral expression teachers never interrupt them to correct errors they have committed. From our

student participants' answers to this question and from our classroom observation checklist, we come to confirm that our teacher participants most of the time interrupt students to correct their errors.

Q4. In your oral expression sessions, do your classmates correct your errors?

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never	NA
The number of students	68	3	52	12	1
Percentage	100%	4.41%	76.47%	17.65%	1.47%

Table 15: Students providing corrective feedback to each other

To know whether peer correction is valued in oral expression sessions, we have asked the above question and the results are presented in the above table. 76.47% of our student participants consider that peer correction is sometimes achieved in their classes, 17.65% answered that always their classmates provide them with corrective feedback, and finally, 4.41% of our participants answered that peer correction is never achieved in their classes. 1 student (1.47%) has not answered the question. What we can say is that our teacher participants correct their students' errors without giving rise to peer correction which is considered by researchers as the solution to the problem of corrective feedback as the literature review indicates.

- **Section two: Students' perceptions and reactions to the teachers' corrective feedback**

To go further in investigating the teachers' corrective feedback and to see how students perceive and react to their teachers' corrective feedback, we have devised the following questions. Thus the results are shown in what follows:

Q5. Do you lose the idea you want to transmit when your oral expression teacher corrects an error you have made?

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never
The number of students	68	5	50	13
Percentage	100%	7.35%	73.53%	19.12%

Table 16: Loosing the idea when the teacher corrects a student's error.

As this table indicates 50 students (i.e. 73.53%) lose the idea they want to transmit when their teacher correct their errors and 13 students answered that they never lose the idea they want to deliver when their teacher of oral expression provide them with corrective feedback and only 5 students answered that they always lose the idea they want to transmit. Students' reactions to the teachers' corrective feedback is what teachers should take into account when delivering it.

Then the other question in this section is about students' reaction to their teachers' correction and which is asked to know whether our student informants find difficulties to carry on their speech after their teachers' provision of corrective feedback. The results are provided in the following table:

Q6. Do you find it easy to carry on (continue) speaking while the teacher corrects your errors?

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never	NA
The number of students	68	13	41	11	3
Percentage	100%	19.12%	60.29%	16.18%	4.41%

Table 17: The Continuation of students' talk after the teacher correction of errors

The majority of our participants (i.e. 60.29%) sometimes find difficulties to continue their speech after correcting their errors and 13 (i.e. 19.12%) students always face difficulties to carry on speaking and finally 11 (i.e. 16.18%) students never face obstacles to carry speaking after the teacher's correction of errors. Three (03) students have not answered this question. Since our teacher participants' error correction makes the majority of our student informants sometimes unable to carry on speaking, it is better for them to find ways in which they will do that without interrupting students and without causing them to find obstacles to continue what they are saying.

Q7. While speaking, does your oral expression teacher disturb you when he/she corrects you frequently (often)?

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never
The number of students	68	1	28	39
Percentage	100%	1.47%	41.18%	57.35%

Table 18: disturbing students when correcting them frequently

The following are results we have reached after asking our student informants whether they feel disturbed when their teachers of oral expression correct them frequently. Most of these students (57.35%) answered that they never feel disturbed when their teachers correct their errors frequently but 41.18% of the these students sometimes feel disturbed and only 1 student (i.e. 1.47%) who always feel disturbed when his/her teacher of oral expression corrects him/her frequently.

Q8. Do you feel less competent when your teacher corrects your errors several times?

The above question is asked to know whether our participants feel less competent when their oral expression teachers correct their errors several times and the results are shown in the following table:

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never
The number of students	68	6	25	37
Percentage	100%	8.83%	36.76%	54.41%

Table 19: Feeling less competent when the teacher corrects students' errors several times

This table shows that 37 students never feel less competent when their teachers correct their errors several times and 25 of them sometimes feel less competent and the other 6 students always feel less competent when their oral expression teachers correct the errors they make several times. Different students, different personalities which lead to different reactions, but what we want to say is that teachers should take all these students into consideration since even if the majority of our student informants do not feel disturbed when their teachers of oral expression correct their errors but there are a big number who feel like that.

Q9. Do you think that your teacher's correction of errors encourages you to participate?

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never	NA
The number of students	68	31	30	5	2
Percentage	100%	45.59%	44.12%	7.35%	2.94%

Table 20: Encouraging students to participate and to speak more when correcting

This table shows that 45.59% of our participants think that this error correction always encourages them to participate and 44.12% think that this is not the case, that is to say that their teachers' corrective feedback sometimes encourages them to speak and that 7.35% think that this correction does not encourages them to participate. 2 students have not answered this question.

Q10. Does your oral expression teacher's correction of a large number of errors reduce your chances to speak and to practice more the language?

	The total	Always	Sometimes	Never	NA
The number of students	68	8	25	33	2
Percentage	100%	11.76%	36.76%	48.53%	2.94%

Table 21: Reducing students' chances to speak by correcting a large number of errors

The above question is about how students recognize that their teachers' error correction gives them more chances to speak and practice the language they are learning. The results are shown in the above table.

The majority of our student participants (48.53%) answered by never, that is, their teachers' corrective feedback does not reduce their chances to speak, and 36.76% recognize that this correction of errors sometimes reduces their chances to practice the language and finally, 11.76% of the participants consider that their oral expression teachers' correction always reduces their chances to speak more and to practice the language they are learning. 2 students have answered this question. To say that this error correction when it is done frequently encourages students to speak more and to practice the language they are learning, means that it gives them more opportunities to speak, and what we have observed is that this error correction is done most of the time by interrupting students in the middle of their utterances and leads them to lose the ideas they want to transmit.

Q11. To what extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

These are seven statements where students are going to tell us to what extent they agree with each of them and the results reached are shown in what follows:

1. I can not speak a lot because my oral expression teacher interrupts me to correct.

	The total	Strongly disagree	Disagree	agree	Strongly agree
The number of students	68	18	38	12	0
Percentage	100%	26.47%	55.88%	17.65%	0%

Table 22: Interrupting students discourages them to speak

For the first statement, most of our student informants (i.e. 55.88%) disagree and then 26.47% of them strongly disagree with the statement which means that the teachers' error correction does not cause a problem for them when it interrupts them while speaking. In the other hand 17.65% of these students agree with the following statements, that is to say, they can not speak a lot since their oral expression teachers interrupts them to correct. No one of the students strongly disagree with this statement.

2. I feel more comfortable when my teacher neglects the errors I have made.

	The total	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	NA
The number of students	68	21	31	12	2	2
Percentage	100%	30.88%	45.59%	17.65%	2.94%	2.94%

Table 23: Feeling comfortable when the teacher neglects students' errors

For the second statement, 31 students disagree and 21 of them strongly disagree with this statement, whereas 12 students agree with this which means that they feel more comfortable when their teachers of oral expression neglects errors they have made and only 2 of our student informants strongly agree to this statement. 2 students have neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Since the majority of our student participants disagree to the above statement, this means that they want all their errors to be corrected what we are going to confirm in the section of preferences.

3. When my oral expression teacher corrects the errors I have made, I feel disturbed and then I lose the idea that I want to say.

	The total	Strongly disagree	Disagree	agree	Strongly agree
The number of students	68	5	36	25	2
Percentage	100%	7.35%	52.94%	36.76%	2.94%

Table 24: Feeling disturbed and losing the idea when the teacher corrects a student error

The majority of our student participants (52.94%) disagree with this statements which indicates that they neither feel disturbed nor they loose the idea they want to transmit when their oral expression teachers provide them with corrective feedback, others agree with the statement in that they feel disturbed and that they loose the idea they want to deliver when their teacher correct their errors. For the two other categories of students, 7.35% of students strongly disagree and only 2.94% strongly agree.

4. Whenever I make an error my teacher of oral expression intrudes to correct that error.

	The total	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	NA
The number of students	68	5	14	39	2	2
Percentage	100%	7.35%	20.59%	57.35%	2.94%	2.94%

Table 25: The teacher's intervention to correct students' errors

Concerning this statement, 39 students agree with it which denotes that their oral expression teachers intrude whenever students make errors, whereas 14 students disagree with it. 5 students strongly disagree and 2 students strongly agree. 2 students have not given their point of view. From what we have observed in the two classes, we say that our teacher participants correct just a small number of students' errors and do not intrude whenever students make an error.

5. My oral expression teacher's correction is worthless since it does not give us freedom to speak.

	The total	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	NA
The number of students	68	19	33	8	4	4
Percentage	100%	27.94%	48.53%	11.76%	5.88%	5.88%

Table 26: The consideration of the teacher's correction as worthless

For the fifth statement, the answers are as follows:

On the contrary to the first category (i.e. 27.94%) which strongly disagrees to this statement, the other category that represents 5.88% of the whole research participants strongly agree. 48.53% of our student informants disagree with this statement and 11.76% of them agree with this in that they consider the teacher correction of errors as worthless when it does not give them freedom to speak. 4 students (i.e. 5.88%) have not shared their view about this statement.

6. When our teacher of oral expression corrects the error I have made I feel anxious and I make more errors.

	The total	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	NA
The number of students	68	18	33	10	5	2
Percentage	100%	26.47%	48.53%	14.71%	7.35%	2.94%

Table 27: Feeling anxious and making more errors when the teacher corrects a student's error

The majority of our student informants (i.e. 48.53%) disagree with this statement and 10 of them (i.e. 14.71%) agree which means that they feel anxious when their teachers of oral expression correct their errors and then they make more errors. 18 students strongly disagree and 5 of them strongly agree with this statement. 2 students neither agree nor disagree with this statement. Feeling anxious and making more errors when the teacher corrects a student's error is not the case with our student participants. Perhaps this is because they have good relationships with their teachers who encourage them to speak and do not be afraid of making errors.

7. When our oral expression teacher corrects every error I make I become unwilling (not wanting) to speak again.

	The total	Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree	NA
The number of students	68	35	13	10	7	3
Percentage	100%	51.47%	19.12%	14.70%	10.29%	4.41%

Table 28: Becoming unwilling to speak after the teacher's correction of a student's error

For the last statement, most of our student participants (i.e. 51.47%) strongly disagree with it, on the other hand 10.29% of them strongly agree. 19.12% of these students disagree

and 14.70% agree. 3 students (i.e. 4.41%) have not shared their view about this statement. Our student participants' motivation is another factor which teachers' corrective feedback affects for some of them and which is not affected for others.

- **Section three: The students' preferences of correction**

This last section is composed of 11 questions where students are going to choose their preferences of the teachers' corrective feedback delivery.

The first question is asked to know whether our student informants prefer their oral expression teachers to correct all their errors and the results reached are shown in the following table:

Q12. Do you prefer that your teacher corrects every error?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	50	9	9
percentage	100%	73.53%	13.24%	13.24%

Table 29: Students' preference of the correction of all their errors

The majority of our student participants (50 students) prefer their teachers of oral expression to correct all their errors and 9 of them prefer to their teachers to do not correct all their errors. 9 students have not answered the question. The preference of correcting all errors that are made perhaps will justify our student participants' answer to the question of whether their teachers' correction of errors encourages them to speak and to practice more the language they are learning.

The second question in this section is asked to know whether our student informants prefer the use of non-verbal communication by their teachers of oral expression when correcting their errors.

Q13. Do you prefer that your teacher of oral expression uses gestures, facial expressions (non-verbal communication) to indicate that you have made an error instead of saying this verbally (by using words)?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	33	25	10
percentage	100%	48.53%	36.76%	14.71%

Table 30: Students' preference of the use of non verbal communication

As the above table shows, 33 students prefer their oral expression teachers to use gestures and facial expressions when correcting errors they have made instead of verbal communication and 25 students on the contrary do not prefer the use of non-verbal communication. 10 students have not answered this question. Since the use of non-verbal communication is preferred by our student informants, oral expression teachers can use it to indicate that errors are made and then let students correct themselves.

Then another question was asked and the results obtained are shown in what follows:

Q14. Do you prefer that your teacher asks your classmates to correct your errors?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	13	45	10
percentage	100%	19.12%	66.17%	14.71%

Table 31: Students' preference of asking their classmates to correct their errors

Most of our student informants (i.e. 66.17%) do not prefer their oral expression teacher to ask their classmates to correct errors they have made and 19.12% of them prefer that and finally 14.71% of the whole students have not answered this question.

As well, we have asked students whether they prefer their teachers of oral expression to record errors they have made and correct them at the end of the activity and the results reached are as follows:

Q15. Do you prefer that your teacher record your errors and at the end of the activity, he/she will correct together with all the students?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	31	28	9
percentage	100%	45.59%	41.17%	13.24%

Table 32: Students' preference of recording their errors and correcting them at the end of the activity

Nearly the number of students who prefer this way of error correction and those that do not prefer it is the same. 31 students (i.e. 45.59%) prefer the use of recording while others (i.e. 41.17%) do not prefer their oral expression teachers to record their errors. 9 students have not answered this question. Recording students errors and correct them at the end of the activity is what some of our student participants prefer and others do not even if it is a good technique that gives them more opportunities to speak and to practice their oral fluency.

Additionally, this fifth question is asked to discover whether our student participants prefer their teachers of oral expression to acknowledge them about the errors they have made and then ask them to reproduce the correct version.

Q16. Do you prefer that your teacher tells you about what is wrong and asks you to reproduce the correct version (form)?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	49	9	10
percentage	100%	72.06%	13.23%	14.71%

Table 33: Students' preference of telling them about what is wrong and asking them to reproduce the correct form

49 students (i.e. 72.06%) from our sample prefer their teachers to tell them about what is wrong in their utterances and then ask them to reproduce the correct form and only 9 of them do not prefer that. 10 students have not answered this fifth question. Since telling students about what is wrong and asking them to reproduce the correct form is what they prefer to be treated with, teachers should do that to avoid the fossilization of errors and to make students speak more.

Furthermore, we have asked this question about a type of corrective feedback which is very used by many teachers (as our literature review indicates) and the results are shown in the following table:

Q17. Do you prefer that your teacher repeats the utterance or word where you have made an error with the correction?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	25	34	9
percentage	100%	36.76%	50%	13.24%

Table 34: Students' preference of the use of recasts

Most of our student participants (34 students) do not prefer the use of recasts, that is, they do not prefer their oral expression teachers to repeat the erroneous utterance with correction and 25 of them prefer the use of recasts. 9 students have not answered this question. Coming back to our literature review and to our classroom observation checklist, recasts are the most used type of corrective feedback but most of our student participants do not prefer its use.

Q18. Do you prefer that your teacher uses the errors that the students have committed as a starting point for the next lesson?

Another question is asked about students’ preferences of corrective feedback and the reached are indicated in the above table.

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	32	27	9
percentage	100%	47.06%	39.70%	13.24%

Table 35: Students’ preference of the use of their errors as a starting point for the next lesson

47.06% students prefer to use their errors as a starting point for the next lesson but 39.70% of them do not prefer that. 9 students (i.e. 13.24%) have not answered this question. On the contrary to the previous preference, using students’ errors as a starting point for the next lesson is preferred by the majority of our student participants even if it is not in their classes (at least for the period when we were observing).

To know when our student informants prefer their errors to be corrected we have asked them if they prefer their teachers to correct their errors immediately after their occurrence and the results are shown in what follows:

Q19. Do you prefer that your teacher corrects your errors immediately after their occurrence?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	40	19	9
percentage	100%	58.82%	27.94%	13.24%

Table 36: Students’ preference of correcting their errors just after their occurrence

The majority of our student participants (i.e.58.82%) prefer their teachers to correct errors they have made immediately after their occurrence but 27.94% of them do not prefer to correct their errors immediately. 9 students (i.e. 13.24%) have not answered this question.

As well, to know whether our student informants prefer their errors to be corrected after finishing the message they want to transmit we have suggested the following question for which the results are as this table indicates:

Q20. Do you prefer that your teacher let you finish your message you are trying to convey and corrects your errors?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	44	14	10
percentage	100%	64.70%	20.59%	14.71%

Table 37: Students' preference of correcting their errors after finishing their messages

Most of these students (i.e. 64.70%) prefer their teachers to correct their errors when they finish the message they want to deliver and only 20.59% do not prefer that. 10 Students (i.e. 14.71%) have not answered this question. From the previous question and this one, we notice that our student participants give equal preference to the two ways of corrective feedback delivery, i.e. correcting their errors just after their occurrence and also correcting them after they finish the messages they want to transmit.

Moreover, we want to know whether self correction is preferred. Thus we have asked them the following question:

Q21. Do you prefer to correct your own errors?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	43	24	1
percentage	100%	63.24%	35.29%	1.47%

Table 38: Students' preference to correct their own errors

As the above table indicates, the majority of our student informants (i.e. 63.24%) prefer to correct errors they have made by themselves and 24 of them (i.e. 35.29%) do not prefer their errors to be self corrected which means that perhaps they prefer their teachers or their classmates to do that. 1 student (i.e. 1.47%) has not answered the question. After this small discussion of the results of this question, we come to say that self-correction is what the majority of our student participants prefer. For this reason, oral expression teachers should give a priority to self-correction not only because it is the preferable for the students but also because it is considered by researchers as a good technique which leads to more oral fluency practice.

Along with self correction, we have asked our research participants whether they prefer peer correction as a way of corrective feedback provision and the results are like the following:

Q22. Do you prefer your classmate to correct the errors you have made instead of your teacher?

	The total	Yes	No	NA
The number of students	68	13	53	2
percentage	100%	19.12%	77.94%	2.94%

Table 39: Students' preference of the correction of their errors by their classmates

53 students (i.e. 77.94%) among our sample do not prefer their classmates to correct errors they have made instead of their teachers and only 13 of them prefer that. 2 students have not answered the question. Peer-correction is another technique that is suggested by many researchers but unfortunately it is not preferred by most of our student participants.

-If you have other suggestions about error correction, please give them.

When asked to suggest other ways of error correction, our student informants suggested the following:

1. One student stated that he/she prefers that the oral expression teacher corrects all his/her errors but after finishing the idea he/she wants to transmit.
2. A number of students prefer their teacher to intervene and correct their errors since this for them enables them to not internalize their errors.
3. Another category of students prefer to correct their errors by themselves because this for them is beneficial since it enables them to remember these errors and to avoid their fossilization. Moreover, this is also because the teacher's intervention makes them nervous and anxious which will likely lead them to make more errors.
4. One student prefers the teacher to correct his/her errors but without being severe and judgmental when correcting since this can lead them to dislike the sessions of oral expression.
5. Another student suggested that the oral expression teacher indicates what is wrong and the type of the error committed and let the student correct him/herself.
6. The last student suggested that oral expression teachers let students' errors at the end of the activity and give students a chance to correct these errors.

From these suggestions, we notice that our student participants prefer self-correction as a way of corrective feedback delivery.

After analyzing the data collected from the use of the students' questionnaire, we have reached the following results:

In contrast with what we have observed, most of our student participants recognize that their teachers of oral expression always correct all their errors while they consider that their teachers sometimes do that by interrupting them in the middle of their utterances. And when we have asked them about the effect of this corrective feedback on them, nearly all the students answered that their oral expression teachers' corrective feedback affects them positively. But we can say that this is true when it develops their accuracy, when it avoids the fossilization of incorrect forms and when it gives them more opportunities to speak and when it suits their preferences.

When we have asked these students whether peer correction is achieved in their classes and if their classmates provide them with corrective feedback, the majority of our student informants answered that this sometimes happens. Indeed, from our observation, we have noticed that our student participants do not provide correction to each other.

Most of our student participants (i.e. 73.53%) claimed that they sometimes lose the idea they want to transmit and that 60.29% of the whole students find difficulties to continue speaking after their teachers of oral expression correct errors they have made. But 57.35% of these students stated that their teachers do not disturb them when correcting them frequently and that 54.41% of the whole participants do not feel less competent when their errors are corrected.

Next, the results have shown that some of our student participants (i.e. 45.59%) recognize that their teachers' corrective feedback always encourages them to participate in their oral expression classes while others (i.e. 44.12%) consider that sometimes this happens. In addition, we have asked students whether the correction of a large number of errors reduces their chances to speak more and practice the language and the results show that in contrast with what the relevant literature tells us most of our student informants (i.e. 48.53%) recognize that this is not the case with them and this never happens, but 36.76 of these students consider that sometimes this is the case with their teachers' corrective feedback.

From the data analysis we deduce that most of our student participants' preferences of corrective feedback delivery are the following:

1. They prefer their teachers of oral expression to correct all their errors.
2. They prefer the use of non-verbal communication instead of verbal one.

3. They prefer their teachers to record their errors and correcting them at the end of the activity.
4. They prefer their teachers to tell them about what is wrong and then ask them to reproduce the correct form.
5. They prefer the use of the errors they have made as a starting point for the next lesson.
6. They prefer their teachers to correct their errors immediately after their occurrence
7. They prefer to correct their errors after finishing the message they want to transmit.
8. They prefer to correct the errors they make by themselves.

On the other hand, most of our student informants do not prefer their oral expression teachers neither ask their classmates to correct their errors nor their classmates do this voluntarily; along with the use of recast, that is to say most of our students' informants do not prefer their teachers to repeat the utterance where they have made the error with correction.

I. 2. 4. Summary of the major findings of the research

From all the results that we have reached through the use of the classroom observation checklist and from the students' questionnaire we have reached the following results that we hope will help oral expression teachers cope more effectively with the issue of corrective feedback in their oral expression classes.

To avoid making more errors and to avoid their fossilization, teachers provide their students with corrective feedback which normally will solve this sort of problems, but sometimes the contrary happens. During oral expression classes, teachers' corrective feedback affects students negatively when it gives less attention to their oral fluency, when it does not give them enough opportunities to practice it and to practice speaking, when it deviates from the intended objective of their courses, when it makes them lose the ideas they want to transmit, when it makes them in difficult situations where they find themselves unable to carry on speaking and finally when it does not fit their preferences.

Teachers' corrective feedback sometimes can be a problem during oral expression classes. A lot of factors intrude and push this aspect to be a problem. One of these aspects is interrupting students in mid-flow which does not let students finish what they want to say, and this sometimes causes them to lose the ideas they want to transmit and also makes them in a difficult situation where they can not carry on speaking after providing the correction.

From the analysis of the results reached from our data collection tools, we come to say that our teacher participants focus more on accuracy than fluency. Also another factor is when this error correction focuses more on the form of students' utterances, on language rules, i.e. on accuracy and gives less or no attention to the content of these utterances, i.e. fluency, which is the main goal of communicative activities.

Correcting a large number of students' errors whereby the teacher intervenes to correct every error and then this automatically reduces the chances for students to speak and to practice speaking. This is not the case with our teacher participants since they correct only some errors and neglect others. The fact that our teacher participants do not correct all the students' errors is not the best choice simply because they do not choose and select the types of errors that should receive more priority, instead they do this randomly. Our teacher participants sometimes correct lexical errors, other times they correct grammatical ones and other times they correct phonological errors, where normally they should correct more serious ones and the ones that interfere with communication.

Using only one type and technique of corrective feedback which students may not prefer or which may not suit their level is another factor that can push teachers' corrective feedback to be a problem in oral expression classes. Our teacher participants use recasts as a type of corrective feedback neglecting other types which may bring better results for these students. No techniques were used except one (i.e. noticing students' errors and correcting them at the end of the activity) which was used only one time.

Another question that we seek to answer during this investigation is how can oral expression teachers deal with corrective feedback in a way that does not influence negatively students' oral fluency practice?. A lot of things are found to be hampering regarding communication and students' willingness to communicate, including interrupting students in the middle of their utterances, not correcting global and frequent errors that interfere with communication, focusing on students' accuracy and giving less importance and attention to their fluency, and using only one type of corrective feedback and nearly no techniques are used to give students more opportunities to practice their oral fluency. To transmit corrective feedback successfully, teachers should avoid such problems when providing it and should go for encouraging the use of a variety of types of corrective feedback and techniques that are recommended for an optimized oral fluency practice. Also, global and frequent errors should

receive more importance from teachers, and another thing that should be taken into account when correcting is students' preferences of corrective feedback delivery.

As the solution to all the problems that concern corrective feedback during oral expression classes, learners' preferences can be the best way. To do that, we have reached some of our student participants' preferences which are the following:

The majority of our student participants prefer all their errors to be corrected; also they prefer the use of non-verbal communication instead of verbal one that their teachers can use to indicate that they have committed an error. Beside the use of non-verbal communication, our student participants prefer their teachers to record their errors and correcting them at the end of the activity. Also, they prefer their teachers to tell them about what is wrong and then ask them to reproduce the correct form. They prefer the use of the errors they have made as a starting point for the next lesson. Next, they prefer their teachers to correct their errors immediately after their occurrence together with correcting their errors after finishing the message they want to transmit. Finally, they prefer to correct the errors they make by themselves (i.e. self-correction). On the other hand, most of our student informants do not prefer their oral expression teachers neither ask their classmates to correct their errors nor their classmates do this voluntarily along with the use of recasts.

II. Section two: Implications, limitations and suggestions for further research

This part is devoted to the implications of the results that could help second year university students to overcome the problems they usually encounter when their teachers of oral expression provide them with corrective feedback. Then, we are going to discuss the limitations that we have encountered during this investigation and at the end of this section we will give some suggestions that can help for further research.

II. 1. Implications

After discussing the major results of this investigation, we come to the implications of these results that we hope will help both oral expression teachers and their second year students in maximizing their oral fluency practice and thus developing their speaking skill.

Since oral fluency is the objective of communicative activities as the relevant literature indicates, it is better to separate accuracy practice from fluency practice, that is to say, activities whose objective is the production of correct language forms (accuracy), and those whose objective is communicative language use (fluency). If teachers do not separate the two aspects, this will create a sense of confusion and frustration among learners. Sometimes in one lesson the two aspects can be present, so teachers can divide the lesson into two types of activities, one with the objective of developing the students' accuracy and the other with the objective of improving their (oral) fluency. In the first part the teacher will correct students' errors which concern language rules; here the teacher can ask his/her students whether the speaker's messages are transmitted successfully to compare the results of the two tasks. In the second part, the teacher will only correct those errors that interfere with communication and the students' performance will be assessed on how ideas are well expressed and understood.

Since self-correction is preferred by the majority of our research participants and also it is recommended as a technique which gives students more opportunities to express themselves and to speak. To help students correct themselves, oral expression teachers should first help them recognize and notice their errors which can be realized by the use of supplementary tools like the use of the board or the use of gestures or facial expressions.

From the results that we have reached all along our investigation, we recommend that teachers of oral expression correct global and frequent errors which can lead students (listeners) to misunderstand the speaker's message. Frequent and global errors should receive the priority from oral expression teachers than phonological, lexical and grammatical ones which can drag the lesson to the study of language form when focusing more on them.

Again, no correction is not always the best choice. Global and frequent errors if are not corrected by oral expression teachers will cause the students' misunderstanding of the speaker's message. Normally global and frequent errors are what oral expression teachers should correct because they interfere with communication, instead of correcting grammatical, phonological and lexical ones.

Relying on our student informants' preference of not using recasts as a way or type of corrective feedback, it is better that teachers of oral expression use a variety of types and techniques of corrective feedback which can help them give more opportunities to their students to practice speaking and to practice their oral fluency, like self-correction; the use of recording; using the errors as a starting point for the next lesson and so on and so forth.

Teachers' corrective feedback during fluency activities should be transmitted successfully and should go to encourage students to speak more. To avoid students' losing the ideas they want to transmit can simply be realized by letting them finish expressing what they want to say and then correct the errors they have made. For this reason, oral expression teachers had better use the techniques we have provided in the literature review and which give students the freedom to speak and to express themselves.

From our literature review we recognize that students' preferences are what teachers of oral expression must take into consideration. According to Ur (1991: 248) "*learners' preferences are on the whole a reliable guide*". To this effect, oral expression teachers should correct their students' errors according to their preferences, either about when to correct, who will correct and then how to correct.

II. 2. Limitations of the study

Every research is under some constraints that may result in inability to reach or cover all the aspects that concerns a given topic of research. The limitations of this study lie mostly in the methodological design. One data collection tool used in our investigation is the

questionnaire which may fail to reveal the real attitudes and views of our student participants, thus it would be better if an interview is used in addition to the questionnaire to gather detailed data needed about our student participants' reactions, perceptions and preferences.

Also, the students' preliminary questionnaire was distributed to ninety students but only seventy one students have returned their questionnaires, the same with the students' questionnaire which was distributed to the same number of students and only sixty eight questionnaires have been returned. Perhaps the missed questionnaires will provide us with other preferences, views, perceptions and also reactions.

For the classroom observation we have opted for, observing a whole class in the course of speaking is a difficult task. More than one person can be speaking at a time which limits the possibility of the researcher to observe all of them at a time. When the observer marks the behavior on the observation checklist, he/she can ignore what is going on at least for the moment of noting down the behavior.

II. 3. Suggestions for further research

Our main concern when conducting this research work is to discover whether teachers' corrective feedback affects negatively learners' oral fluency practice and therefore to achieve this aim we have adopted a descriptive study. Since the majority of our research participants prefer their teachers to correct all their errors, we think that conducting an experimental research will likely lead to useful new insights and to better understanding of the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice. This type of research will need to make a comparison between two groups of learners (group A and B), correcting all the errors that students have made with one group; group A for example, and not correcting those errors with the other one; group B, and then see the results (measure students' oral fluency practice). This study can be done by the use of recording of the students' errors of the two groups (i.e. using a recording instrument) which permits the researcher to get valid and reliable data, also an observation sheet can be used to record observable behaviours related to the two variables.

Also an experimental study can be conducted by implementing the techniques we have suggested and see their effectiveness and as to whether they will likely lead to an increase of the learners' oral fluency practice.

Conclusion

This chapter provides a view about the methods, the procedures, and the tools we have used to collect data about the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice. Then we have presented the analysis and discussion of the results we have reached all along our investigation. Finally, we have dealt with the implications of the results for oral expression classroom which aim at maximizing second year B.A students' oral fluency practice and after that, we have dealt with the limitations and some suggestions for further research.

General conclusion

General conclusion

The present study investigates the impact of the teachers' corrective feedback on the learners' oral fluency practice, taking the case of the second year university students and starting from the hypothesis that the way teachers provide corrective feedback affects negatively the students' oral fluency practice. Our aim behind conducting this investigation is to identify the impact of teachers' corrective feedback on 2nd year students' oral fluency practice, and then we also aim at finding out our student informants' preferences in terms of feedback provision.

To realize our research, a hybrid methodology is required; indeed, we have adopted both the qualitative and the quantitative methods. The qualitative method is used to describe the reality of teachers' corrective feedback, students' reactions, perceptions together with their preferences of their teachers' correction of errors, and then the quantitative method is used for measuring the effectiveness of this corrective feedback and also to measure the students' reactions, perceptions and preferences. Thus, two research tools were used which are the observation checklist and the questionnaire. To be specific, the classroom observation checklist enabled us to collect data about the way teachers provide students with correction, and the questionnaire helped us to discover the students' reactions, perceptions and preferences of the teachers' corrective feedback, the information we have gathered using the questionnaire was impossible using only the observation. The classroom observation checklist is filled when observing two teachers from the population and the questionnaire is distributed to ninety students from the same population.

The results of the study have shown that there are some problems which affect the learners' oral fluency practice. In other words, the problem lies in the fact that teachers when providing corrective feedback seem to minimize the learners' opportunities to develop their oral fluency.

Despite the fact that teachers' corrective feedback causes a problem to language learners when it is excessive, when it interrupts the learners in mid-flow and when it takes a long time, we have suggested some useful and practical techniques that we hope will help language learners and their teachers to cope with this problem and enable them to increase and maximize the classroom opportunities to develop their oral fluency.

On the basis of the results, we come to the conclusion that our hypothesis is confirmed, that is oral expression teachers' provision of corrective feedback affects negatively second year students oral fluency practice at the University of Bejaia.

To conclude, many questions need to be answered by conducting other studies on the effect of teachers' corrective feedback on learners' oral fluency practice. To do this, we recommend conducting an experimental study by implementing the different techniques we have suggested and see whether the learners' oral fluency practice will increase.

Bibliography

Bibliography

Books

- Allright, Dick and Bailey, M. Kathleen. *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library. CUP. 1991. Print.
- Broady, Elspeth. “The four language skills or juggling simultaneous constraints”. *Effective learning and teaching in modern languages*. Routledge. London and New York. 2005. Print.
- Brown, H. Douglass. *Principles of Language learning and teaching*. 4th Ed. Longman. 2000. Print.
- ---. *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 2nd ed. Longman. 2001. Print.
- Chaudron, Craig. *Second language classrooms. Research on teaching and learning*. CUP. 1988. Print.
- Coleman, A. James and Klapper, John. “Research into language learning”. *In effective learning and teaching in modern languages*. Routledge. London and New York. 2005. Print.
- Ellis, Rod. *Second language acquisition*. Oxford university press. Oxford introductions to Language study. 1997. Print.
- Ellis, Rod and Barkhuizen, Gary. *Analyzing learner language*. Oxford Applied Linguistics. Oxford University Press. 2005. Print.
- Hall, Graham. *Exploring English Language Teaching: Language in Action*. Routledge Introductions To Applied Linguistics. Routledge. 2011. Print.
- Harmer, Jeremy. *How to teach English: An introduction to the practice of English language teaching*. Longman.1998. Print.
- ---. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 3rd Ed. Longman, 2001. Print.
- ---. *The practice of English Language Teaching*.4th ed. Pearson Longman. 2007. Print.
- Hedge, Tricia. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers. OUP. 2000. Print.

- Hill, Jane D and Flynn, Kathleen M. *Classroom Instruction that works with English Language Learners*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, Virginia USA.2006. Print.
- Hughes, Rebecca. *Teaching and researching speaking*. Pearson education. Longman. 2002. Print.
- Johnson, Keith. *An introduction to Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. 2nd ed. Pearson. Longman. 2001, 2008. Print.
- Lightbown, M.Patsy and Spada, Nina. *How languages are learned*. Oxford Handbooks for language teachers. 3ed ed. Oxford university press. 2006. Print.
- Lindsay, Cora and Knight, Paul. *Learning and teaching English: A course for teachers*. Oxford: OUP. 2006. Print.
- Littlewood, William. *Communicative Language Teaching*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library. CUP. 1981. Print.
- Lynch, Tony. *Communication in the Language Classroom*. Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers. Oxford University Press. 1996. Print.
- Nation, I. S. P and Newton, Jonathan. *Teaching ESL/EFL Listening and Speaking*. ESL & Applied Linguistics Professional Series. Routledge. New York and London. 2009. Print.
- Nunan, David and Lamb, Clarice. *The self- directed Teacher: Managing the learning process*. Cambridge language education.CUP. 1996. Print.
- Richards, Jack, C and Renandya, Willy, A. *Methodology in language teaching: An Anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press. 2002. Print.
- Scrivener Jim. *Learning Teaching: A guidebook for English language teachers*. Macmillan Books for Teachers. 2nd edition. Macmillan. 2005. Print.
- Seliger, herbert. W and Shohamy, Elana. *Second language research methods*. Oxford, UK: OUP, 1989. Print.
- Shumin, Kang. “Factors to consider: developing adult EFL students’ speaking abilities”. *Methodology in language teaching: An Anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press. 2002. Print.
- Thornbury, Scott. *How to teach speaking*. Pearson. Longman, 2005. Print.
- Tsui, Amy. B. M. *Introducing Classroom Interaction*. Penguin group. London, 1995. Print.
- Ur, Penny. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. CUP, 1991. Print.

- Wajnryb, Ruth. *Classroom Observation Tasks: A resource book for language teachers and trainers*. Cambridge University Press. 1992. Print.
- Young, J. Dolly. *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low-anxiety classroom atmosphere*. McGraw-Hill College. 1999. Print.

Dictionaries

- Richards, Jack C and Schmidt, Richard. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. 3rd Ed. Longman, 2002. Print.

Journals and Forums

- Anker, William. “Errors and corrective feedback: Updated theory and classroom practice”. *English teaching forum* 38. 4 (2000). United States. Print.
- Bress, Paul. “Speaking skills. What are they and how can we teach them?”. *Modern English Teacher* 15. 4 (2006). Print.
- Stillwell, Christopher et al. “Students transcribing tasks: noticing fluency, accuracy, and complexity”. *ELT journal. An international journal for teachers of English to speakers of other languages*. 64. 4 (2000). Oxford University Press. Print.

Electronic sources

- Chu, Ruili. “Effects of Teacher’s Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in the Oral English of English-Majors College Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Academy Publisher*. (2011): 454-459. Web. 13 Mar. 2013.
- Ellis, Rod. “Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development”. *L2 Journal* (2009): 3-18. Web. 13 Mar. 2013.
- Kellem, Harlan. “Principles for developing oral fluency in the classroom”. *The Language Teacher forum* (2009): 9-11. Web. 13 Mar. 2013.
- Lyster, Roy and Ranta, Leila. “Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms”. 1997. Web. 13 Mar. 2013.
- Panova, Iliana and Lyster, Roy. “Patterns of Corrective Feedback and Uptake in an Adult ESL Classroom”. *TESOL Quarterly* (2002): 573-595. 2002.

- Rossiter, Marian. J et al. “Oral Fluency: The Neglected Component in the Communicative Language Classroom”. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue canadienne des langues vivantes* (2010) : 583–606. Web. 13 Mar. 2013.
- Tedick, Diane J. and Barbara de Gortari. “Research on Error Correction and Implications for Classroom Teaching”. *ACIE Newsletter* 1. 3 (May 1998). Web. 13 Mar. 2013.

Appendices

Appendix N° 2: The Observation Checklist

“Teachers’ corrective feedback delivery”

Date:

Hour:

Lesson:

Class:

For each item the observer notes down its occurrence in the classroom, and sometimes more additional information are included.

Item		occurrence	Additional comments
Which errors to correct	The teacher corrects every error that occurs.		
	The teacher corrects a phonological (pronunciation) error.		
	The teacher corrects a grammatical error.		
	The teacher corrects a lexical error.		
	The teacher corrects frequent errors.		
	The teacher corrects the error that interferes with communication (global error).		
When to correct	Immediately after the error occurs.		
	After the student finishes the message he/she is trying to convey.		
	After the activity has finished.		
How to correct	While correcting, the teacher focuses on the form of the student’s utterance (accuracy)		
	While correcting, the teacher focuses on the content of the student’s utterance (fluency).		
	Asking another student to correct the error.		
	Asking the student who made the error for repetition (to reproduce the correct version).		
	The teacher provides the correct version (directly).		
	Notices the errors and at the end of the activity he/she will correct the errors together with the students.		

Appendix N° 1: The Students' Preliminary Questionnaire

“The problem identification questionnaire”

The following questionnaire is a part of a research we are carrying out on teachers' feedback at the university of Bejaia .we would be very grateful to you if you devote some of your time to answer the following questions .we thank you in advance for your collaboration.

*please circle the answer (s) of your choice.

Q1: During oral expression sessions and while speaking, does your teacher correct your errors?

1. Yes

2. No

Q2: Do you feel at ease (relaxed and comfortable) when your teacher interrupts you and corrects your errors?

1. Yes

2. No

Q3: Does the teachers' feedback (correction of errors) stand as a barrier for you to practice speaking?

1. Yes

2. No

If yes, does this cause you to:

1. Feel less competent.

2. Stop speaking and unwilling to speak again.

3. Be shy and embarrassed.

4. Loose the idea you want to transmit.

Q4: Do your classmates give you feedback (correct your errors) while speaking?

1. Yes

2. No

Thank you

Appendix N° 3: The Students' Questionnaire

“Students' reactions, perceptions and preferences of teachers' corrective feedback delivery”

This is a part of a research we are undertaking on the teaching of oral expression. Your answers will pave us the way for better understanding of the process of learning and teaching. We will be very grateful to you if you devote some of your time to answer the following questions.

Section one: Teachers' corrective feedback

Please put a cross (x) in front of the answer of your choice.

Q1. Does your teacher of oral expression correct all your errors?

Always Sometimes Never

Q2. Does this error correction affect you negatively or positively?

Negatively positively

Q3. Does your teacher of oral expression interrupt you in the middle of your utterance (sentence) to correct your errors?

Always Sometimes Never

Q4. In your oral expression sessions, do your classmates correct your errors?

Always Sometimes Never

Section two: Students' reactions and perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback

Please put a cross (x) in front of the answer of your choice.

Q5. Do you lose the idea you want to transmit when your teacher corrects an error you have made?

Always Sometimes Never

Q6. Do you find it easy to carry on (continue) speaking while your teacher corrects your errors?

Always Sometimes Never

Q7. While speaking, does your oral expression teacher disturb you when he/she corrects you frequently (often)?

Always Sometimes Never

Q8. Do you feel less competent when your teacher corrects your errors several times?

Always Sometimes Never

Q9. Do you think that your teacher's correction of errors encourages you to participate in the classroom?

Always Sometimes Never

Q10. Does your oral expression teacher's correction of a large number of errors reduce your chances to speak more and practice the language?

Always Sometimes Never

Q11. To which extent do you agree with each of the following statements?

Strongly disagree	disagree	agree	Strongly agree

--	--	--	--

1. I can not speak a lot because my oral expression teacher interrupts me to correct.
2. I feel more comfortable when my teacher neglects the errors I have made.
3. When my oral expression teacher corrects the errors I have made, I feel disturbed and then I lose the idea that I want to say.
4. Whenever I make an error my teacher of oral expression intrudes to correct that error.
5. My oral expression teacher's correction is worthless since it does not give us freedom to speak.
6. When our teacher of oral expression corrects the error I have made I feel anxious and I make more errors.
7. When our teacher corrects every error I make I become unwilling (not wanting) to speak again.

Section three: The students' preferences of corrective feedback delivery

Put a cross (x) in front of the answer of your choice.

Q12. Do you prefer that your teacher corrects every error you make?

Yes No

Q13. Do you prefer that your teacher of oral expression uses gestures, facial expressions (non-verbal communication) to indicate that you have made an error instead of saying this verbally (by using words)?

Yes No

Q14. Do you prefer that your teacher asks your classmates to correct your errors?

Yes No

Q15. Do you prefer that your teacher record your errors and at the end of the activity, he/she will correct together with all the students?

Yes No

Q16. Do you prefer that your teacher tells you about what is wrong and asks you to reproduce the correct version (form)?

Yes No

Q17. Do you prefer that your teacher repeats the utterance or word where you have made an error with the correction?

Yes No

Q18. Do you prefer that your teacher uses the errors that the students have committed as a starting point for the next lesson?

Yes No

Q19. Do you prefer that your teacher corrects your errors immediately after their occurrence?

Yes No

Q20. Do you prefer that your teacher let you finish the message you are trying to convey and corrects your errors?

Yes No

Q21. Do you prefer to correct your own errors by yourself?

Yes No

Q22. Do you prefer your classmates to correct the errors you have made instead of your teacher?

Yes No

If you have other suggestions about error correction, please give them.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....