Effect of Corrective Feedback Mechanism on the Performance of Grade VI English Language Students in Private Sectors Schools in Karachi

Erum Khan[1]

S.M. Danish[2]

Dr. Muhammad Yousuf Sharjeel[3]

Abstract

Several Pakistani secondary school students from various popular institutes undergo a variety of problems and difficulties due to their inability to demonstrate a genuine and natural skill to use English language in real life. The situation under which English at the secondary level is taught in Pakistan is not as favorable to teaching and learning of the language as it ought to be. The courses taught lack precise curricular objectives as English language teachers are not prepared with resourceful academic tools. The majority of English language teachers depend upon outmoded instructional modus operandi. In addition, inapt textbooks are selected to teach English as a Second Language and language teaching amenities are not operational with audiovisual aids; the examination system is flawed as it lacks determining achievement and the education system is deficient of an observation and feedback system.

The paper serves as a measure to identify the current gaps in teaching quality of English teachers in secondary school and the impact of corrective strategy and its significance on writing skills of Grade VI private sector English language students with emphasis on mechanism and explanations on various aspects of language learning.

The study shows that corrective feedback strategy has a significant impact on writing skills, linguistic mechanism, explanations and written corrective feedback on various aspects of language learning. Students" responses in essay questions affect their overall English language performance under the principles of corrective feedback mechanism.

Key Terms

Skill-oriented language teaching, secondary students, linguistic competency, conventional language teaching styles, language-deficient performance, Corrective feedback, language tools

Background of the Study

Currently in Pakistani secondary schools, the assessment system prevailing in the majority of the secondary schools is not continuous summative, but still only summative in nature. This trend leads to the students relying on efforts to score well in the written assessments only disregarding the development of other English Language skills essential for the professional scenario. In order to measure eventual achievement, development or aptitude in language skills, skill-based teaching and formal tests should be conducted without corrective feedback. In terms of writing, each of the above mentioned qualities can be evaluated. For example, after using corrective feedback techniques to teach, analysis of the students' grasp of the language at the phonological stage, an assessment of achievement in understanding the written language can be administered. Such a test could be of the students' understanding regarding second language writing. Related tests can be considered to evaluate the other skills of English language rather than giving corrective feedback. The gap is very obvious because nearly all assessments in Pakistan are subjective and this is the main reason they only test the writing skills of the students. These subjective tests do not assess the secondary school students' performance of the language rather limit them by only measuring the learners' knowledge of it.

Problem Statement

Corrective feedback in classes of English writing skills in secondary schools in Pakistan does not assess the written skills which are required in the real professional work. This research explained efforts to assess the aptitude of the secondary English language learners for

developing skills focusing corrective feedback to enhance writing competency and grammatical structure. The study intended to shed light upon English language writing skill testing strategies which focus on skill development pedagogy rather than the conventional practice of testing secondary English language students with a summative written test only. In Pakistan, secondary education institutions do not focus on skill-based language teaching strategies and valid language tools are not utilized to teach and test English Language, competency effectively (Malik 2009).

The existing procedures of assessment in Pakistan secondary schools are deficient in employing corrective feedback strategies so as to lessen the differences and problems between teaching and testing of the English language to higher secondary learners. Gronlund (2000) also substantiates that skill-based corrective feedback test composed according to an instructional framework performs a very important part in undertaking the extent of the success or failure of language teaching program. Hambleton & Patsula (1991) explain the value of enhancing the validity of adapted language tests, stress upon avoiding myths and recommend guidelines in order to improve language testing.

Study Objectives
1. To study the difference in performance between secondary students taught through corrective feedback mechanism
2. To investigate linguistically competent procedures that ensures effective English language proficiency at private secondary schools
3. To analyze the effect of corrective feedback on the language students
4. To evaluate the extent to which corrective feedback is effective in English language teaching practice can meet the national secondary education objectives

Research Question
Is there effect of corrective feedback on performance of Grade VI English language students in private schools in Karachi?

Research Hypotheses

There is a significant difference in the written test score achieved in English by secondary English language students taught wit through corrective feedback mechanism.

Types of Feedback

Formative feedback is intended to facilitate improvement in 1 of the 3 competency domains of knowledge, skills, or attitudes. Specific feedback is linked to a specific statement or behavior demonstrated in the encounter by the student. General feedback is not linked to specific statement or behavior demonstrated in the encounter by the student. Positive feedback is intent of reinforcing successful performance. Corrective feedback is with intent of pointing out deficit in performance for future improvement. Summative feedback is feedback providing overview of student performance in the encounter without specifically referring to one of the competency domains of knowledge, skills, or attitudes.

Cognition and Metacognition in Language

This introduces the basic concepts of metacognition and self-regulated learning, explores how learners take an active part in their learning through self-regulation. We study different models of self-regulated learning (SRL). We discussed the theory of metacognition and SRL and show how these basic cognitive processes motor learning in academic settings, as well as how to facilitate SRL in the secondary classroom.

In educational settings, applications of learning strategies related to cognitive psychology focus on understanding the impacts of strategy training for diverse types of works and students. Results from these researches usually signify that strategy training is valuable in enhancing the performance of English language learners on an extensive variety of reading and problem-solving tasks (Brown, Bransford, Ferrara, and Campione 1983). Significant conclusions from these researches show that English language learning strategies include an executive, or metacognitive, function inclusive of cognitive processing.

Flavell (1979) says that language-based cognition is the process of knowing and perception through thinking, experience, and the mind. Human cognition is mindful and unaware, tangible or intangible, as well as instinctive, like knowledge of a language and theoretical background like a model of a language. Vygotsky hypothesized that learners build up the capability for self-regulation during communication with more well-informed others. (Vygotsky, 1978).

Pintrich (2002) states that language learners who are aware about the various types of methodologies for learning, thinking and problem solving are more liable to utilize them. Efficient secondary English language students have various learning strategies suitable to the characteristics of the task, to the learning material, to personal goals and level of learning (Skehan, 1991). Research conducted upon learning of language have given significance to cognitive and meta cognitive learning strategies like the formation of hypothesis or language practice which is cognitive and planning and evaluating one's own learning which is meta cognitive (Oxford and Cohen, 1992).

Dunning, Johnson, Ehrlinger, and Kruger (2003) in their study ‒Why People Fail to Recognize Their Own Incompetence‖ discovered that generally people are ignorant of their lack of ability, lack awareness about deficits in their academic and communal skills. They recognized this design across many areas like test-taking, writing grammatically and thinking logically. This research suggests that amplified metacognitive capability, to learn explicit and correct skills, how to identify them, and how to apply them is required in several situations. Tanner (2012) asserts that learners to become further metacognitive must be educated about the idea and its language clearly and not in a content-delivery model like simply a reading or a lecture and also not in a single lesson. This kind of explicit instruction will assist learners enlarge or substitute existing learning strategies with innovative and more valuable ones.

Kaplan (2001) advocates that skill-oriented language teaching and testing strategy needs to be seen as a vital component of contemporary secondary education English language curriculum as the skills needed in

the real professional world provide the experiential foundation to language students to practice in later life. McNamara (2001) says that most internationally renowned secondary education institutions have also realized that the pre-existent supremacy of English skills around the world in professional contexts insists on them to prepare the secondary school students for the upcoming real world demands and challenges. The skills of secondary students of English are therefore, a fundamental feature to be developed.

Writing Skills

Writing is the inscription of characters on a medium, intending to create words or other constructs of language. By writing well, one earns respect as it clarifies thoughts, makes better learning and enhances the effective use of words in speech, both oral and written. Experts in applied language teaching are of the opinion that power to write good ideas in good English with clarity and confidence will always profit an individual. Writing has always been recognized as an extremely essential skill in English language acquisition. It is a vital part of language learning because when an individual writes, thoughts and information are blended to cultivate a meaning that is unique. This leads to the identification of writing on more complex issues by secondary students.

The question here is whether a single measure can, for example a written test, provide a complete framework to test the overall proficiency in all modes of English communication. Studies have shown that although testing one or two English language skills may provide an indirect indication of other skills, they provide no comprehensive assessment of communicative ability. The four skills have very strong correlation, but not to the extent that assessment of one can take place for another. Logically, they have to be assessed individually and failing to assess all of them proficiently may leave gaps which are critical. These gap need to be addressed adequately at all forums of language teaching.

Socio-cultural theory and Corrective Feedback

Much of the preceding discussion of CF has been based on an interactionism/cognitive view of L2 acquisition according to which CF

facilitates acquisition by activating internal processes such as attention and rehearsal that make acquisition (conceived as something that goes on inside the learner's head) possible. In this section, a different view of acquisition and the role played by CF will be outlined. Drawing broadly on both interactionism/cognitive and SCT views of CF, the study proposes the following general guidelines for correcting learner errors. These guidelines constitute an explicit set of principles that teachers can reflect on when determining their own policy for CF.

1. Teachers should ascertain their students' attitudes towards CF, apprise them of the value of CF, and negotiate agreed goals for CF with them. The goals are likely to vary according to the social and situational context.

2. CF (both oral and written) works and so teachers should not be afraid to correct students' errors. This is true for both accuracy and fluency work, so CF has a place in both.

3. Focused CF is potentially more effective than unfocused CF, so teachers should identify specific linguistic targets for correction in different lessons. This will occur naturally in accuracy work based on a structure-of-the-day approach, but can also be usefully applied in fluency work.

4. Teachers should ensure that learners know they are being corrected (i.e., they should not attempt to hide the corrective force of their CF moves from the learners). Whereas it will generally be clear to learners that they are being corrected in the case of written CF, it may not always be clear in the case of oral CF.

5. Teachers need to be able to implement a variety of oral and written CF strategies and to adapt the specific strategies they use to the particular learner they are correcting. One way of doing this is to start with a relatively implicit form of correction (e.g., simply indicating that there is an error) and, if the learner is unable to self-correct, to move to a more explicit form (e.g., a direct correction). This requires that teachers be

responsive to the ‒feedback‖ they get from learners on their own corrective feedback.

6. Oral CF can be both immediate and delayed. Teachers need to experiment with the timing of the CF. Written CF is almost invariably delayed.

7. Teachers need to create space following the corrective move for learners to uptake the correction. However, whether the correction is or is not appropriated should be left to the learner (i.e., the teacher should not require the learner to produce the correct form).

8. Teachers should be prepared to vary who, when, and how they correct in accordance with the cognitive and affective needs of the individual learner. In effect this means they do not need to follow a consistent set of procedures for all students.

9. Teachers should be prepared to correct a specific error on several occasions to enable the learner to achieve full self-regulation.

10. Teachers should monitor the extent to which corrective feedback causes anxiety in learners and should adapt the strategies they use to ensure that anxiety facilitates rather than debilitates.

These guidelines should not be presented to teachers as mandatory, but rather as a set of propositions that they can reflect on and debate. They serve as a basis for teacher development. Richards and Farrell (2005) define teacher development as follows: Ellis Corrective Feedback L2 Journal Vol. 1 (2009) 15 Teacher development…seeks to facilitate growth of teachers' understanding of teaching and of themselves as teachers. It often involves examining different dimensions of a teacher's practice as a basis for reflective review. (p. 4).

Critical Debate in the Literature

  Beuningen (2010) argues that corrective feedback looks at in the context of second language learners as it relates to second-language

acquisition, but is very useful for low-achieving writers .The researcher is merely saying be selective and don't try to mark up every mistake on the paper. This is useful. Perhaps you are trying to teach adverbs and you are assessing adverbs through a writing assignment. The author also looks at other, more positive ways of offering feedback in grammar correction. That one is my favorite and one that I have adopted in my teaching.

Another study on corrective feedback by AL- Bakri, (2015) states that teachers' beliefs and their practices are extremely significant in the context of giving students feedback in L2. This study is particularly design in Omani context. On contrary, Aljaafreh & Lantolf (1994) states that negative feedback also has very prominent impact on second language. Ashwell (2000) stated the responses of student's writings in more than one drafts also has positive responses. Feedback forms followed by content feedback gratified the students to write their responses. Bitchener (2008) states that corrective feedback has powerful role in writing skill ,it give positive and approach to the second language learner, it is evident in most of our researches and researchers are agreed that corrective feedback is a good technique .

According to Brown (2012) there is a new debate stated about corrective feedback is that now teacher should go for written corrective feedback for compositions. Some researches states that it is not as straight forward and early to change the approach. According to Schachter (1991), corrective feedback, negative evidence, and negative feedback are three terms used respectively in the fields of language teaching, language acquisition, and cognitive psychology. Different researchers often use these terms interchangeably. The feedback can be explicit (e.g., grammatical explanation or overt error correction) or implicit. Implicit correction includes, but is not limited to, confirmation checks, repetitions, recasts, clarification requests, silence, and even facial expressions that express confusion.

There is further evidence of the role of corrective feedback in the hypothesis testing models of acquisition. In these models, the learner is assumed to formulate hypotheses about the TL, and to test these

hypotheses against the target norm. In this model of learning, corrective feedback, or negative data, plays a crucial role (Bley-Vroman, 1986, 1989). Ohta (2001) takes corrective feedback a step further by showing that if the correct form is provided, learners may have the chance to compare their own production with that of another. In this way, corrective feedback may stimulate hypothesis testing, giving the learner the opportunity to grapple with form-meaning relationships. Corrective feedback that does not provide the correct form, on the other hand, may force the learners to utilize their own resources in constructing a reformulation. In either case, corrective feedback may facilitate L2 development. According to Chaudron (1988), the information available in feedback allows the learners to confirm, disconfirm, and possibly modify the hypothetical, transitional rules of their developing grammars. Finally, Schachter (1991), with reference to the above views, points out that it is due to the corrective feedback the learners receive that they abandon their wrong hypotheses and immediately switch to formulating new ones.

According to Ur, ‒The learner needs feedback on how well he or she is doing‖ (Ur, 1996, p. 243). However, in the post-method era, language teaching methodologists are less inclined to be so prescriptive about CF, acknowledging the cognitive contribution it can make while also issuing warnings about the potential affective damage it can do. Ur recognized that ‒there is certainly a place for correction‖ but claimed ‒we should not Ellis Corrective Feedback L2 Journal Vol. 1 (2009) 5 over-estimate this contribution‖ (because it often fails to eliminate errors) and concluded that she would rather invest time in avoiding errors than in correcting them—a position that accords with a behaviorist view of language learning. Other methodologists, however, distinguish between ‒accuracy‖ and ‒fluency‖ work and argue that CF has a place in the former but not in the latter.

Harmer (1983), for example, argued that when students are engaged in communicative activity, the teacher should not intervene by ‒telling students that they are making mistakes, insisting on accuracy and asking for repetition‖ (p. 44). This is a view that is reflected in teachers‛ own opinions about CF (see, for example, Basturkmen, Loewen, & Ellis,

2004). Harmer's advice has the merit of acknowledging that CF needs to be viewed as a contextual rather than as a monolithic phenomenon. However, as we will see later, SLA researchers—especially those working within an interactionist framework (see, for example, the collection of papers in Mackey, 2007)—take a different view, arguing that CF works best when it occurs in context at the time the learner makes the error.

SLA researchers also disagree about the role CF plays in L2 acquisition. Krashen (1982) called error correction ‒a serious mistake‖ (p. 74). He offered two main reasons for this view. First, error correction has the immediate effect of putting the student on the defensive‖ (p. 75) with the result that the learner seeks to eliminate mistakes by avoiding the use of complex constructions. Second, error correction only assists the development of ‒learned knowledge‖ and plays no role in ‒acquired knowledge.‖

Various proposals have been advanced regarding which errors to correct. Corder (1967) distinguished ‒errors‖ and ‒mistakes.‖ An error takes place as a result of lack of knowledge (i.e., it represents a gap in competence). A mistake is a performance phenomenon, reflecting processing failures that arise as a result of competing plans, memory limitations, and lack of automaticity. Burt (1975) suggested that teachers should focus on ‒global‖ rather than ‒local errors.‖ Global errors are errors that affect overall sentence organization. Examples are wrong word order, missing or wrongly placed sentence connectors, and syntactic overgeneralizations. Local errors are errors that affect single elements in a sentence (for example, errors in morphology or grammatical functors). Krashen (1982), as noted above, argued that CF should be limited to features that are simple and portable (i.e., ‒rules of thumb‖). Ferris (1999) similarly suggested that written CF be directed at ‒treatable errors‖ (i.e., errors relating to features that occur in ‒a patterned, rule-governed way‖ (p. 6). Others, including myself (Ellis 1993), have suggested that CF be directed at marked grammatical features or features that learners have shown they have problems with.

Some CF strategies automatically place the burden of correction on the learner—for example, signaling an error by means of a clarification request or by simply repeating the erroneous utterance. In the case of written CF, ‒indirect correction‖ (e.g., indicating the presence of an error without supplying the correct form or using an error-coding system to signal the general category of an error) constitutes a half-way house—the teacher takes on some responsibility for correcting but leaves it up to the individual student to make the actual correction. There is evidence to suggest that prodding the learner to self-correct is effective in promoting acquisition (e.g., Lyster, 2004; Ferris, 2006). There are, however, a number of problems with learner self-correction. First, learners typically prefer the teacher do the correction for them. Second, and more importantly, learners can only self-correct if they possess the necessary linguistic knowledge. That is, in Corer's terms, they can correct their ‒mistakes‖ but not their ‒errors.‖ Other (typically teacher) correction will be necessary to enable learners to identify forms that are not yet part of the interlanguage. Third, although output-prompting CF strategies signal that there is some kind of problem with the learner's utterance, they do not make it clear that the problem is a linguistic one (as opposed to just a communicative one)

Such a system is somewhat crude; however, as it fails to acknowledge the variation that can occur in the performance of a single CF type. Recasts, for example, can take many different forms as Sheen (2006) and Loewen and Philp (2006) have shown. For example, a recast may occur by itself or in combination with another CF strategy; it may or may not include prosodic emphasis on the problematic form; it may be performed with rising intonation (i.e., as a confirmation check) or with falling intonation (i.e., as a statement); it may be partial (i.e., reformulate only the erroneous segment in the learner's utterance) or complete (i.e., reformulate all of it); and it may involve correcting just one or more than one feature. Depending on the particular way the recast is realized, it may be implicit (as in the case of full recasts performed in isolation, as a confirmation check, and without any prosodic emphasis) or much more explicit (as in the case of partial recasts performed in conjunction with

another CF strategy, such as repetition, and as a statement with prosodic emphasis).

1. Recast. The corrector incorporates the content words of the immediately preceding incorrect utterance and changes and corrects the utterance in some way (e.g., phonological, syntactic, morphological or lexical). L: I went there two times. T: You've been. You've been there twice as a group?

2. Repetition. The corrector repeats the learner utterance highlighting the error by means of emphatic stress. L: I will show you. T: I will SHOWED you. L: I'll show you.

3. Clarification request. The corrector indicates that he/she has not understood what the learner said. L: What do you spend with your wife? T: What?

4. Explicit correction. The corrector indicates an error has been committed, identifies the error and provides the correction. L: On May. T: Not on May, In May. We say, ‒It will start in May.‖

5. Elicitation The corrector repeats part of the learner utterance but not the erroneous part and uses rising intonation to signal the learner should complete it. L: I'll come if it will not rain. T: I'll come if it ……?

6. Paralinguistic signal the corrector uses a gesture or facial expression to indicate that the learner has made an error. L: Yesterday I go cinema. T: (gestures with right forefinger over left shoulder to indicate past)

The teacher has to select both the particular strategy to use in response to a learner error and the specific linguistic devices for realizing that strategy. This calls for considerable pragmatic and pragma linguistic competence, and it is likely that teachers Ellis Corrective Feedback L2 Journal Vol. 1 (2009) 10 respond intuitively to particular errors committed by individual students rather than knowingly in accordance with some predetermined error-correction policy. This may explain two general

characteristics of teachers' error correction practices—they are imprecise and inconsistent. Imprecision is evident in the fact that teachers use the same overt behavior (e.g., ‒repetition‖) both to indicate that an error has been made and to reinforce a correct response (Leyster, 1998). Nystrom (1983) commented that ‒teachers typically are unable to sort through the feedback options available to them and arrive at an appropriate response.‖ Inconsistency arises when teachers respond variably to the same error made by different students in the same class, correcting some students and ignoring others. Such inconsistency is not necessarily detrimental, however, for, as Wrights (1975) has pointed out, it may reflect teachers' attempts to cater for individual differences among the students. Edge's (1989) Mistakes and Correction and Mishra's (2005) amendments of Error in English. A wide range of pedagogical practice is reflected in this literature but it is simple and clear that there is an open agreement about what constitutes productive practice.

METHODOLOGY

The research questions of this study posed the problem as to what extent the corrective feedback at secondary English language students in their performance give positive impact if taught and tested using the teaching strategies that are majorly skill- oriented. This study adequately depended on the experimental design as it was framed for this format of research. The study endeavoured to control the effect of many confounding variables as it was necessary for the researcher to employ the experimental research design. This design is also effective in eliminating the effects of external and intervening variables to a great extent. The experimental design in this experimental research was the predictor variable, being the strategic skill-oriented teaching which affected the performance of the treatment group. This performance is also known as the criterion variable.

Random sampling procedure with true experimental design was used in this study with n= 143 (74 experimental samples and 69 control samples) male and female students. Two groups of secondary English language students with initial homogeneity were employed to minimize bias and ensure randomization. The investigator adopted simple random

sampling strategy as the probability of the effect size on both selected sample was unknown and equal for all study participants from population of interest.

A true experimental design in an educational setting focused upon the research participants who were selected randomly in order to study the impact of the treatment. Chance occurrence was what could have caused some difference in the two groups, control and experimental. Sampling error and sampling bias were controlled to a great extent. The true experimental design defined the true characteristics of the cause and effect relationship when the treatment group was given the treatment under the decided conditions and therefore was integral to this research. This design also ensured higher level of internal validity reducing internal threats to validity. The true experimental method of research measured what it was intended to measure. In educational research, when this design is employed, it provides and augments a strong comprehension of the impacts of the treatment upon the group which has been experimented upon.

Procedure

Using standardized essay type test which follows the formats of, the competency of participating secondary English language students was tested. In order to make sure randomization and non-biased impacts upon the control and experimental groups of participants, pre-experiment testing was conducted employing a test of homogenous control variables. The pre- decided treatment was administered to the experimental group for a period of four months as defined by authorities in educational research.

After the experimental group underwent the treatment, the results were compared with the control groups' performance. SPSS paired sample T test was used for ensuring accuracy and the results assisted to test the hypothesis. This procedure informed the investigator whether or not the treatment of corrected feedback language teaching strategy was better than the traditional method of teaching English to secondary school students. Class VI secondary English language students were the target population of the study. The sample was drawn from chartered and recognized

secondary schools in Karachi comprising male and female students. All the students of secondary schools were the target population. Pertinent information was obtained related to corrected feedback teaching and testing strategies through the investigations in the desired direction.

This proposed model was used to assist the teachers of secondary schools offering English language classes to improve their academic capabilities. Along with the data obtained through the experiment i.e essay writing, pre and post test was conducted which focused on the standard operating procedures of the corrective feedback of English language teaching and testing practices. With regards to the impact on secondary English language students' performance, the middle, class VI English language teachers' pedagogic skills, content knowledge, competency, Corrective feedback and testing skills were also analyzed. Secondary English language teachers' pedagogic skills, content knowledge and competency were also studied with regards to their impact on students' motivation and knowledge. Effect of summative and formative assessments in English language competency formed the basis to identify the strength and weaknesses of the two strategies employed by the teachers. Significance level to test the developed hypotheses was set on 0.05. Paired sample t-test, Multi linear Regression Analysis and the Pearson Coefficient of Correlation were used as tools to test the developed hypotheses.

The results acquired through the test administered on experimental group were compared with that of the control group after the treatment. The control group was taught through traditional method, then corrective feedback was given, then posttest was taken with. Prior to the randomization process, the effect of control variables on the two groups was ensured through a pre-test instrumentation process.

Research Instrument

The self-developed research instrument comprised the skill-oriented test with various items focusing various aspects designed by the experts in the field of linguistic testing. The instrument was administered on the experimental group whereas the control group was taught

conventionally. This technique helped ascertain that the two groups were not chosen on prior assumptions and that the pre-test effect obtained through the homogeneity of the participants was not significantly different. The other components of the instrument were essays and observation. Dichotomy, Likert scale, semantic differential scale, multiple choice and rank order scale, open-ended and close-ended questions were used to collect descriptive data. The reliability coefficients were also estimated on these aspects.

Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted with n= 28 secondary students enrolled in the regular English language courses offered at various private secondary schools across the city of Karachi. The study constituted the basic framework to estimate the instrument reliability and validity. Other significant changes were made after the data had been obtained through the pilot study. This was a self-administered recognized test of English language skills.

Instrument Reliability/Validity

The reliability of the essay and observation were ensured prior to administering the entire instrument to the participants. Statistical reliability was estimated through Cronbach Alpha using SPSS v.20. Content validity, criterion validity and construct validity of the instrument was particularly addressed using the techniques advocated by L.R.Gay, an expert in educational research.

Method of Data Collection

Study participants were contacted through a consent-seeking letter after they had been randomly selected for the study. This random sampling method was selected for the reasons that experimental studies are best when done with random samples to avoid research bias to best possible extent. In case of their non-availability, they were contacted through ordered telephone calls and e-mails. Both the groups were asked for their opinion after the treatment. This technique was disguised strategy in which the researchers did not disclose to respondents that the control group was also asked the same questions the same time to ensure that

internal validity threats do not interfere with the results and its generalization. The filled questionnaires were collected from the respondents through e-mails and personal visits.

Incorrectly filled out and late submission of the questionnaires were not granted approval to be included in the data analysis process. The researchers ensured that the minimum rate of return and rate of response were 95%. The questionnaire was personally administered by the investigator and the team trained by the investigator. This process was monitored and evaluated adequately as and when need arose for intervention. During the data collection, it was ensured that the process of data collection was error free and no respondent answered the questionnaire or interview items vaguely. A voice recording system and videotaping strategy was also used with prior notice and permission to ensure that the data collection was bias free. The evidence of students' confidence level, perceived stress, experienced stress, achievement level of the two groups after the treatment was emphasized in the data collection process.

Results and Findings
Hypothesis
There is no significant difference in the writing test score of secondary English language students taught by corrective feedback and those who are not taught by corrective feedback.

Table 1: Writing Test Score of Grade VI Students

Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Writing Score Equal variances assumed	1.318	.252	-2.922	225	.004	-.66193	.22654	-1.10834	-.21552
Equal variances not assumed			-2.935	223.507	.004	-.66193	.22554	-1.10638	-.21747

Levene's test for equality of variance and t-test for equality of means in Table 1 suggest that the test is significant. The F test value reads 1.318 which is significant and so is the t-test value which reads -2.922. The two-tailed independent sample t-test is significant with a mean

difference between the two groups which reads -0.66193. The test significance is also evident from the fact that the upper and lower confidence interval values at 95% significance level is a non-zero value which rejects the probability of equal means.

Conclusion

When secondary English students learn through corrective feedback, they enjoy learning English language more as there are various opportunities to express emotions. Similarly, corrected feedback language teaching strategy is more durable as a teaching method as in conventional settings, teachers seem to dominate the process of teaching and learning entirely through their planned lectures. The other glaring findings drawn through this research was that in corrected feedback secondary English language class, students also get to written various types of native and non-natives of English and express feelings at the end of every writing comprehension exercise.

On the other hand, in a corrected feedback lesson, secondary students work in pairs and groups to discuss various events when the teacher arranges an activity for written communication. This opportunity is denied otherwise in conventional lecture-based and translation-based teaching practices. The study also concludes that class VI English students enjoy different forms of writing exercises in groups and pairs. . This opportunity is denied in conventional lecture based teaching methodology. The other significant conclusion drawn from the study is that there is prominent difference seen writing possible in this form of teaching English language with corrective feedback mechanism.

References

Van Beuningen, C. (2010). Corrective feedback in L2 writing: Theoretical perspectives,empirical insights, and future directions. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10 (2), 1-27.

Al-Bakri, S. (2015). Written corrective feedback: Teachers[1] beliefs, practices and challenges in an Omani context, *Arab Journal*

Aljaafreh, A. & Lantolf, J.P. (1994). Negative feedback as regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development. *Modern Language Journal, 78* (4), 465–483.

Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/328585

Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9* (3), 227–257. doi:10.1016/S1060-3743(00)00027-8

Bacha, N. N. (2002). Developing learners' academic writing skills in higher education: A study for educational reform. *Language and Education*, *16*(3), 161-177.

Bacha, N. N. (2002). Developing learners' academic writing skills in higher education: A study for educational reform. *Language and Education*, *16*(3), 161-177.

Cole, J., & Feng, J. (2015). Effective Strategies for Improving Writing Skills of Elementary English Language Learners. Online Submission.

Gronlund (2000). *How to write and use language instructional objectives.* (6th Ed.). Prentice Hall. NJ.

Hartman, H. J. (Ed.). (2001). *Metacognition in learning and instruction: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Springer.

Johnstone, K. M., Ashbaugh, H., & Warfield, T. D. (2002). Effects of repeated practice and contextual-writing experiences on college students' writing skills. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *94*(2), 305.

Malik, F (2009). *The Teaching of English in Pakistan*. Lahore: Vanguard.

Olson, C. B., & Land, R. (2007). A cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for English language learners in secondary school. Research in the Teaching of English, 269-303.

Oxford, R. L., & Cohen, A. D. (1992). Language Learning Strategies: Crucial Issues of Concept and Classification. *Applied Language Learning*, *3*, 1-35.

Pintrich, Paul R. (2002). The Role of metacognitive knowledge in learning, teaching, and assessing.Theory into Practice, 41(4). 219-225.

Rahman, T. (1999). Language, Education and Culture. Karachi: Oxford University Press. Rao, Z. (2007). Training in brainstorming and developing writing skills. *ELT journal*, *61*(2), 100-106.

Schellekens, P., & Berry, V. (2013) Setting standards for professional and academic contexts Siegel, J. (2013). Second language learners' perceptions of listening strategy instruction. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 7(1), 1-18

Shamim, F. (2009) *Linguistic inequalities in Pakistan: Texts, contexts and identities*. Karachi University Press. Karachi

Shamim, F. (2011). English as the language for development in Pakistan: Issues, challenges and possible solutions. *Dreams and realities: Developing countries and the English language*, 291-310

Skehan, P. (1991). Individual differences in second language learning. *Studies in second language acquisition*, *13*(02), 275-298