

Investigating Teachers' Attitudes towards Peer Feedback Use in EFL Writing Classes: Case Study of Bejaia Secondary Schools, Algeria

Assia Feroudj^{1*}, Mouloud Ait Aissa²

¹ University of Bejaia (Algeria), assia.feroudj@univ-bejaia.dz.

² University of Sétif 2 (Algeria), aitaissamouloud7@gmail.com.

Submission Date 21/02/2022 Acceptance date 05/06/2022 Published date 20/07/2022

Abstract:

Research on English Foreign Language (EFL) writing proved that peer feedback could help learners develop their writing performance. The purpose of this case study is to explore secondary school teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes. The study also explores teachers' real classroom practices in teaching the writing instruction. The subjects were 46 EFL teachers from different secondary schools in Bejaia, Algeria. A quantitative method approach was adopted using a questionnaire as an instrument of data collection. The Cognitive Affective and Conative (CAC) model of attitudes by Schiffman & Kanuk (2004) in Jain (2014) was also employed in the teachers' attitudes analysis. The results of this case study showed teachers' positive attitudes towards peer feedback use in the EFL writing classroom. However, some hindrances preventing peer feedback frequent use were exposed. The study concluded that teachers are aware of peer feedback usefulness in EFL writing classes, but some factors could prevent its full implementation.

Keywords: teachers' attitudes, peer feedback use, EFL writing, Bejaia secondary schools.

1. Introduction

One of the most difficult skills to learn by EFL learners is the writing skill. In the Algerian context, many secondary school students are unable to display their ability to write meaningful expressions. Besides, they make multiple errors. Many teachers as well, encounter difficulties in teaching writing instructions. The current research intends to investigate secondary school teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in the writing classes. The study also explores the nature of teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in order to be more aware of their thoughts. Furthermore; teachers' views on the importance of peer feedback in enhancing students' writing performance are considered. To begin with, three major concepts should be discussed respectively: attitudes, feedback, and writing.

Fishbein & Ajzen (1975) stated that attitude consists of four main categories: "affect, cognition, conation" and behavior (p.12). According to them, affect refers to feelings, cognition indicates thoughts, beliefs, or knowledge, however conation relates to behavioral intentions. The fourth category which is behavior represents the "observed overt act". Later, it was reported in Jain (2014) that an attitude constitutes only of three components: cognitive, affective and conative (Schiffman & Kanuk, 2004). Schiffman and Kanuk's (2004) Cognitive, Affective, Conative (CAC) Model is selected to be the basis of attitudes analysis in the findings. The choice of the CAC

* The sender author. ¹LESMS Laboratory, ²LTECAL Laboratory.

Model was founded on the way three main components (cognitive, affective, and conative) could join to make an attitude about a person or a thing. In this case, teachers' knowledge, feelings, and behaviors could affect teachers' attitudes positively or negatively towards peer feedback use in the writing classes.

Concerning feedback, it is commonly referred to as advice, criticism or information about how good or useful something or somebody's work is ; this being said, feedback could be described as an umbrella term which denotes multiple meanings. In the same context, feedback "consists of assigning students to groups of two, three, or four who exchange completed first drafts and give comments on each others' work before they revise them" (Hyland, 2003, p.200). Furthermore, Ho (2015) noted that peer review "involves learners working in groups commenting on one another's writing, and it serves as a source of feedback that supplements teachers' comments" (p.1). Again, Ho (2015) added that peer review could express, interpret, and negotiate meaning throughout collaboration (p.1). Black and William (1999) suggested that "feedback is a key feature of formative assessment" cited in (Atik Zid, 2015, p.72). Based on these previous definitions, peer review (feedback) then is a formative assessment; it is also a learning process done in pairs, small groups and it involves discussion, interpretation, and negotiation of meaning.

Previous studies in the field of EFL writing have distinguished between different types of feedback (Hyland & Hyland, 2019). Teacher feedback and peer feedback are the most common types. Teacher feedback or corrective feedback occurs when teachers comment on, correct, respond to or evaluate the works of students. The feedback could be provided orally or in a written form. Peer feedback however carries multiple labels. The most frequently used terms referring to it consist of peer response, peer review, peer assessment, peer editing, peer interaction, and peer collaboration (Yu & Lee, 2016). The current study opted to use the term peer feedback in its investigation because the focus is on writing as a social phenomenon which requires commenting and negotiating meaning more than evaluating or assessing.

With this in mind, the writing skill is far more complex to learn because it needs much more cognitive skills. Currently and according to Widiati and Cahyono (2006), three views to writing exist which are product view, process view, and social view (p. 141). For the researchers who consider writing as a product, they define it as "a way of communicating which uses a system of visual marks made on some kind of surface. It is one kind of graphic expression" (Crystal, 2006) as cited in (Atik Zid, 2015, p. 257). This is the old view towards writing. Researchers in the field were first interested in writing as a final product not as a whole process which requires going through many stages to achieve the final product. However, research has recently shifted from product approach to process approach. Writing in this view is regarded as " a recursive process involving planning, writing, and reviewing and thus usually involves production of multiple drafts" (Widiati & Cahyono,

2006, p. 141). Algeria has officially recognized process approach in the teaching of writing only after the changes made in education in 2003 (Atik Zid, 2015, p.65). As a third view to writing, Hyland (2015) stated “Writing is a social act, and to understand it fully we must go beyond the decisions of individual writers to explore the regular features of texts as the preferences of particular communities” (p.25).

The present study then seeks to investigate the realities of teaching writing in EFL classes by conducting a careful analysis of secondary school teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, and views towards peer feedback use. It is motivated by a number of factors. Firstly, secondary school learners are unable to perform well in writing. They get low scores in official writing exams. Secondly, teachers consider writing a challenging skill to be taught. Thirdly, teaching writing under peer feedback approach has not received much attention by researchers. The study addresses the following questions:

1. What are teachers’ attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes?
2. What are the factors which may influence teachers’ attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes?

2. Literature review

The present section is an account of the main studies conducted in the field of attitudes, peer feedback, and writing. It is divided into three parts; and a chronological order is followed.

2.1. Attitudes

Ulug, Ozden & Eryilmaz (2011) conducted research about the effects of teachers’ attitudes on students’ personality and performance. The study was carried out on 353 students enrolled from different departments of Istanbul Kultur University and Maltepe University. The findings concluded that teachers’ positive attitudes affected positively students’ personality development and performance; however, negative attitudes had adverse effects on students’ personality as well as performance level. This study then demonstrated that the student teacher relationship was sensitive to affection. Thus, students’ success in both personal and academic life was predominantly connected to positive or negative attitudes of their teachers in all levels.

Atik Zid (2015) investigated the attitudes of Algerian secondary school teachers of El-Oued towards peer feedback and its usefulness in improving students' writing skills in English. 113 secondary school teachers from El-Oued were the subjects of the study. The findings revealed that a vast majority of teachers kept negative attitudes towards peer feedback. Additionally, they even questioned its positive effect on improving students writing skills. Consequently, the teachers avoided using peer feedback in their teaching of writing. Even so, the researcher observed a number of teachers ready to implement this approach in their writing classes. This remarkable change in teachers’ attitudes emerged after raising their awareness about the utility of peer feedback in improving students’ writing skill.

Gómez, Hernández, and Perales (2019) conducted a case study at a university in southern Mexico. It aimed at characterizing EFL teachers’ attitudes towards oral corrective feedback. They employed a model which

integrates the cognitive, affective and conative components of attitude from Schiffman and Kanuk's attitude model (2004) with Jain's 3D (Three-Dimension) model of attitude. The latter is based on the various combinations of cognitive, affective, and conative components of attitude. Isolated, the components could be either positive or negative. Therefore, their combination could form "a different state of attitude" (Jain, 2014, p.7). They reported in their investigation that all the interviewed participants (six EFL teachers) preferred to use implicit corrective feedback strategies rather than explicit ones. That was because the teachers in question focused more on considering the feelings and ignoring the cognition of their students in their feedback provision. The research however suggested a need for more theory-based corrective feedback and practice.

Considering the available literature, research on secondary school teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback in writing is not investigated by many Algerian authors; Atik Zid's (2015) case study about teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback in EFL writing classes was the only investigation we could find in the Algerian context. Additionally, no similar studies were conducted recently in Bejaia area; that's why we attempted to explore and analyze secondary school teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes.

2.2. Peer Feedback

Yang, Badger and Yu (2006) provided a comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing classes. Students were divided into two classes; a teacher feedback class of 41 students, and a peer feedback class of 38 students. The students of the former class practiced teacher feedback while those of the latter class practiced peer feedback. The data collected from interviews, video recordings, and questionnaires showed that students used both peer and teacher feedback to enhance their writing. Despite that, teacher feedback was more frequently used in comparison to peer feedback. The researcher concluded that peer feedback is complementary with teacher feedback and it should be used under the right conditions to be beneficial.

Moussaoui Samira (2012) investigated the effects of peer evaluation on promoting EFL students' writing autonomy and their positive affect. The study was conducted on second-year undergraduate EFL students at Setif University, Algeria. The results obtained showed that the target population demonstrated positive attitudes towards peer feedback; thus, an increase in the writing autonomy, and a decrease in writing apprehension was observed.

Yu and Lee (2016) paper, peer feedback in second language writing (2005–2014), is a review of the major studies recently done in the field of peer feedback between 2005 and 2014. Yu and Lee (2016) asserted that research on peer feedback was initiated in ESL contexts; however, a number of recent studies investigated peer feedback in EFL contexts as well. Thus, various studies tried to prove the effectiveness of peer feedback in improving EFL writing quality; nevertheless, its full implementation in EFL contexts seemed challenging due to many reasons. One challenge as cited in the

review is that teacher feedback is considered more reliable than peer feedback in EFL contexts. Another challenge is the use of L1 or L2 in peer commenting activities since the use of L3 in peer comments in EFL contexts may be challenging for EFL students with limited language knowledge (Hyland & Hyland, 2006) cited in (Yu & Lee, 2016).

Kaya, Ateş, Yıldırım, and Rasinski (2020) studied the effect of feedback on Turkish fourth-grade elementary school students' fluent writing skills. Although this study was conducted in elementary level, the results showed that feedback impacts students' fluent writing skills positively. This study was conducted on 42 public fourth grade elementary school students in Turkey's Ankara province. The students were divided into two groups of 21, control and experimental groups. The research took two months to achieve. It went through three main phases. The findings showed that the experimental group posttest scores were better than those of control group posttest scores. The findings also showed that teacher's oral or written feedback on students' story writing activities proved to be more effective in enhancing their writing skills. That could be explained through the scores of the experimental group posttest which were higher than those of control group posttest. Finally, this study concluded that students require teacher's written or oral feedback in order to enhance their fluent writing skills.

Most investigations conducted on peer feedback approach to writing were conducted at university level. We focused on EFL studies. More precisely, we selected countries where English is a foreign language like in Algeria, China, Turkey, Mexico, and Arab world. In Algeria, Moussaoui (2012) dealt with peer review at university level. Other than this, no similar work was done at the secondary school level in addition to Atik Zid (2015) study on attitudes.

2.3. Writing

Rabehi Salima (2012) in her paper, Measures of eliminating EFL students' errors in writing, she attempted to identify the main factors hindering EFL students' writing skill and tried to find out more effective ways to overcome those obstacles and improve their writing skill. A questionnaire was designed and administered to 25 teachers of the English Department at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra, Algeria. Another questionnaire was addressed to 60 students of different levels at the same department. The data collected from the questionnaires served as a source of information about students' awareness of writing importance, their motivation to write in English, and the way they correct their errors. Observation of students' writings was used as a second research tool of data collection. The findings showed that students' lack of background knowledge in English, lack of practice, and low motivation are the main factors preventing students to write more effectively. Based on these results together with teachers' views and experiences, the paper suggested some measures that should be taken into consideration to achieve the targeted goal. Among the suggested measures, students should be encouraged to write more frequently. They should also be provided with immediate feedback and guided to peer correction.

Melouk Mohamed and Merbouh Zouaoui (2014) worked on EFL writing

hindrances and challenges. The subjects were 80 second year EFL students from Djillali Liabes University of Sidi Belabes, Algeria. Data was collected by means of two tools: The corpus from former "Baccalaureate" results of English exam papers, and the observation of students' writing tests and assignments. The final results showed that students faced challenges in expressing meaning correctly using the target language. These challenges were mainly demonstrated in the wrong use of words, absence of idiomatic expressions, sentence components wrong placement, wrong connectives use, and lack of coherence.

Adjeroud Safia and Belouahem Riad (2020) investigated secondary school teachers' opinions about the teaching of writing under Competency-Based Approach (CBA). For this, they designed a questionnaire to eighty-three (83) secondary school teachers of English in Jijel, Algeria. They selected teachers of second year level as subjects of their study. The results of the investigation revealed some contradictions between teachers' views and their classroom teaching realities. Based on these findings, the researchers concluded that the teaching of writing does not totally agree with the principles of CBA. It must be mentioned that teaching EFL under CBA approach in Algerian secondary schools is highly recommended. Even so, research in the field showed that, Belouahem (2008) - Adjeroud and Belouahem (2020), teachers do not really stick to it in their writing classrooms.

To cover this section, the study resorted to conceptual analysis of the available literature in the field along with the chronological order of previous research conducted in the same context of teachers' attitudes, peer feedback, and writing skill. In this light, the paper seeks to explore secondary school teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes.

3. Methods

This section deals with the research methodology. It contains a detailed explanation of the research design, the research setting, the methods and the techniques used for the selection of the sample, data collection and data analysis procedures.

3.1. Research Design

According to Creswell (2014) "Research designs are types of inquiry within qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches" (p.12); in the similar context, Kothari, (2004) defined a research design as "a plan that specifies the sources and types of information relevant to the research problem. It is a strategy specifying which approach will be used for gathering and analyzing the data. It also includes the time and cost budgets since most studies are done under these two constraints" (p.32). Kothari (2004) added that the selection of the research design depends on the purpose of research "exploration, description, diagnosis, and experimentation" (p.14). The purpose of the present study is to examine and understand teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in the writing classroom. On this basis, it could be classified under exploratory research type because ideas and insights discovery constitute the basis of such inquiry.

In this sense, research questions of the present study could be answered by any research design, but for this specific research it is expected that case study design could best answer them. The reason of choosing case study design is that these kinds of designs focus more on exploring and understanding rather than on confirming and quantifying (Kumar, 2018). Griffiee (2012) referring to Yin (2000) stated that “a case study must have three aspects, which can serve as a definition: it must have data from multiple sources, examine something in a real-life context, and use theory to generalize results” (p.97). Sources of data collection in the present study include teachers from different secondary schools; the study also attempts to examine the attitudes of teachers in real life teaching context. Moreover, it attempts to use the obtained data to understand the case in its totality. “A case” here is identified as a group of ‘46’ teachers” selected from ‘280’ entire population of English secondary school teachers in Bejaia. However, the main limitation of case study design lies in the difficulty or the impossibility of generalizing the finding of the study (Kumar, 2018).

3.2. Research Setting

The study in hand is carried out in Bejaia secondary schools of Algeria, and during the first two weeks of January 2022.

3.3. Population and Sample Selection Procedures

Sampling means choosing members of the population to participate in research (Dörnyei, 2003), in the end of investigation, findings will be projected on that population (Levy & Lemeshow, 2008). In other words, “The sample is the group of people whom researchers actually examine and the population is the group of people whom the survey is about” (Dörnyei, 2003, p.70). According to this, English secondary school teachers of Bejaia were selected as the population; the entire sampling frame includes 280 English teachers working in 62 secondary schools. For this quantitative study, the researcher decided to use simple random sampling. This type of sampling is better in saving time, in giving the population an equal chance to be selected to participate in the study and in making the research more objective. Forty six (46) secondary school teachers were randomly selected as subjects. The participants were 36 females and 10 males. Their age varied from 25 to 50. Some of the selected teachers responded online and some others were handed the questionnaires in paper format. The teachers took two weeks to respond. The participants were not homogenous concerning years of teaching experience, this variable of teaching experience varied from 1 to more than 20 years; the fact which may add more different insights to the research findings. All the subjects agreed to participate voluntary in this research; the selected sample consists of full time permanent teachers exercising in different public secondary schools of Bejaia, Algeria.

3.4. Data Collection Procedures

Quantitative data was required in this case study, and a questionnaire was used as a technique of data collection. It was administered either online or in paper format. The purpose from this was to reach more respondents and generalize the findings to the whole population. The data collected through questionnaires was analyzed statistically using IBM SPSS statistics 26.

4. Results

Data was collected through questionnaires in the first two weeks of January 2022. A total of 50 responses were received. We excluded 4 responses because the respondents were not eligible as subjects in the study, either for their age, or for their geographical location. The questionnaire contained 16 items divided into three sections. The first section contains teachers' profiles information. The second section examines teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use. The third section investigates factors affecting teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use. Two forms of question are used in the questionnaire; including two open ended questions and 14 closed questions. The closed questions were multiple choice questions and attitude measurement questions using Likert scale. The following contains a description and an explanation of the findings:

4.1. Section One: Teachers' Profiles

The first section seeks background information about teachers' gender, age, years of teaching experience, and name of the secondary school they work in.

4.1.1. Teachers' Gender

Table 1. Teachers' gender

Teachers' Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	10	21,7 %
Female	36	78,3 %
Total	46	100 %

In this table, the gender distribution of the teachers is displayed. There are thirty six (36) female teachers with a percentage of (78, 3 %) representing a wide majority of the research sample. On the other hand, data shows a number of ten (10) male teachers with a percentage of 21, 7% of the research sample.

4.1.2. Teachers' Ages

Table 2. Teachers' ages

Teachers' Ages	Frequency	Percentage
25-30	7	15,2%
31-35	12	26,1%
36-40	19	41,3%
41-44	2	4,3%
45+	6	13%
Total	46	100%

This table above shows teachers' ages in frequencies and rates. Their ages were classified into five (5) categories of age range. From a total of 46 teachers, seven (7) teachers aged between 25 and 30 represented 15, 2 % of the participants. Twelve (12) teachers whose ages ranged from 31 to 35 represented 26,1 % of the participants, and those between 36 and 40 represented 41,3 %, that is nineteen (19) teachers. Only two (2) teachers were aged between 41 and 44 representing only 4,3 % of the participants. Finally, six (6) teachers with a percentage of 13% were more than 45 years old. The second and third categories of age range [31-35]-[36-40] are remarkably

higher than the three other categories, meaning that 31 teachers out of 46 aged between 31 and 40 constituted the majority of the participants with 67,4%. This fact indicates that most teachers are in the middle of their carriers, assuming they could clearly reflect on their teaching experiences.

4.1.3. Teaching Experience

Table 3. Teaching experiences

Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1-5 Years	12	26,1%
6-10 Years	11	23,9%
11-15 Years	14	30,4%
16-20 Years	6	13%
20+	3	6,5%
Total	46	100%

The table above shows five (5) categories of teaching experiences in years. This professional experience varied between 1 to more than 20 years. Twelve (12) teachers out of 46 had from 1 to 5 years of teaching experience with a percentage of 26,1%. Eleven (11) teachers with 6 to 10 years of teaching experience represented 23,9% of the participants. Fourteen (14) teachers with a percentage of 30,4% represented those whose teaching experience ranged between 11 to 15 years; they constituted the highest number of the participants. Moreover, there were six (6) teachers with a percentage of 13% of the participants; their teaching experience is aligned between 16 to 20 years. The results also indicated that there were only three (3) teachers, i.e. 6,5% of the participants, whose teaching experience was more than 20 years. Thirty seven (37) teachers belonging to the first three categories constitute the majority of participants.

4.1.4. Name of the Schools

This case study was conducted in different secondary schools of Bejaia. The 46 respondents were randomly selected from (17) different secondary schools which are: Mohamed Bachir Boumaaza secondary school, Soumani Mahmoud secondary school, Laboirdi lakhder secondary school, Late Mujahid Hocine Ait Ahmed secondary school, Khaled Messaoud secondary school, Abane Remdane secondary school, krim Belkacem secondary school, Amara Ali secondary school, Kadi Athmane secondary school, Chouhada Zennache Secondary school, Cheikh Asie El Haddad secondary school, Boudries Laarbi secondary school, Amalou secondary school, Mohand Chrif secondary school, Adekar New secondary school, Timezrit secondary school, and Akfadou secondary school.

4.2. Section Two: Teachers' Attitudes Towards Peer Feedback Use

As an attempt to answer the first research question, (What are teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use?). This section describes how much teachers agree or disagree with the statements. The table below summarizes teachers' responses to six different statements in frequencies and percentages.

Table 4. Frequency and percentage (%) distribution of teachers' attitudes

Statements		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
	<i>F</i>	1	1	6	19	19

- Investigating Teachers' Attitudes towards Peer Feedback Use in EFL Writing Classes: Case Study of Bejaia Secondary Schools, Algeria-

<i>1. peer feedback use could positively affect students' writing performance</i>	%	2,2%	2,2%	13%	41,3%	41,3%
<i>2. peer feedback is useful in English writing classes</i>	F	0	1	4	20	21
	%	0%	2,2%	8,7%	43,5%	45,7%
<i>3. peer feedback in writing needs to be implemented explicitly</i>	F	2	4	8	21	11
	%	4,3%	8,7%	17,4%	45,7%	23,9%
<i>4. peer feedback in writing is more effective when given immediately</i>	F	5	5	6	15	15
	%	10,9%	10,9%	13%	32,6%	32,6%
<i>5. peer feedback develops students' critical thinking skills and autonomy</i>	F	0	2	2	21	21
	%	0%	4,3%	4,3%	45,7%	45,7%
<i>6. peer feedback empowers students' social interaction ability</i>	F	1	1	3	11	30
	%	2,2	2,2	6,5	23,9	65,2

4.2.1. Peer feedback use could positively affect students' writing performance

Table (4) demonstrates that 38 teachers agree or strongly agree on the fact that students' writing performance could be positively affected by peer feedback, which makes a total of 82,6% of the participants. In contrast, only 2 teachers out of 46 were against the statement, that is to say 4,4% of the participants. Six other participants were undecided with a percentage of 13%. These results show that teachers have positive intentions about the possibility of integrating peer feedback in their writing classroom because they think this could develop students writing performance and bring positive results.

4.2.2. Peer feedback is useful in English writing classes

Numbers in table (4) indicate that the vast majority of participants (41) have agreed about peer feedback usefulness in English writing classes. This means that 89,2% of the respondents have positive attitude towards peer feedback. Other than this, only one (1) participant disagreed with the statement with a percentage of 2,2%. And 4 participants were neutral with a percentage of 8,7%.

4.2.3. Peer feedback in writing needs to be implemented explicitly

This statement was intended to identify teachers' views about peer feedback implementation mode. According to the findings, more than half of the participants (32) answered positively; that is a total of 69,6% teachers agreed that peer feedback should be implemented explicitly. In contrast, 13% of the participants representing (6) teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed about the statement. The other 17,4% of the participants remained uncertain representing a number of (8) teachers.

4.2.4. Peer feedback in writing is more effective when given immediately

This statement was meant to determine teachers' opinions about peer feedback effectiveness; whether they believe feedback could be more effective when it is provided immediately during the writing process or when it is delayed i.e. after the writing process. According to the findings, (15) teachers agree that peer feedback in writing is more effective when given immediately, also (15) other teachers strongly agree on the statement. That is a total of 30 teachers who agreed with the statement. This number represents 65,2% of the participants. Only 13% of the participants were undetermined representing a number of 6 teachers. Finally, a percentage of 21, 8 % of the participants (i.e.10 teachers) disagreed with the statement.

4.2.5. Peer feedback develops students' critical thinking skills and autonomy

This inquiry aimed at measuring the extent to which teachers think that peer feedback develops students' critical thinking skills and autonomy. The findings show that nearly all participants (i.e.42 teachers) agreed with the statement; that means 91,4 % of the participants had positive attitudes about the statement. Only two (2) participants disagreed with the statement making of that only 4,3%. The other 4,3% of the participants were uncertain.

4.2.6. Peer feedback empowers students' social interaction ability

This statement reflects teachers' beliefs about whether or not peer feedback helps increase students' social interaction ability. Thirty (30) participants strongly agreed with the statement, and (11) others just agreed; this makes a total number of forty one (41) teachers who think that peer feedback could promote students' social interaction ability, this totality represents 89,1% of the participants. The disagreement rate was 4,4% representing two (2) teachers. Finally, 6,5% of the participants selected the neutral option representing only three (3) teachers.

4.3. Section Three: Factors Affecting Teachers' Attitudes towards Peer Feedback Use

This section exposes some important factors affecting teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes; the findings will answer the second research question.

Table 4. Frequency and percentage (%) distribution of Factors affecting teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use

<i>Statements</i>		<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
<i>1. teachers' positive attitudes affect positively students' learning performance and vice versa</i>	F	0	0	1	9	36
	%	0%	0%	2,2%	19,6%	78,3%
<i>2. teachers lack of theoretical and practical knowledge in peer feedback could affect its use in the writing classroom</i>	F	0	1	5	20	20
	%	0%	2,2%	10,9%	43,5%	43,5%
<i>3. students low self-confidence as feedback providers prevents peer feedback implementation in the writing classroom</i>	F	2	4	10	14	16
	%	4,3%	8,7%	21,7%	30,4%	34,8%
<i>4. students' preference of teacher feedback over peer feedback blocks peer feedback use in the writing classrooms</i>	F	1	5	11	17	12
	%	2,2%	10,9%	23,9%	37%	26,1%
<i>5. time distribution is not sufficient to practice peer feedback in the writing classroom</i>	F	1	4	1	12	28
	%	2,2%	8,7%	2,2%	26,1%	60,9%

4.3.1. Teachers' positive attitudes affect positively students' learning performance and vice versa

This statement was intended to discover teachers' opinions about whether or not teachers' positive attitudes affect positively students' learning performance in general and whether or not the other way reversed is possible (i.e. teachers' negative attitudes affect negatively students' learning performance). Remarkably, 0 % percent of the participants disagreed with the statement. This means that apart from one (1) neutral option with a percentage of 2,2%, 97, 9% of the participants agreed, or strongly agreed with the statement; they represent a number of forty five (45) teachers out of 46.

4.3.2. Teachers lack of theoretical and practical knowledge in peer feedback could affect its use in the writing classroom

The objective of this statement was to rate participants' degrees of agreement with the fact that teachers' lack of theoretical and practical knowledge about peer feedback could affect its use in the writing classroom. The results showed that 87% of the participants (i.e. 40 teachers) agreed with the statement. The results also show that only one respondent with 2,2% disagreed with the statement. In addition to this, 10,9% of the participants stayed neutral.

4.3.3. Students low self-confidence as feedback providers prevents peer

feedback implementation in the writing classroom

This statement describes whether or not students' low self-confidence as feedback providers prevents teachers from using peer feedback in the writing classroom. As perceived by teachers, thirty (30) participants agreed with the statement, their agreement rate was 65, 2%. Also, a considerable number of participants (10 teachers, i.e. 21,7%) were undecided. Moreover, 13% of the participants represented a disagreement rate.

4.3.4. Students' preference of teacher feedback over peer feedback blocks peer feedback use in the writing classrooms

Students' preference of teacher feedback over peer feedback prevents peer feedback use in the writing classrooms. This inquiry exposes teachers' views and opinions as follows: Almost the majority of the participants with a percentage of 63,1%, meaning a number of twenty nine (29) teachers, agreed that students preference of teachers feedback could hinder peer feedback use in the writing classroom. Remarkably, 23,9% of them were undecided representing a number of eleven (11) teachers. And the remaining 13,1% of the participants disagreed with the statement (i.e. 6 participants were against the idea).

4.3.5. Time distribution is not sufficient to practice peer feedback in the writing classroom

The aim behind this statement is to demonstrate teachers' attitudes towards the factor of time and whether it could influence or not the use of peer feedback in the writing classroom. According to the graph above, the vast majority of participants agreed with the statement. Only 2,2% of participants were neutral and 10,9% disagreed representing only 5 teachers.

4.4. Teachers' suggestions and recommendations

To end up the questionnaire, an open ended question was used in order to let the teachers express themselves freely about their attitudes towards peer feedback use and students' writing performance. Answers on this question revealed that most teachers have positive attitudes about the use of peer feedback in the writing classroom; additionally, most of them are not satisfied with students writing performance in general. For example one respondent said: "Peer feedback is useful and should be implemented in the syllabus". Always in the same topic, another respondent stated: ***"I notice that learners appreciate peer feedback, it's very helpful and useful for developing the writing performance, but the time distribution does not allow that. Another problem with the learners' feedback is the learners' low self confidence"***. This quote means that teachers' are conscious about peer feedback effectiveness, but lack of time and students' low confidence is what makes its implementation more difficult. Another respondent, added:

"As a teacher of English I find that 3 hours or 4 hours a week for this international language is not enough. In order to teach English well we need more time and more motivation from the learners. When it comes to writing, most pupils get weak marks in their compositions. This is the result of the ineffectiveness of the method and the resources". This participant raised important issues in the teaching of writing instruction which are methods and resources. Again, the respondent judges that the methods of

teaching writing are ineffective and the resources are inadequate; that's why students are unmotivated to perform well in writing and get low scores in their examinations. Some suggested practical solutions; others suggested theoretical ones in order to help promote students' writing performance teachers may consider these suggestions:

“Extra reading sessions should be implemented to improve students' writing skills”.

“Peer feedback can better function with small classes and it needs time and practice”.

“Peer feedback strategy is more convenient with third year classes”.

In brief, data gathered through questionnaires was analyzed and interpreted. Throughout the analysis, the researcher has used quantitative method of data analysis. At the first level of analysis, the researcher presented the findings in tables of frequencies, and rates. In the second step, the researcher described and analysed those findings. In the third step, the researcher attempted to give interpretations of the obtained results.

5. Discussion

The purpose of this section is to provide a discussion of the quantitative main findings presented previously in relation to the available literature; that is, show how these results approve or disapprove previous studies. It also aims at stating whether or not these results provided answers to the research questions proposed by the researcher. The most significant findings are as follows:

Section two of the questionnaire was designed to determine the nature of teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes. To begin with, 82,6% of the participants agreed that peer feedback use could positively affect students' writing performance which means that a vast majority of teachers accepted the idea and have positive views about the integration of peer feedback in their writing classroom practices. Also, 89,2% of the respondents have answered positively; they believe that peer feedback is useful in EFL writing classes; however, this result contradicts Atik Zid's (2015) findings, where most teachers' 69.03 % rejected the idea that peer feedback is a useful technique in EFL writing classes. It is worth mentioning that; place and time of the two studies were different. In addition to that, students were lately reduced into small groups of 15 to 20 in each class due to the Sanitary Crisis of Covid 19; maybe this situation helped to practice peer feedback in the classroom. This contradictory result proved the impossibility of generalizing case study results.

Besides, 69,6% of teachers agreed that peer feedback should be implemented explicitly. These findings go against Gómez, Hernández, & Perales (2019) case study findings who reported in their investigation done on six EFL university teachers' that corrective feedback needs to be implemented implicitly taking into consideration students' feelings in order to avoid their frustration . However, in our case study, teachers preferred explicit peer feedback perhaps because the feedback provided here is from student to student. They think that giving feedback explicitly could be more beneficial. In addition to this, peer feedback and teacher corrective feedback

are two different kinds of feedback and their implementation procedures should be different as well. Furthermore, 65,2% of the participants accepted the thought that peer feedback in writing is more effective when given immediately; this rate represented more than half of the sample. It means that the majority of teachers are against delaying peer feedback comments to a later time. Over and above, 91,4 % of the participants had positive attitudes about the statement "peer feedback develops students' critical thinking skills and autonomy". These results conform to those found by Moussaoui (2012) in terms of promoting students' critical thinking skills and writing autonomy. More than that, 89,1% of the participants think that peer feedback could promote students' social interaction ability. These results again seem to be similar to those found by Moussaoui (2012) in terms of promoting students' social interaction and reducing their apprehensions about writing. Therefore, on the basis of what was found, Abdelhamid M. Ahmed (2020) claimed "In Algeria students interacted socially during the peer evaluation process and exhibited positive attitudes towards peer feedback" (p.5). We could admit that these results have clearly provided answers to our first research question. So, teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes are positive.

However, there are some factors which may influence teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes. Section three of the questionnaire attempted to identify those factors and give answers to the second research question. According to the findings, 97, 9% of the participants agreed that teachers' positive attitudes affect positively students' learning performance and vice versa. This result is a confirmation of Ulug, Ozden & Eryilmaz (2011) findings which concluded that the affective factor is very important in a student-teacher relationship and thus it affects learning performance positively or negatively. Accordingly, 65, 2% of the participants agreed with the statement that students' low self-confidence as feedback providers prevents peer feedback implementation in the writing classroom. These findings are similar to those of Gómez, Hernández, & Perales (2019), in which teachers give more consideration to students' affective side more than their cognitive side. Also, 63,1%, agreed that students preference of teachers feedback could hinder peer feedback use in the writing classroom. This result corresponds to Yu & Lee (2016) findings in their review of the major studies recently done in the field of peer feedback between 2005 and 2014 that teacher feedback is considered more reliable than peer feedback in EFL writing contexts which is a challenging situation.

The results also showed that 87% of the participants agreed with the statement which assumes that teachers' lack of theoretical and practical knowledge about peer feedback could affect its use in the writing classroom. This outcome confirmed Jain's (2014) statement that attitude can directly predict behavior (p.2); for example, if someone's attitude is negative towards a specific thing or object no matter how good it is, s/he may develop a specific behavior towards it. Just like a teacher who has a limited or no knowledge about peer feedback as a technique in teaching writing might avoid using it

in the classroom. In this case, not using peer feedback in the language classroom might be an action or a behavior resulted from teacher's negative attitude towards this technique. So, cognitive component of attitude could affect teachers' use of peer feedback in the writing classroom. Similarly, the conative factor (behavior) could play a role in influencing peer feedback use in EFL writing classroom as explained in this same example. Furthermore, 87% of the participants agreed on the fact that time distribution is not sufficient to practice peer feedback in the writing classroom.

As illustrated above, this case study revealed that cognitive affective and conative factors, in addition to time limitation are some of the main factors which may influence peer feedback use in the writing classroom. Over time, teachers could use peer feedback as a strategy in their EFL writing classes more successfully if there is more "*time and practice*", or "*with third year classes*", or "*with small groups*". After all, many teachers are conscious about peer feedback usefulness, and hold positive attitudes towards it. But its real implementation differs from one teacher to another.

6. Conclusion

The study in hands was divided into six main sections: Introduction, literature review, methods, results, discussion, and conclusion. In the introduction, a conceptual framework was presented for more clarification of concepts. In literature review section, a chronological account of the main studies conducted recently in the field was exposed. In methods section, a description of the main procedures of research was elaborated; an exploratory research design was employed, and the instrument used in collecting quantitative data was described. In results section, tables were used to interpret the data. In discussion section, the results were compared to previous literature and answers were found to the the research questions set at the beginning of this investigation. In the conclusion, a brief summary was given.

In few words, the study explored secondary school teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes. A noticeable conclusion was extracted. That is, many teachers do have positive attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes. However, their use of peer feedback as a technique in their EFL writing classes may be influenced by some factors like: student-teacher relationship, teachers' lack of theoretical or practical knowledge, students' low self confidence, students learning preferences, and time limitations. It is worth mentioning that these results apply to the case of Bejaia secondary schools; and one of the limitations of case study is the impossibility of generalizing the findings.

7. Recommendations

In conclusion to future research, we would like to state some recommendations, and we wish they will be considered in future EFL teaching practices. EFL teachers of the secondary schools should:

- Devote more time to teach writing in the classroom.
- Increase their theoretical and practical knowledge about different types of feedback.
- Receive training on the use of peer feedback in EFL writing classes.

- Practise peer feedback in small group classes.
- Use peer feedback more frequently to teach writing.
- Encourage social interaction to raise students' self-confidence.

8. References

1. Abdelhamid M. A. (2020). Feedback in EFL Writing: Arab World Contexts, Issues, and Challenges. In A. M. Ahmed, S. Troudi & S. Riley (Eds.), *Feedback in L2 English Writing in the Arab World: Inside the Black Box* (pp.1-31). Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland AG.
2. Adjeroud, S., & Belouahem, R. (2020). Writing Instruction under the Competency-Based Approach in Algerian Secondary Schools: Traditions, Realities, and Perspectives. *Revue Des Sciences Humaines*, 31(1),515-530.
3. Atik Zid, O. (2015). *Investigating Algerian Secondary School Teachers' Attitudes towards Peer Feedback in EFL Writing Classes* (Doctoral dissertation, Djillali Liabes University of Sidi Bel-Abbes, Algeria).
4. Belouahem, R. (2008). *The suitability of the first year secondary school 'coursbook' At the crossroads' to the Algerian teaching environment* (Doctoral dissertation, Mentouri University of Constantine, Algeria).
5. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approach*. USA: Sage publications, Inc.
6. Dornyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in Second Language Research: Construction, Administration, and Processing*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
7. Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*.USA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
8. Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2011). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.
9. Gómez Argüelles, L., Hernández Méndez, E., & Perales Escudero, M. D. (2019). EFL teachers' attitudes towards oral corrective feedback: A case study. *Profile Issues in Teachers Professional Development*, 21(1), 107-120.
10. Griffee, D. T. (2012). *An introduction to second language research methods* (1 ed.). USA: TESL-EJ Publications.
11. Ho, M. C. (2015). The effects of face-to-face and computer-mediated peer review on EFL writers' comments and revisions. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 31(1), 1-15.
12. Hyland, K. (2003). Responding to student writing. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Second Language Writing* (pp.177-211).
13. Hyland, K. (2015). *Teaching and researching writing* (3ed.). New York: Routledge.
14. Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues* (2ed.). United Kingdom: Cambridge university press.
15. Jain, V. (2014). 3D model of attitude. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 3(3), 1-12. ISSN: 2278-6236.
16. Kaya, B., Ateş, S., Yıldırım, K., & Rasinski, T. (2020). Effect of feedback on Turkish fourth-grade elementary school students' fluent writing skills. *Education and Science*, 45(201), 189-205.
17. Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques* (2ed.). New Delhi: New Age International (P) Ltd.
18. Kumar, R. (2011). *Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for*

- beginners* (3ed.). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
19. Levy, P. S., & Lemeshow, S. (2008). *Sampling of populations: methods and applications* (4ed.). New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, INC.
 20. Melouk, M., & Merbouh, Z. (2014). EFL writing hindrances and challenges: The case of second year students of English at Djillali Liabes. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(3), 149-156.
 21. Moussaoui, S. (2012). An investigation of the effects of peer evaluation in enhancing Algerian student's writing autonomy and positive affect. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 1775-1784.
 22. Rabehi, S. (2012). Measures of eliminating EFL students' errors in writing. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 69, 318-327.
 23. Storch, N. (2019). Collaborative writing as Peer Feedback. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and Issues* (2 ed.), (pp.143-161).UK: Cambridge University Press.
 24. Ulug, M., Ozden, M. S., & Eryilmaz, A. (2011). The effects of teachers' attitudes on students' personality and performance. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 30, 738-742.
 25. Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2006). The teaching of EFL writing in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 13(3), 139-150.
 26. Yang, M., Badger, R., & Yu, Z. (2006). A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback in a Chinese EFL writing class. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 15(3), 179-200.
 27. Yu, S., & Lee, I. (2016). Peer feedback in second language writing (2005-2014). *Language Teaching*, 49(4), 461-493.
 28. Zhao, H. (2018). New insights into the process of peer review for EFL writing: A process-oriented socio-cultural perspective. *Learning and Instruction*, 58, 263-273.

9. Appendix

Questionnaire of teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback

Dear secondary school teachers,

I am a post graduate student in English didactics and literature at the University of Bejaia. I am conducting a case study research on secondary school teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use in EFL writing classes. Your valuable cooperation could contribute positively to raise the quality of teaching writing in Algerian secondary education. Thank you!

Section One: Teachers' profiles

Gender	() male () female
Age	(25-30), (31-35), (36-40), (41-44), 45+
Teaching experience (in years)	(1-5), (6-10), (11-15), (16-20), 20+
Name of the school	

Section Two: Teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use

Scale: 1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3= neutral 4= agree 5= strongly agree

Statements	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. peer feedback use could positively affect students' writing performance					
2. peer feedback is useful in English writing classes					

- Investigating Teachers' Attitudes towards Peer Feedback Use in EFL Writing Classes: Case Study of Bejaia Secondary Schools, Algeria-

<i>3. peer feedback in writing needs to be implemented explicitly</i>					
<i>4. peer feedback in writing is more effective when given immediately</i>					
<i>5. peer feedback develops students' critical thinking skills and autonomy</i>					
<i>6. peer feedback empowers students' social interaction ability</i>					

Section Three: Factors affecting teachers' attitudes towards peer feedback use

Scale: 1= strongly disagree 2= disagree 3= neutral 4= agree 5= strongly agree

<i>Statements</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>SA</i>
<i>1. teachers' positive attitudes affect positively students' learning performance and vice versa</i>					
<i>2. teachers lack of theoretical and practical knowledge in peer feedback could affect its use in the writing classroom</i>					
<i>3. students low self-confidence as feedback providers prevents peer feedback implementation in the writing classroom</i>					
<i>4. students' preference of teacher feedback over peer feedback blocks peer feedback use in the writing classrooms</i>					
<i>5. time distribution is not sufficient to practice peer feedback in the writing classroom</i>					

6. Teachers' suggestions and recommendations