



ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

**COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM
AND COMMUNICATION**

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LITERATURE

**PRACTICES OF EFL TEACHERS' WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON
STUDENTS' WRITING: GENERAL TADESSE BIRU SECONDARY SCHOOL
N0- 2 IN FOCUS.**

By: Chala Mengistu Gameda

August, 2024

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

**PRACTICES OF EFL TEACHERS' WRITTEN FEEDBACK OF STUDENTS'
WRITING: GENERAL TADESSE BIRU SECONDARY SCHOOL N0 2 IN FOCUS.**

By: Chala Mengistu Gemedo ID N0: GSK/2482/11

Advisor: Alemu Hailu (PhD)

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE IN FULFILLMENT OF MASTERS DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
TEACHING**

August, 2024

Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that this MA thesis entitled 'Practices of EFL Teachers' Written Feedback of Students' Writing: General Tadesse Biru Secondary School NO 2 In Focus. was composed by me, that the work contained here is my own. To the best of my knowledge, in whole or in part, this work has not been submitted to any institution for the award of any other academic degree. Wherever contributions of others are involved, every effort was made to mention due reference to the literature and acknowledgments.

Name Chala Mengistu Gameda

Signature

Submission Date -----

-

Approval Sheet

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES & LITERATURE**

**PRACTICES OF EFL TEACHERS' WRITTEN FEEDBACK OF STUDENTS'
WRITING: GENERAL TADESSE BIRU SECONDARY SCHOOL NO 2 IN FOCUS.**

By: Chala Mengistu Gemedo ID N0: GSK/2482/11

**THESIS SUBMITTED TO DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND
LITERATURE IN FULFILLMENT OF MASTERS DEGREE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE
TEACHING**

Approved by Board of Examiners.

Advisor: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Internal Examiner: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

External Examiner: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
DECLARATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VII
Abbreviations and Acronyms	VIII
Lists of Table	IX
ABSTRACT.....	X
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Background of the Study	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Research Questions	5
1.4. Objectives of the Study	5
1.4.1. General Objective	5
1.4.2. The Specific Objectives of the Study.....	5
1.5. Significance of the Study	6
1.6. Scope of the Study	6
1.7. Limitations of the study	6
1.8. Organization of the Study	7
CHAPTER TWO	8
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
2.1. Theoretical Background of Feedback	8
2.2. The Concept of Writing	8
2.3. The Importance of Teaching Writing.....	9
2.4. Approaches to teaching writing	9
2.4.1. The Product Approach	9
2.4.2. Process Approach.....	10

2.5. Definition of Feedback	11
2.6. Source of Feedback in EFL Students Writing	11
2.6.1. Students Self-Feedback.....	12
2.6.2. Peer feedback.....	12
2.6.3. Teachers Written Feedback.....	13
2.7. Direct and Indirect Teachers written Feedback	13
2.8. Importance of Feedback.....	14
2.9. Impact of Written Feedback on student writing.....	15
2.10. The Advantage of Written Feedback	15
CHAPTER THREE	16
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	16
3.1. Research Design.....	16
3.2. Research setting	16
3.3. Target populations of study.....	16
3.4. Sampling Techniques.....	17
3.5. Instruments of Data Collection	17
3.5.1. Observation	17
3.5.2. Interview	18
3.5.3. Document Analysis.....	18
3.5.4. Questionnaire for Students.....	19
3.6. Methods of Data Analysis.....	19
3.6.1. Analysis of questionnaire data	19
3.6.2. Analysis of interview	19
3.6.3. Analysis of Data from Document	19
3.7. Validity and Reliability	20
3.7.1. Validity of questionnaire and interview	20
CHAPTER FOUR.....	21

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	21
4.1 Students’ Questionnaire	22
4.2. Students’ Feeling Towards Teacher Written Feedback	24
4.3 The Existence of Written Feedback Aspects	27
4.4 Teachers’ Interview.....	29
4.4.1 The Way that EFL Teachers Apply Written Feedback.....	30
4.4.2 Regularity of written feedback on students’ writing.....	33
4.4.4 The challenges in providing written feedback	35
4.5 Data from Document Analysis.....	37
4.5.1 Clarity of the Written Feedback.....	37
4.5.2 Comprehensiveness of the Written Feedback.....	37
4.5.3 Nature of Teachers’ Written Feedback	38
4.5. 4 Teachers’ Feedback Giving Strategies	38
CHAPTER FIVE	39
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	39
5.1 Summary	39
5.2 Conclusions.....	40
5.3. Recommendations.....	42
Reference	44
Appendix A.....	48
Appendix B:.....	51
Appendix C.....	52

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank the Almighty God who arranges everything on it's willingness to come my dream true. Second, I would like to express my deepest thanks to my adviser Alemu Hailu (PhD) for his insightful and critical comments from the very beginning up to the end of the drafts of the chapters. Next, I would like to express my gratitude to my wife – Aster Beka who have been on the side of me to complete my study successfully. I would like to forward my sincere appreciation to my best friends, namely who for sharing me their belief. Finally, my thanks also go to English teachers and students of General Tadesse Biru Secondary School N0 2.

Abbreviations and Acronyms

EFL English as a foreign language

L2 Second Language

Lists of Tables

Table 4.1: Students' belief about the ways that EFL teachers apply written feedback.....	28
Table 4. 2: Students' feeling towards teacher written feedback.....	30
Table 4.3: The frequency of the existence of written feedback aspects.....	33
Table 4.4: Educational background of the teachers.....	...35

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to be assess a Practices of EFL teachers' written feedback on students' writing. descriptive research design which contains both quantitative and qualitative method was employed. The study be came centered on grade 9&10 students .The participants of the study were(70) students taken through systematic random sampling and (7)EFL teachers were chosen on the idea of purposive sampling. Instrument data collection were questionnaire ,classroom observation, interviewed and document analysis.for data analysis both quantitative and qualitative methods were used . The data collected close ended and open ended questionnaire were analyzed and described quantitative method was used frequency and percentage, However, interview and classroom observation were analyzed qualitatively.changed into carried out to take a look at teachers' techniques of presenting written feedback, to provide an explanation for the reasons why instructors provide remarks, to become aware of the frequency of comments provision on students' writing, and to discover secondary school students' feeling closer to teachers' written comments which obtained the objectives, a descriptive survey layout regarding each quantitative and qualitative research techniques have been hired. Moreover, questionnaire, interview and record evaluation were preferred records accumulating equipment. encourage to supply extra drafts and it changed into now not addressed to college students' at a right time have been a number of the fundamental issues. eventually, based on the findings of the have a look at, the researcher would like to suggest that instructors must fill their own gaps on written comments to shed light on college students' writing improvement; college students need to pay interest as well.

The finding of the study indicate that English teachers didn't encourage students to practices written feedback. Therefore, this study recommend that EFL teachers should increase their knowledge on feedback and improve writing skill.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the Study

Feedback is considered as an inherent part and an important element in instructional design and it has a strong foundation in major learning theories. The practice of instructional design had been influenced by major learning theories such as behavioral learning theory, cognitive information processing theory, and Gagne's theory of instruction (Ferris, 2004). All of these theories regard feedback as a crucial part in learning and instruction. According to the above learning theories, providing feedback is an important and crucial instructional instrument that helps teachers to correct students performances.

Different scholars defined the term feedback differently with common meanings. For example, the definition given by Ur, it is an idea or information provided to the learners about their performance of learning activity with the intention of helping, correcting and encouraging them (Ur, 1996). It is the way in which different sources provide comments and corrections to the learner's activity to improve their performance. Keh, (1990) definition of the term feedback is input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision. Therefore, it is the tool, in which the reader describes strength and weakness of some ones' writing for the sake of improving his/her writing.

It can be classified as positive and negative, oral and written, direct and indirect. One of the most frequent and simplest distinctions is between positive and negative feedback. For many years, behaviorist research has found that positive feedback is more effective than negative feedback in changing pupil's behavior. Positive feedback has two principal functions:

According to Nunan, teachers have to give positive feedback and praise to the learners so that they can be motivated and encouraged to keep on their performance. Feedback can also be sub- divided into oral and written. Oral feedback in any corrective comments provided to students speech. We give feedback on oral work through speech, on written work through writing; and although there are occasional situations we might do it the other way round (Ur, 1996). There are some situations where we might prefer not to correct learners' mistake in fluency. For example, when the learner is in mid

speech, to correct would disturb and discourage more than help. However, there are other situations when correction is likely to be helpful (Ur, 1996, p. 247). Written feedback is any comments provided to learners' written work including written composition, assignments, or exam papers with the assumption of improving their writing. Therefore, teachers are expected to use it as parts of their job to respond to learners work in providing appropriate written feedback (Ur).

The teachers' written feedback can be either direct or indirect. By the direct feedback, according to Lalonde (1982) cited in Hyland and Hyland (2006), the teacher identifies directly the errors and give suggestions which mostly relates to form and more of accuracy. Whereas indirect feedback is when the teacher indicates where an error has been made by means of underlining, circling or coding, (Napaporn, 2012). Improvements seem to be more likely if indirect feedback methods are used. Therefore, feedback is any comments, suggestions, or criticism given from the reader to the writer with the intention of improving or progressing. Criticism is not advisable in feedback process. It is the part and parcel of teaching learning process.

The point that inspired the researcher to conduct a research on this topic was weak performances of students writing. From his experiences and observations, the researcher identified that students of General TaddesseBirru Secondary School No. 2 have defects in their writing. The students were even unable to ask permission through writing. This could be lack of teachers' strategies of providing written feedback to the students writing. The researcher believed that if the teacher provided supportive comments and correction on students writing performances continuously students writing could be improved. This motivated the researcher to conduct research on teachers and students practices on written feedback in EFL classroom.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Feedback is a fundamental element of a process approach to writing. It plays an important role in the teaching of writing skills as it does in all educational fields. It is vital in just about all learning contexts (Race, 2001). It may also have a definition of input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision, usually in the form of comments, questions, and suggestions (Keh, 1990). Through feedback, the writer may learn the reader's confusion caused by the

writer's insufficient information, illogical organization, poor development of ideas, or even inaccurate usage and choice of words and tense.

Among them, teacher written feedback is the most important feedback that L2 students expect to receive. It is indispensable in the students whole writing process. Usually we can easily find the interpretation gap between the teacher and the students, especially in written feedback. Written teacher feedback plays a crucial role in improving students writing skills. Not only does it provide a valuable opportunity for individualized, text based, contextualized instruction from teachers (Ferris, 2001), but also it is likely to be taken seriously by students than feedback given to group of students (Hattie, 2012, p. 171). For second or foreign language writing, research has found that both teachers and students hold that teacher feedback on student is a critical part of writing instruction and have a great impact on students writing (Ferris & Hedcock, 2014, p.237; Goldstein, 2004; Leki, 1990, p. 58). From the above point, we can infer that students prefer teacher feedback for the improvements of their writing. This is because the students cannot understand whether the message they intended to convey is properly understood by the reader without written feedback. In line with this, since English is a medium of instruction, in General TedessaBiru Secondary School No-2 learners need a great support from the teacher. Teacher written feedback is the only means to drive the learner in the right truck.

Some international and local researches have been conducted regarding feedback. For example, international researches conducted in a related research work. There are two controversial ideas regarding toward teacher written feedback. For example, Truscott (1996), Cohen and Robinson (1976) reject every positive effects of written feedback provided by the teachers to their students in order to improve their writing. However, Ferris (1999), Lee (1997) and Grami (2005) believe that the application of written feedback has a significance importance for the improvements of the students writing skills.

There are also some local studies conducted on written feedback in our country. Among these, the research done by Taye (2005) on the title “ the effect of written feedback in promoting 1st year preparatory students writing skills at Kellem Secondary school is the best example. This study shows that the theoretical aspect of written feedback and its practicality in the classroom. He showed that feedback provided to students writing is not properly handled in the class. Italo's (1999) study is concerned with comparing with the effectiveness of teacher's feedback and students peer feedback in

Addis Ababa University first year students writing revisions. He justifies that the improvement of students writing was due to re-writing of the revision students did after getting feedback from these resource. This shows that students would improve through rewriting after getting feedback from their teachers or their peers. His research finding shows that both peer and teacher feedbacks have impacts on the improvement of students' composition skills. According to his study, his finding has not tried to put the importance of teacher written feedback instead of peer and self.

This in turn implies that the feedback students get on their writing is not adequate to encourage them to practice writing. Teacher feedback in a writing class appears to be the dominant one (Getnet 1993 and Tesfaye 1995), and even this feedback comes to students with marks and some comments after some delays. This affects students opportunity to improve their written work in at least three ways. First, after the mark is assigned, it is less likely that students would rewrite their work; second, since the papers are returned after some delays students cannot remember well what they have written. Thirdly, teachers response to students' first drafts as if it were the final one may make students develop fear towards the skill. This obviously results and has resulted in the low writing performance of students (Tefaye 1995; Yonas 1996 and Italo 1999) as writing cannot be improved in a single draft. Arguably, the poor quality of student's written work could be attributed to among many others, the way students written work is treated.

For instance, the researchers' experience in teaching at this school has also helped him to realize the fact that teachers tend to assign students with writing tasks and they do not seem to give comments that encourage students to rewrite their drafts. What is well established is responding to the first draft written by students just as the final one (usually coming back with some comments and marks assigned). This goes well with what Zamel (1985) criticizes teachers for responding to students' first draft as a final one. It could be argued, that students are simply expected to receive the comments and the marks passively. A lot of research has been conducted regarding teacher written feedback. Most of the research conducted at universities, colleges, or tertiary level. However, this research was done in secondary school contexts using four different data collection instruments: interview, observation, document analysis, and questionnaire. Therefore, it differed from the other in objective, research design and data collection instruments.

The researcher identified poor performance of students in writing from his experience and classroom observations. He teaches that because of lack of supportive and continuous written feedback provided by the teacher to their writing. This inspired the researcher to conduct the study on the area. Therefore, this study assessed the teachers and students practices towards written feedback in EFL classroom: the case of General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No-2 in focus.

1.3. Research Questions

This study answered the following research questions:

1. What techniques do teachers use to give written feedback for students writing?
2. Do the students practice written feedback in the writing section?
3. What are the significant factors that hinder the implementation of teachers and students written feedback?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1.4.1. General Objective

The general objective of this study was to assess teachers and students' practices towards written feedback in EFL classroom: the case of General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No-2 in focus.

1.4.2. The Specific Objectives of the Study

The study specifically answered the following specific objectives to:

1. Assess the strategies teachers use to provide written feedback to the learners
2. Assess the practices of students" towards written feedback in the writing section
3. Investigate what the significant factors that hinder the implementation of teachers" and students written feedback are,

1.5. Significance of the Study

The study investigated teachers and students practices toward written feedback in EFL classroom: the case of General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No-2 in focus. To this effect this study will provide the following significant contributions:

1. To the organization: the findings of the study will be directly and indirectly a manifestation of the realities in the case of General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No-2 in focuses. Therefore, they will assist the responsible bodies of education administrative in looking into themselves and make necessary institutional improvements taking advantage of the findings.

2. To policy makers: The research will also help for the policy formulators, the decisions of political leaders, government stakeholders and some other direct and indirect participants who are interested in the enhancement of government in quality of education and utilization. Institutionalization problems are manifests of policy gaps and strategy shortcomings.

3. Academic implications: there is a clear empirical gap in the area of investigating teachers and students' practices toward written feedback in EFL classroom: the case of General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No-2 in focus. To this end this study will make an important contribution to the academic literature as an input to similar and related studies and theory conceptualization.

1.6. Scope of the Study

The study confined only one Secondary school due to there are many Secondary School in our woreda. Secondly, for the fact that researcher is currently teaching from this school. He believes that it will have yield results that are more comprehensive by the inclusion of the data from some other schools. This helps the researcher to obtain reliable information easily. Hence, the study would be limited to teachers and students' practices toward written feedback at General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No-2 in focus.

1.7. Limitations of the study

Many researchers believe that any research work cannot be free from certain constrains. Therefore, the researcher paper also will be faced certain limitations. Some of the limitations the researcher faced in the process of the study were lack of internet and resource material in the area due to the distance from

the internet access. Also there were lack of previous recorded documents and reference material about written feedback and shortage of time and financial constraints. However, the researcher overcame the problem of internet by using mobile data connecting into PC.

1.8. Organization of the Study

The study consists of the following chapters: chapter one deals with introduction, background of the study, a statement of the problem, general objective, specific objective, research questions, significant, delimitation, limitation and operational definition of the terms of the study. The second chapter is concerned with the review of related literature relevant to the problem under investigation. The third chapter consists of the research methodology, research design, and research approach, procedure of the data collection, data analysis techniques and ethical considerations.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher discusses some issues, which has two parts. The first part attempts to review what the literature has to say about writing skills. Meaning, the theoretical background of feedback, concept of writing skill, the importance of teaching writing, and approach to teaching writing. The second part deals with some important and relevant issues about feedback.

2.1. Theoretical Background of Feedback

The practice of instructional design has been influenced by major learning such as behavioral learning theory, cognitive information processing theory and Gange's theory of instruction (Ferris, 2004). All of these theories consider feedback as an important part in learning instruction. Driscoll (2002) summarizes that these major theories of learning and instruction have provided strong foundation for current practice of instructional design. Based on behavioral view of learning, reinforcement and feedback can have important instructional effects on students learning as reinforcement and feedback can modify learner behavior by reinforcing correct responses or providing corrective feedback for incorrect responses (Ferris, 2003).

In behavioral learning theory, learner's behavior is observed before and after instruction. When we see in the case of information processing theory, feedback is also considered to have a significant value in instructional design (Ferris, 2004). Information processing theory assumes that learning internal process within the learner (Driscoll, 2002) where the learner process input from the environment to become desirable output as results of learning. According to the above major learning theories feedback has been an important aspect in learning theory and as inherent element in learning and instruction.

2.2. The Concept of Writing

Writing is not simply the matter of putting thought into print. Byrne (1988:1) defines writing as the act of forming graphic symbols (letters or combinations of letters related to the sound we make when we speak on flat surface of some kind). As Byrne expresses, writing is not only thought; it is the technology of putting idea in print. Zamel (1982, p. 197) also explains that writing is a process of

exploring one's thought and learning from the act of writing itself. Zamel's definition implies that writing gives an opportunity for the writer to put thought in words or prints and learn from it. This indicates that there is no communication between a text and a reader without the existence of writing, and writing exposes the writer to share one self's internal feeling for others regardless of distance and time.

The entire definitions share a common understanding in that writing is a latest tool in which people communicate or share their internal feelings through graphic representation.

2.3. The Importance of Teaching Writing

Writing has the significance importance in the context of language learning, it is one of the powerful tools which help learners to monitor their language performance to a greater extent than other language skills as it is the most conscious and creative process (Tribble, 1997). Even if there are different mechanisms by which learner control their language performance while speaking, reading, Listening and writing provides the best opportunity to the writer in employing the most appropriate language fits the purpose and the target group because it is not an ephemeral mode of communication like that of speaking. Thus, writers have better chance to look into their language use by moving backward and forward at sentence, paragraph or essay level time and again and make the necessary changes or amendments for a better written product. Therefore, it is the skill that everybody needed to improve to describe his/her own thought in print.

2.4. Approaches to teaching writing

Approaches to teaching writing can be categorized as product and process approaches to writing (Kroll, 1997). As far as the teaching of writing skill is concerned there are numbers of different approaches to the practice of writing skills both in and outside of the classroom (Harmer, 2001). As, Harmer also states while teaching writing, teacher can either focus on the product of writing or on the writing process.

2.4.1. The Product Approach

As the name suggests, the product approach to teaching writing the aim is on evaluating student's final written papers. And the intention is to make students use the language as accurately as possible. In this regard, Hedge (2000, p.200) also says that:

Product approach focuses the students, attention on the features of text and largely concerned with developing his other ability to produce those features accurately. The methodology therefore, involves analysis of model texts in order to raise awareness of how they are structured. It also involves formal practice of such feature.

The practice is so controlled (controlled writing activities whose aim is on the accuracy of the language in nature that students have little opportunity for composing (Hedge, 2000). The teacher is not in a position to help student during the writing process. In this approach students are not expected to follow the stages of writing and teachers could not get an opportunity to help their students writing. Harmer (2000, 257) reveals that, “ when concentrating on the product, we are only interested in the aim of the task and in the end product.

In this approach as the teacher expects higher standards of language he/she plays a comparatively more attention to the formal or micro aspects of writing such as grammar, spelling, punctuation, and careful reflection of vocabulary than macro aspects (content and organization) of writing.

2.4.2. Process Approach

The process approach to writing refers to teaching approaches that focus on the process. A writer engages in which constructing meaning. This teaching approach concludes with editing as a final stage in text creations, rather than an initial one as in a product-oriented approach. The process-oriented approach may include identified stages of writing process such as pre-writing, writing, and re-writing. Once the rough draft has been created, it is polished into subsequent drafts with the existence of peer and teacher conferencing.

Final editing and publication can follow if the author chooses to publish their writing (Murray, 1972). According to Ho(2006, p,1) , explains that the process approach to writing has been as all improvement over the traditional methods of writing has been seen as an improvement over the tradition methods of writing instruction in a recent years.

Likewise, process writing seems to be a feasible solution to lightening the writing abilities and confidence of the students. Ho(2006 p.2) added that the process approach is an approach to teaching writing that place more emphasis on the stage of the writing process than on the final product. Here

we can observe that writing is not a linear or one-step action that brings perfection. Writing in a process approach is seen as predominant to do with linguistics skills, such as planning and drafting and there is much less emphasis on linguistic knowledge, such as knowledge about grammar and text structure. In this approach, students are thought planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing strategies at each stages of the writing process to help them to write freely and arrive at product-guided quality because the process approach is based the principle that learning is the process of discovering meaning.

2.5. Definition of Feedback

Different scholars with common meanings define feedback differently. For example, the definition given by (Ur, 1996), it is an idea or information provided to the learners about their performance of learning activity with the intention of helping, correcting and encouraging in their performance(Ur. 1996). According to Keh (1990) definition of the term „feedback“ is “input from a reader to a writer with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision. In other words, it is the comments given upon, questions, and suggestions a reader gives a writer to produce „reader-based text“ Flower (1979, p.294) as opposed to „writer based prose“. This means it is a reader who leads the writer in the way he favors.

According to definition of Freedman (1987), She states that feedback; “ includes all reaction to writing, formal or informal, written or oral, from teacher or peer, to a draft or final version” (p.5). From these definitions, we can see that feedback can come in different forms, from different readers, and at different stages of the writing process with the intention of improving students“ writing. In the context of teaching and learning, feedback can be defined as any form of response by teacher to students performance, attitude or behavior, at least where attitude and behavior mending up on performance. It is important to realize that feedback is not only an outcome of students“ performance but also an essential part of the learning process (Scott &Dinham, 2005).

2.6. Source of Feedback in EFL Students Writing

Feedback is widely seen as a crucial for encouraging and supporting teaching learning process. Writing scholars agree that feedback to students“ writing could come from three main sources: teachers, peer, and students“ writer (Harmer 1991, Celce-Murcia1991). Keh (1990, p. 295) on the

other hand, there are three areas of feedback: peer feedback, conferencing as feedback and teachers comments.

According to Celce- Murcia (1991, p.256) teachers must make concern of the member of draft for any given text that they want students to produce. This assertion supported by Ur(1996,p, 172)who writes that teachers in process approach to writing are not supposed to correcting students' errors, but rather help students completing the teacher feedback. As Leki (1994, p. 177) noticed that teacher is not the only one respond or evaluate student's texts now students are also involved in the responding to writing. What we can infer from the above opinion is that teacher should engage students in the process writing by, supporting; giving comments and by letting the students make use of his/her comments in the second draft and in the last version. In general, Ur, (1996, p.257) suggests, teachers need to develop or adopt responding methodologies which can foster improvement in writing.

2.6.1. Students Self-Feedback

Self- evaluation aims to develop the students' ability in reading his or her owns' writing and examining it critically, learning how to improve it and how to express his/her own meaning fluently.

Writers can make their own revision without any feedback from any sources like, peers or teachers and can improve their writing significantly, (Hyland, 2006). In line with this, other scholars give their suggestion about the importance of self –feedback.

Makino (1993,p. 338) argues saying, “ in the process of language learning, learner sometimes notice some of their errors when other people such as teachers or peers, give them clues or hint about them. The point being under lined is that other feedback types should be given to the students writer in the way that promotes self-correction. This feedback can help the writer, the teacher, and other students.

2.6.2. Peer feedback

It simply refers to the type of feedback that a learner receives from another learner. Like teachers' feedback, it can be verbal or written. The other source information about one's writing in the feedback that comes from other students. Hansen and Liu, (2002,p.274) define peer feedback as the use of learners as source information and interact ants for each other in such a way that learners assumes role

and responsibilities in commenting and critiquing each other's draft in both written and oral formats in the process of writing.

Hendrickson (1980) advises teacher to instruct students to work in pairs and corrects each other's compositions. He believes that this procedure is beneficial in that it allows students to work in nonthreatening educational setting that helps build their confidence and fosters learning by discover and sharing.

2.6.3. Teachers Written Feedback

Teachers' written feedback is the most widely used form of feedback that students receive on their work. It is a kind of feedback that is provided from the teacher to learners during mid-draft or on the final draft gives a teacher a unique role to play in facilitating, the improvement of the learners' writing ability (Muncie, 2000).

Even if there are different types of giving feedback, teachers' feedback on students' written performances is written comments. These are considered by Li Waishing (2000) as the most common feedback delivering method for both teachers and students and which contribute to the overall improvement of student writing be it at form or content level. Not only are written comments the most common but they are also the most expected and welcomed feedback type by students. In this respect, Ferris (2003, p.41) notes, " this type of feedback may represent the single biggest investment of time by instructors, and it is certainly clear that students highly value and appreciate it." A similar idea is the one introduced by Sommers, (1982) who thinks that such comments constitute a challenge for teachers of writing since they have to address a number of issues such as, motivating students to revise and rewrite their work using the feedback, targeting areas of failure in students' learning, and making students understand and incorporate teachers' suggestions in their writings.

2.7. Direct and Indirect Teachers written Feedback

Direct feedback (correction) simply means providing the students with the correct form of their errors. It shows them what was wrong and how it should be written, but it leaves no work for them to do. According to Napaporn, (2012), there are two techniques of written feedback. Both types have their own advantages and disadvantages. Direct feedback is a technique of correcting students error by giving an explicit written correction but indirect feedback is when the teacher indicates that an error

has been made by means of underline, circle, code, etc (Napaporn, 2012). Both methods can improve students' writing, but a number of researchers think that indirect feedback generally more appropriate and effective than direct feedback and bring more benefits to students' long-term writing development than direct feedback (Ur, 1996). According to Ur, this can happen in two ways. First, indirect feedback can guide learning and help students solve problem by themselves. Second, students are able express their idea more clearly in writing and get clarification on any comments that teachers have made.

In addition, students feel that indirect feedback is useful in encouraging them to reflect on aspects of their writing and to develop improvements (Napaporn, 2012). Indirect feedback can be done by a code representing a specific kind of error.

Indirect teacher feedback is useful when it incorporated with student's self-revision, but lower proficiency students may be unable to identify and correct errors even when they have been marked for them (Ur, 1996). The danger of direct feedback is that teachers may miss interpreting students meaning, and students may express confusion and dissatisfaction with teacher feedback. When students have different opinion the teachers' response, they may resist revision and feel a teachers feedback is invalid or incorrect. Consequently, in facilitating teacher feedback in L2 writing, teachers need to consider students English background knowledge and indicates their needs for error correction.

Direct feedback seems to be appropriate for students with weak English skills. However, when giving direct feedback, teachers should also give them clear explanations about grammatical error so that they can deepen their English knowledge. In addition, a combination of direct and indirect feedback can be used for students.

2.8. Importance of Feedback

Writing takes a lot of time and efforts, and so it is only fair that students writing are responded suitably. Positive comments can help build students confidence and create good teaching for the next class. Through feedback, a writer will become less painful process. Feedback is equally vital in schooling and performs a variety of functions including recognizing, correcting and encouraging challenging, and improving students' performance. Feedback also keeps students' "on track" and is an aid to classroom management.

Moreover, according to Keh (1990), feedback is observed as essential to the multiple draft process because it is what pushes the writer through various drafts and soon to the eventual product. Additionally, through feedback, the writer learns where she/he has misled or confused the reader by not supplying enough information, logical organization or proper word choice or tense Keh (1990).

2.9. Impact of Written Feedback on student writing

The discussion about giving grammar-errors feedback (form feedback) cannot overlook the oft-cited, rather controversial article by Truscott (1996) which has been the target of almost all the following studies addressing the same topic. The findings of his article, which clearly stands against grammar correction, were the aim of continuous debate either in favor or against. Again, the given possible reason for ineffectiveness was due to teachers themselves. Sommers (1982: 142) supports the claim when found that teachers comments were arbitrary and idiosyncratic. Furthermore, Connors and Lunsford (1993:215) comment on teachers' written feedback: large number of short, careless, exhausted, or extensive comments.

However, with respect to his radical ideas, Truscott's (1996) article yet remains the most controversial for he does not attribute the failure of grammar feedback to any sort of inadequacy caused by teachers, students, or teaching contexts but because of form feedback itself.

2.10. The Advantage of Written Feedback

Truscott's disputed views have been critically and empirically examined by many subsequent studies. That is to be supported with early studies whose findings have been neglected in Truscott's controversial paper. Some of these studies (to be mentioned anon) give practical evidence that grammar correction in fact does help students improve their accuracy as opposed to Truscott. The main weak point of Truscott's paper is that most of the literature he used to support his claims is actually researches that have been carried out in L1 contexts which cannot be transferred complete to ESL contexts as the students in the latter environment struggle with their L2 and errors are definitely expected from them. Prior to Truscott (1996), Kepner (1991:305) believes that error correction in second language teaching is of perennial concern to L2 teachers. Kepner notes that many L2 teachers fear the fossilization of errors (a persuasive argument later supported by Ferris, 1999) and those teachers felt morally obliged to correct all mistakes in their L2 students work.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

A descriptive study research design was employed in this study to assess General Tadesse Biru Secondary School No-2 teachers and students' practices toward written feedback using questionnaire for students, document analysis, interview, and classroom observation. According to Kumar (1996), descriptive methods attempt to describe systematically a situation, problem, or phenomenon. Therefore, the researcher used descriptive research method since it is important in gathering data of what people think, feel and do. Factors influencing teachers practices of Written Feedback lack of enough time large classes the need to cover textbooks heavy workload.

3.2. Research setting

The study was carried out in General Tadessee Biru secondary school in no.2 The school is located in Oromia region, North shoa Hidabu Abote woreda in Ejere town. There are six high Schools including the target one. This school is located at 156km away from Addis Ababa to the north direction. There were five male and two female English language teachers. Besides, the school has one director and vice director. Moreover, the reason for selecting this school is that the researcher works there and teaches in the given grade level in General Tadessee Biru secondary School. The students have serious problem regarding to writing skill. In addition, it helped the researcher's study deeply and makes the research reliable. Moreover, there has not been any significant research conduct concerning the current study in the selected school.

3.3. Target populations of study

The participants of the study were all General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No -2 grade 9th and 10th English language teachers, and grade 9th and 10th students. The school has currently seven, (7) English language teachers. The school and the grade level were selected purposively because the researcher works there and teaches in the given grade level. In addition, it helped the researcher's study deeply and makes the research reliable. Moreover, there has not been any significant research conduct concerning the current study in the selected school.

3.4. Sampling Techniques

Since a number of teachers teaching English in this school are small in number, the researcher used comprehensive sampling method. This is because it is easy to manage. It is the best techniques when the numbers of respondents are few in numbers. There are six sections of grade 9 and four sections of grade 10th students in this school. From this, the researcher selected five sections by random sampling techniques for classroom observation and document analysis. These sections were B, D and F from grade 9 and A and C from grade 10th students. This is because; they were taught by different teachers and aim to observe different classes and to obtain diversified information. The researcher obtained 70 students from 350 students. Fourteen student assignments from each section was selected in order to analyze the kinds of feedback (on content, on forms), techniques of written feedback (direct and indirect) and other forms of feedback(praise, suggestions or criticism) was given by the teacher. Questionnaires were distributed these sample students whose assignments were selected for analysis. This was because the researcher was intended to cross check whether the students are taking part in the practices of written feedback and how the teachers practice write feedback in the classroom during the writing lesson. The result of the study was presented as a note by the researcher.

3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

In order to collect data the researcher used classroom observation, teachers interview, document analysis, and questionnaire for students as the research design is qualitative in nature.

3.5.1. Observation

One of the data-gathering tools were used in this particular study is classroom observation. Morrison (2000,p. 33) said that observations are useful tools for providing direct information about language and language learning, and it is the best data collecting technique for gaining insight into the subject in a natural environment." This is why a nonparticipant, semi-structured classroom observation is chosen to collect data because as Concel (2000) states in nonparticipant observation, the observer does not interact to a great degree with those he/she is observing; the researcher primarily observe and complete the checklist and have no specific role as a participant. Classroom observation was used to see actions in the classroom. Before the observation conduct, teachers who are going to be observe and ask about his/her willingness and were informed in advance. The English language classes were observed particularly during the teaching and the learning of the writing sections. The instructional

observation was made using the pre-planned checklist. The teachers' teaching techniques, the way they give feedback and manage the writing tasks and the feedback practice activities were observed.

The checklist is design by researcher from the literature review according to the purpose of the study. The researcher observed five sections from ten using lottery method. The researcher observed four times each. Therefore, the researcher observed twenty times using a design checklist “ yes” and “ no.” This classroom observation aim to answer the following research questions:

- 1, Teachers practices of written feedback
- 2, Factors affecting the provision of written feedback

3.5.2. Interview

Interview is an effective qualitative method for getting population to ask about their personal feelings, opinion, experience and inference contact with a rich data (Kothari, 2004). There are three types of interviews. These are structured, semi-structured, and unstructured interviews.

The researcher used semi-structured interview. This type of interviewing is most common type of interview used in qualitative social research. The researcher used this type of interview to involve series open-ended questions based on the research topic area of the researcher wants to cover the questions for teachers.

Seven English language teachers were interviewed about their written feedback. To lead the interview, main open-ended questions that are related to the written feedback areas were prepared and address. The responses of the teachers were written as note by the researcher.

3.5.3. Document Analysis

Document analysis is one of the data gathering instruments for this study. It is a technique, which generates both valid and reliable data from documents (Stemler & Bebell, 1998). Participants' exercise books, as well as written assignments and exam papers are investigating the researcher in order to check whether written feedback is properly addressed or not by the teachers.

The researcher was planned to collect seventy students' paragraph writing assignment with teacher comments from five sections by random sampling of 350 students by taking twenty percent of them,

which are seventy. Fourteen students from each section to evaluate the kinds of feedback practiced by the teacher to students writing for example, (direct, indirect and whether the teacher comments emphasized on form (grammar, capitalization, punctuation vocabulary) and content or organization.

3.5.4. Questionnaire for Students

The student questionnaire were designed in line with the teachers' eachers interview and classroom observation checklist and amending it so that it can be suit to the learners level of understanding. The questionnaire was translated orally to the students first language. The rationale is to guarantee the students' understanding of questionnaire items. Similarly, the learner questionnaires were developed to meet the objectives of the study.

3.6. Methods of Data Analysis

3.6.1. Analysis of questionnaire data

The researcher were translated questionnaires from English to Afaan Oromoo, after that collecting the response from the students. then edited, coded and categorized the data depend on the objectives, and then filled the raw data to SPSS version 20. After that the result gained from the items were organized in tables on the basis of the objective they meet. Finally, the researcher described the frequency and percentiles textually; moreover, the disagreed and totally disagreed as well as the agreed and totally agreed groups were summed up and described in percentiles to evaluate the variation, besides the mean value was calculated.

3.6.2. Analysis of interview

Once the data were gathered through interview, the researcher evaluated their relevance. After that the researcher categorized the information in two ways. First, ideas that had interconnectedness were mentioned as a group's idea. Second, teachers' points of view that were different from each other were discussed separately. In addition to this, teachers educational back ground was taken into account during the analysis process.

3.6.3. Analysis of Data from Document

Primarily, the researcher collected the respondents' assignment sheets that were marked by EFL teachers, and then looked the characteristics of the written feedback on students' writing in order to create suitable condition for discussion. Consequently, having evaluated the relevance of the written

feedback on the students' writing, the researcher divided into headings. Finally, the researcher provided thick description on the basis of the provided feedback on the students' writing.

3.7. Validity and Reliability

Primarily the researcher adapted the questionnaires from previously conducted researchers hoping that it helped to ensure reliability; for this reason, the questionnaires were adapted from different researchers' works, namely from (Ferris, 2011: 2; Lee, 2004; Lee, 2003).

3.7.1. Validity of questionnaire and interview

Having already adapted the questionnaires, the researcher highly needed to ensure the relevance of the items organized in such a way; as a result, exposing them to non-target participants were considered worthy to work with the issue of validity. Consequently, the English questionnaires 37 were reviewed by well-experienced EFL teachers. Therefore, they identified some problems; for example, the researcher missed the correct format, that is, the like scales were not represented by numbers, besides some of the items were misrelated with the objectives, others lacked clarity due to illogical arrangement, besides faulty in sentence construction, length of sentences and repetition of items that had similar concept were mentioned; for this reason, the researcher modified the items on the basis of the evaluators' suggestion and personal knowledge. Having made accurate correction on the English questionnaires, the researcher translated them into Afaan Oromoo, and then, for the second time Afaan Oromoo teachers that have good experienced and academic performance were invited to review in order to check if the questionnaires were correctly translated. Finally they provided few comments on the Afaan Oromoo usage, so the researcher made some changes.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter was to present, analyze and discuss the data obtained in assessing teachers and students' practices towards written feedback in EFL classroom: the case of General Tedessa Biru Secondary School No-2 in focus. Therefore, data is organized in sections. The first part deals with the data obtained from students through questionnaire, so it is presented numerically and textually.

In the discussion part of the students' result, adding the responses that corresponded with agreement and disagreement were found relevant to draw accurate conclusion for the findings; for this reason, the researcher added the responses that coincided with strongly agree and agree as one group, and strongly disagree and disagree on the other group. After that the mean value of each group was calculated. Finally, a conclusion was provided on the basis of the final result that was proved greater value; in doing that the students' responses that centered on the rating scale undecided was taken into account.

The second section emphasizes on teachers' interview session. This deals with teachers general practice of written feedback. Therefore, dealing with the teachers' educational background were contemplated plausible to find out what seems the practice of the teachers, and decide on the value of education background to help learners get effective written feedback and its role in promoting the students' writing skill. For this reason, this instrument was really helpful to get aware of the interviewees' status regarding the practice teachers on written feedback.

The last section concentrates on teachers' feedback issues obtained from document analysis. Firstly, the researcher examined the relevance of the teachers written feedback that were provided on the students' assignments, and then the major and minor points were categorized in order to assign headings and sub-headings. Finally, the points that could substantiate the intended objectives were narrated thoroughly.

4.1 Students' Questionnaire

Table 4.1: Students' belief about the ways that EFL teachers apply written feedback

	Item		Responses					Total	Mean	SDv.
			SA	A	U	D	SD			
1	The teacher provides written feedback on selective errors	Fr	2	13	22	26	7	70	2.65	.980
		%	1.9	19.9	30.1	37.4	10.7	100		
2	The teacher' s written feedback focuses only on locating the errors	Fr	4	24	12	20	10	70	3.02	1.007
		%	1.9	38.8	25.2	27.2	6.8	100		
3	The teacher writes feedback for each error	Fr	2	15	18	27	18	70	2.76	1.002
		%	1.0	27.2	29.1	32.0	10.7	100		
4	Teacher' s written feedback is timely	Fr	1	12	12	40	5	70	2.46	.788
		%	.5	14.6	14.6	64.6	2.4	100		
5	The teacher' s feedback shows clear direction for next task	Fr	-	7	22	30	11	70	2.36	.866
		%		11.2	28.6	45.6	14.6	100		

Key: SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree U = Neutral D = Disagree SD=Strongly Disagree
SDv. =Standard Deviation

As stated in the table, item 1 was intended to elicit information whether teachers write correction on selective errors or not; for this reason, 26(37.4%) of the respondents disagreed, and 7 (10.7%) strongly disagreed with the idea, so the total percentage of the students who disagreed and strongly disagreed on the item reveals 48.1% with the mean value of 24.05. On the other hand, 13 (19.9%) of the respondents agreed; likewise, 2 (1.9%) responded strongly agree, so the total percentage of the students who agreed with the idea is 21.8% with mean value of 10.9 %.

Coming to the rest of the respondents, 22 (30.1%) remained undecided. Concerning the total mean value of the item, it shows 2.65 and the SDv. value is .980. From this result, it is clear that nearly half percent of the respondents felt that the teachers did not focus on providing feedback on selective errors. Therefore, due to the fact that the students who disagreed with the item are slightly greater in number than these who agreed, the conclusion will be teachers probably had other preferred technique.

In the above table item 2, students were asked whether the teachers locate error or not; therefore, 24 (38.8%) of the respondents agreed, still other 4 (1.9%) strongly agreed on the idea; therefore, the total percentage is 40.7% with mean value of 20.35%. on the contrary, 20 (27.2%) of the respondents disagreed, and 10(6.8%) also strongly disagreed, so the total percentages of the students who disagreed indicate 34% with mean value of 17%. Calculating the rest number, the researcher found that 12 (25.2%) of the respondents' point of view on the item was undecided. The mean value of item 2 is 3.02 with the SDv. of 1.0007. The students who expressed their agreement are greater in number than those who responded the idea of disagreement; as a result, majority of the teachers write feedback by locating the erroneous part.

In a similar table item 3, students were asked if teachers correct each error, so 27(32.0%) of the respondents disagree, still 8(10.7%) strongly disagree on the idea. The total percentages of the students who disagreed indicate 42.7% with mean value of 21.35. However, 15(27.2%) of the respondents agreed, and 2(1.0%) strongly agreed, so the total percentage is 28.2% with mean value of 14.1. The result shows that the students who disagreed are greater in number than those who agreed. On the other hand, 18(29.1%) of the respondents are undecided. The mean value of the item is 2.76 with of SDv. 1.007. In short, the result shows teachers did not provide correction for each error.

In the table item 4, it deals with time bound of teacher written feedback, based on this information 40(64.6%) of the respondents disagree with the idea of written feedback is timely, and 5(2.4%) also strongly disagree; the total percentage reveals 67 with mean value of 33.5. On the contrary, of the total respondents 7 (14.6%) agree and 1(0.5%) strongly agree; the total percentage shows 16.1 and the mean value is 8.05. Moreover, 30 (14.6%) of the total

respondents remain undecided. The mean value is 2.46 with SDv. of .788. In conclusion, majority of the respondents felt that the teachers’ written feedback was untimely.

Item 5 in the same table was intended to obtain information if feedback shows direction of what students should do next; consequently, 30 (45.6%) of the total respondents disagree; likewise, 11 (14.6%) of the respondents strongly disagree due to the fact that the teachers’ written feedback does not show clear direction to involve themselves in the next tasks actively. In contrast, 7 (11.2%) of the respondents agree with the idea, yet none of the students has strongly agreed. The stand point of the 22(28.6%) of the respondents is unclear because they were undecided. Calculating the mean value, the researcher found 2.36 with the SDv. value of .866. From the result, it is clear that more than half of the students express their disagreement on the idea.

4.2. Students’ Feeling Towards Teacher Written Feedback

Table 4. 2: Students’ feeling towards teacher written feedback

Item		Responses					Total	Mean	SDv
		SA	A	U	D	SD			
1	The teacher’ s written feedback is clear and Complete	Fr %	6 1.5	10 22.8	30 40.8	17 31.6	7 3.4	70 100	2.87 .852
2	The teacher’ s written feedback helps me to improve my writing skill	Fr %	-	16 28.6	20 29.1	29 39.8	5 2.4	70 100	2.84 .872
3	The teacher’ s written feedback covers features of Writing	Fr %	2 .5	8 18.0	23 29.1	26 37.9	11 14.6	70 100	2.52 .966

4	The teacher feedback match with my interest and level	Fr	7	23	17	19	4	70	2.97	.944
		%	3.4	30.6	27.2	36.9	1.9	100		
5	The teacher has good practice on written feedback	Fr	3	10	17	34	6	70	2.84	.952
		%	3.9	23.8	27.7	41.7	2.9	100		

Key: SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree U = Neutral D = Disagree SD=Strongly Disagree
SDv. =Standard Deviation

As stated in table 2, item 1 was intended to elicit information whether written feedback was clear and complete or not, so majority, or 30(40.8%) of the respondents could not decide on the clarity and completeness of feedback. On the other hand, 17(31.6%) of the respondents disagreed, and 7(3.4%) strongly disagreed on the item. The total percentage of the students that disagreed and strongly disagreed reveals 35% with mean value of 17.5. However, 10(22.8%) of the respondents felt that their teachers' written feedback were clear and complete, similarly 6(1.5 %) strongly agree, so the total percentage is 24.1% with mean value of 12.05. The mean value of the item is 2.87 with SD value of .852. In conclusion, majority of the students could not decide on the clarity and completeness of the written feedback, thus as the result of the students who disagreed are greater in number, considering the number of the students that could not decide, the teachers' feedback lacked clarity and completeness.

In the same table, item2 was intended to obtain information whether written feedback helped them to improve their writing or not, to begin with the greater number, 29(39.8%) of the respondents disagreed with the idea, still 5(2.4%) of the respondents strongly disagree. As a result, the total percentage is 42.2% with mean value of 21.1. Nevertheless, 16(28.6%) agreed, but none of the students strongly agree on the item. Finally, 20(29.1%) could not decide on the contribution of feedback on students' writing improvement. The total mean value of the item is 2.84 with SD value of .872. In short, the respondents that disagreed are slightly greater than the agreed, so teachers' written feedback did not help them to improve their writing.

In a similar table, item 3 was asked to obtain information whether teacher written feedback covers features of writing or not; as a result, 26(37.9%) of the respondent disagreed, and 11(14.6%) of the

total respondents strongly disagree with the idea. The total percentage of the students who disagreed shows 52.5% with mean value of 26.25. However, 8(18.0%) of the respondents agreed, still other 1(0.5%) of the respondents strongly agreed that teachers' feedback covered the features of writing, so the total percentage of the students who agreed on the idea reveals 18.5% with mean value of 9.25. Of the total respondents, 25(29.1%) remained undecided. The mean value of the item is 2.52 with SD .966. To conclude, majority of the students felt that the teachers' written feedback did not cover the features of writing.

As clearly stated in the table item 4, 19(36.9%) of the respondents disagreed with the idea feedback meets students' interest and level; likewise, 4(1.9%) of the respondents strongly disagreed, so the total percentage of the students who disagreed with the idea indicates 38.8 % with mean value of 19.4. Nevertheless, 23(30.6%) of the respondent agreed, besides 7(3.4%) strongly agreed on the item. The total percentage of the agreed respondents shows 34 % with mean value of 17. Finally, 17(27.2%) could not decide. The mean value of the item is 2.97 with SDv. value of .944. In conclusion, the respondents who said feedback did not meet students' interest and level are slightly greater than those who said it did.

In the same table item 5, 34(41.7%) of the respondents disagreed, and 6(2.9%) responded strongly disagreed with the idea teachers have good practice in providing written feedback. The total percentages the students who disagreed on the item indicate 44.6% with mean value of 22.3. However, 10(23.8%) of the respondents agreed; likewise, 3(3.9%) strongly agreed on the item, so the total percentage reveals 27.7% with mean value of 13.85. Finally, 17(27.7%) of the respondents could not decide. The mean value of the item shows 2.84 with SD value of .952. In short, majority of the respondents felt that teachers did not have good practice on feedback.

4.3 The Existence of Written Feedback Aspects

Table 4.3: The frequency of the existence of written feedback aspects

	Item		Responses					Total	Mean	SDv
			A	U	ST	R	N			
1	How often do you discuss on the given feedback with your teacher?	Fr	-	4	22	33	11	70	2.30	.806
		%		5.8	34.5	43.7	16.0	100		
2	How often does your teacher' s written feedback show strength?	Fr	5	19	20	16	10	70	3.05	1.046
		%	7.8	28.2	31.6	26.7	5.8	100		
3	How often does your teacher' s written feedback explain weakness?	Fr	3	27	16	20	4	70	3.07	1.077
		%	6.3	35.4	24.8	26.2	7.3	100		
4	How often does your teacher state both strength and weakness?	Fr	3	14	21	28	4	70	2.74	1.011
		%	6.3	15.5	31.5	40.3	6.8	100		
5	How often does your teacher provide you successive tasks after you receive feedback?	Fr	-	3	23	33	11	70	2.20	.823
		%		4.9	31.1	43.2	20.9	100		
6	How often does your teacher create you an opportunity to revise?	Fr	-	5	20	34	11	70	2.26	.826
		%		6.3	31.6	44.2	18.0	100		
7	How often does your teacher append you repeat errors to present work?	Fr	4	6	23	27	10	70	2.54	.976
		%	3.4	11.7	34.0	37.9	13.1	100		

Key: A= Always U= usually ST= sometimes R= rarely N= never

In the above table, item 1 was intended to find out information on how often the students share their view with their teacher on the written feedback; as a result, 33(43.7%) of the respondents felt that the teachers rarely gave them a chance to deal with the written feedback. On the other hand, 22(34.5%) of

the respondents believed that the teachers sometimes let them discuss, and 11(16.0%), 4(5.8%) of the respondents said ‘ never’ and ‘ usually’ respectively. However, none of the students replied ‘ always’ . The mean value is 2.30 with SDv. of .806. In conclusion, the teachers did not create them a situation to discuss on the basis of the written feedback.

As can be seen in the table item 2, of the total respondents, 20 (31.6%) replied that written feedback sometimes stated strength, whereas 19 (28.2%), and 16(26.7%) of the students replied ‘ usually’ and ‘ rarely’ respectively. In addition, 10(7.8%), and 5(5.8%) replied ‘ always’ and ‘ never’ respectively. The mean value is 3.05 with SDv. of 1.046. In short, as compared with the number of students who said ‘ usually’ and ‘ rarely,’ slightly greater number of students felt that teacher written feedback sometimes talk about strength.

As stated in the above table, item 3 was asked to obtain information on how often written feedback centered on weakness, so 27(35.4%) of the students replied ‘ usually’ and 20(26.4%) replied ‘ rarely;’ on the other hand, 16(24.8%) said ‘ sometimes,’ 4(7.3%) also said ‘ never;.’ Finally, the rest of the respondents, that is, 3 (6.3%) replied ‘ always,’ and the mean value of the item is 3.07 with SDv. of 1.077. In short, majority of the students felt that teachers’ written feedback usually stated weakness.

As mentioned in the table item 4, the objective of the question was to get information about how often written feedback dealt with both strength and weakness; as a result, of the total respondents, 28(40.3%) answered ‘ rarely,’ and 21(31.5%) of the participants replied ‘ sometimes.’ . On the other hand, 14(15.5%), and 4(6.8%) of the respondents replied ‘ usually’ and ‘ never’ respectively. The other 3(6.3%) of the respondents said ‘ always’ . Moreover, the mean value of the item is 2.74 with SDv. of 1.011. To conclude, as the number of students who said rarely is high in number, teacher written feedback was unlikely to focus on both strength and weakness.

As can be clearly seen in the table, item 5 illustrates 33(43.2%) of the respondents replied that the teachers rarely provided successive tasks after students receive feedback, besides 23(31.1%) of the respondents said ‘ sometimes.’ Moreover, 11(20.9%) of the respondents replied ‘ never,’ where as 3 (4.9) said ‘ usually.’ None of the students supported the alternative ‘ always.’ The mean value of the item is 2.20 with SDv. of .823. In conclusion, majority of the participants replied ‘ rarely;’ as a

result, English teachers did not let their students practice on tasks progressively on the basis of teacher written feedback.

In the same table, item 6 was asked in order to elicit information on how often teachers connect their students with a revision process on the basis of the written feedback; as a result, 34(44.2%) of the participants replied ‘ rarely,’ while 20(31.6%) of the participants said ‘ sometimes.’ On the other hand, 11(18.0%) of the respondents replied the teacher never create an opportunity for revision, and 5(6.3%) of them feel the teacher usually encourage them revise, even though none of the respondents answered ‘ always.’ The mean value for the item shows 2.26 with SDv. of 8.26. In short, majority of the participants said ‘ rarely,’ thus teachers did not encourage their students to revise, so it can be also be concluded that teacher written feedback did not seem functional.

Item 7 was intended to obtain information on how often the teachers append repetitive errors on the students’ drafts in order to give them special attention. Therefore, it is apparent from the table that 27(37.9%) of the students responded that the teachers rarely indicate the errors that occur continuously, 23(34.0%) of the respondents said that the teachers sometimes append them frequently seen errors. In addition to this, 10(13.1%) of the participants replied ‘ never,’ and 6(11.7%) also said ‘ usually.’ Finally, 4(3.4%) is the least value that proves the answer “ always.’ The mean value of the item indicates 2.54 with SDv. of .976.

To conclude, the result shows that teachers did not append frequently appear students’ error, so the implication is there might be a gap in giving and receiving feedback between teachers and students.

4.4 Teachers’ Interview

Table 4.4: Educational background of the teachers

	Educational background	Frequency	percent
1	MA	2	28.6
2	BA	5	71.4
3	Others	-	-
4	Total	7	100.0

The objective of grouping the teachers based on educational background is to discuss the practice of the teachers on written feedback based on their educational background. Therefore, as can be seen in the above table, 5(71.4%) of the interviewees were degree holders, whereas 2 (28.6%) of them were MA holders with a mean value of .14 and SDv. of .29. In short, large numbers of teachers were degree holders.

In this study, an interview was held with English language teachers. The objective of the interview was to get genuine information from the teachers through face to face communication. In addition, the researcher used semi-structured interview, so it created a good opportunity to raise any doubts that occur when researcher interviewed them. The relevance of the data gathered from the teachers was evaluated, so they were assembled based on their character. In addition, the researcher did his best to avoid repetition, so similar ideas were generalized. However, different points of view given by the teachers were clearly stated separately.

4.4.1 The Way that EFL Teachers Apply Written Feedback

This item was intended to elicit information that deals with the teachers' techniques that are used while they provide written feedback. One of the interviewees felt that he had got a good knowledge of feedback when he attended his MA program, so the teacher's perception was that he strived to make his practices down to the earth.

Therefore, the practice of this teacher is stated as follows:

My prior action was, setting criteria that help me evaluate the students' writing, and then give a value for each criterion. When I wrote a written feedback on the students writing, I considered the students' interest and level of understanding, and my written feedback also varied from students to students or groups to groups. I mean that for students who performed well, I only indicated the errors which need special attention, whereas for students who fail to achieve the intended objective, I provided detail

comment- I mean that I located each error, and then replaced by correct one.

Regarding the mentioned practice, the researcher asked the interviewee on how the students feel when the teacher used various ways for students who are at different level of performance?

The participant replied:

Teachers can use various techniques if they feel applicable. My experience of teaching writing was poor, so currently I want to change this practice. As a result, for what I would like to do I always communicate with my students and I reach on a common consensus with them. I feel that students have different level of performance, so I try to vary my written feedback in order to bring them the same level of performance.

In addition, the interviewee shared his practice about the main focus of his written feedback. He said that “ I believe easily treatable errors, like spelling and grammar are given little attention, so my focus while I evaluate my students’ writing is on what the students wrote – I mean I concentrate on the message.”

The second teacher had a similar practice because she did her MA, but to mention few points the teacher claimed:

First I identify the background level of the students on writing skill, and then I designed clear objectives in a way that incorporate all my students, and then I prepare tasks. In providing written feedback I follow certain criteria, such as spelling, grammar, content and organization I read each written work seriously in order to give special attention while I wrote feedback. Therefore, for serious problems I gave detail description of about the strength and weakness on their written work, and then I suggest what the student should do in his or her revision process, but I do not feel that I

give equal attention for each student' s work since written feedback is by nature exhaustive.

The researcher asked what her contribution in the revision process seems. She reported “ I feel I do not see their revisions because I need much time to cover the other lessons, but at their first draft I always orient the students what they should do.”

The third interviewee was an experienced teacher, so he felt that he gave feedback that shows clear direction for his students. In his explanation, he said:

We teachers focus on either strong or weak side in order not to spend much time and waste our energy, but this is not ethical because our students need a support from us. Therefore, if we do not provide them comments that include both strong and weak sides, they may not have good foundation and may not be optimistic towards the development of the skill.

After that the teacher provided his own practice which seems similar with the previous interviewee' s ideas.

This teacher explained:

At first I give simple writing task to my students; for example, I make them to write short sentences in order to differentiate the level of the students, so this seems paves me a way to identify where my students need help. After that when I give them tasks to be completed individually or in a group, I dealt with the issues that deserve attention. While I provide written feedback I write them both strong and weak side of their work. Finally, I give them a comment on what points they should improve, and then check their revision if they are well done. If the students do not improve I prepared similar task and give them feedback to develop final version.

The researcher feels that the above teachers seem to have good practices because almost all of them prepared certain principles that they should follow. However, they still have difference; for example, the revision process is not given equal attention by all of the teachers.

The fourth two interviewees were asked the same question. When the researcher asked them they were in a state of confusion. I asked them why? Both gave me similar response and their reason was they did not have detail knowledge about feedback; anyhow, one of the interviewee said: “ My intention while I provide feedback is to make the students produce error-free written work, so I glean and abolish each error and put the right word.” He also added that “ while I give feedback on my students written work, I do not have clear grounds, but I simply provide them based on what seems true to me.”

On the other hand, the other teacher felt that “ I do not have detail understanding on feedback because I did not get detail information about it in the past. For this reason, “ I do not feel that my students have got enough support from me, since my written feedback relied on a blindly made decision or personal emotion rather than scientific way, so for the time being, I cannot share you much more about my feedback practice.”

Regarding the last two teachers, they used a similar technique. They said for students who worked hard, they used appreciation words, such as keep it up, well done and nice; however, if the students failed to achieve the objective, the teachers gave only negative comments, that is, they listed out the weakness. The researcher asked them if they explained both strong and weak side of the students’ written work, but they did not use this technique.

In conclusion, the teachers’ educational background and experience are determinant factor for the attainment of written feedback. In conclusion, it seems true that students’ progress on writing skill is also determined by the teachers’ application of written feedback.

4.4.2 Regularity of written feedback on students’ writing

This item was intended to elicit information that reveals the frequency of written feedback on students’ writing. Almost the entire participant had a similar view and some of their feelings are

mentioned as follows:

The first participant said:

I feel that my students and I still have not firm stand point on writing skill – I mean we are still treating it as a supplementary to the other language skills. I, as a teacher have to be blamed because my students, for sure, follows my way. Secondly, the students’ lack of interest towards writing is due to various reasons, like being grammar-focused, affects me not to change their attitude easily. For this reason, I rarely provided writing activities, and the same is true for that of written feedback. Therefore, I can assure you that I provided written feedback only when I collected assignments, this also happen once a semester.

The second participant replied that “ I believe that giving writing tasks, and then providing written feedback for each students’ work is time taking and tiring, so I do not want to give writing tasks consistently; however, when I give assignment and sometimes when I make them write at class room to do my best, but I do not think writing tasks and written feedback have been done persistently.”

The third participant expressed:

Whenever there were writing lessons, I feel that I provided tasks for my students at classroom and outside of classroom as an assignment, and I can ascertain that I gave them feedback if time did not preclude me. By nature I do not want to shirk as far as I have energy and capacity, so I think that I have shared my experience and knowledge. However, I still feel that my written feedback is not given at the right time; therefore, I cannot say all students are benefited from it.

The fourth participant replied that “ I rarely provide feedback, to be specific, when I collected only assignments. Even though writing is a practical work, I present only theoretical aspects; for

this reason, this does not let me provide written feedback.”

The last three participants also expressed a similar view with the fourth participant and said that they provided written feedback with the intention of fulfilling previously set measurement criteria, so it happened only in a limited time. Two of these interviewees worked at the same school, so they added that at department level, writing assignment was intended to be given only once; therefore, once the teachers collected the students’ assignments, there would not be additional writing tasks in and outside classroom, and at the same time, supplying feedback on students’ writing stopped.

The researcher interviewed each participant if their feedback was timely, six of the teachers felt that their feedback was untimely; however, one of the teacher said that he did his best to provide them immediately. To be clear with, the researcher would like to put few of their views as follows:

The first two interviewees had completely the same idea, each of them said “ I feel that providing feedback in a large class size is challenging, so my feedback is delayed.” In addition to this, the third interviewee replied, “ Written feedback is time taking, but I have unmanageable class size, so I do not provide them immediately.” The fourth interviewee felt that “ I believe that written feedback should be intended to promote students’ writing skill, so it takes me much time to decide on how I should apply my written feedback.” Likewise, the fifth interviewee said, “ I believe that deciding on which error should the written feedback focus on and how should it be provided is time taking tasks, so it seems to me that these two things take much of my time; for this reason my feedback is untimely.” The sixth interviewee replied “ I believe that feedback is helpful if it is given immediately, but I cannot do that due to work load.

4.4.4 The challenges in providing written feedback

The teachers reported different challenges; therefore, the problems are organized as follow: All of the teachers felt that lack of knowledge is the main problem to provide effective written feedback. They believed that teachers do not have scientific knowledge about what and how they should give written feedback. Most of the teachers still used traditional approach, that is, they still focused on wiping out

error, particularly errors that centered on spelling and grammar. Therefore, written feedback emphasized on identifying weakness errors, like spelling rather than basic writing feature.

The participants also added:

T1: “I think that the students little interest towards writing skill- this hinders me not to use written feedback effectively.” On the contrary, he added that “ We teachers do not challenge our students to give special attention to writing skill as a whole.

T2: “ It seems to me that written feedback by nature needs much time, so teaches forced to give it little attention; for example, as far as I am concerned teachers usually focus on either strong or weak side rather than providing detail explanation on both sides.

T3: “I feel students errors are various and individualistic, so errors need various techniques. Therefore, all of the teachers fail to achieve students writing skill due to performance gap among the teachers.

T4: this teacher provided somewhat similar idea with T1, and mentioned “ I believe that students have little interest towards writing due to lack of prior knowledge; as a result, students do not give value for the written feedback because to the best of my experience students only concentrate on grades rather than asking about content of feedback.

T5: “ I think that lack of clarity on students writing does not create suitable condition for provision of written feedback.

T6: “I believe that lack of appropriateness on the writing lessons affect the teachers feedback process because some of the lessons are vague and are not suitable to provide the written feedback.”

T7: “I feel that the students background, that is, lack of practice on written feedback affects teachers, thus it is found hard to change the attitude of the students, but we teachers do not provide feedback as soon as possible, so it doesn’t have positive impact. In conclusion, most of the teachers felt that the challenges are not beyond the control of the teachers because they believed that if teachers are determined, they can change the situation.

4.5 Data from Document Analysis

Written feedback is obviously a source of learning for students. Brookhart (2008: 9) claimed that feedback can be powerful if done well. Therefore, teachers good practice of providing well organized feedback on students writing is indispensable because feedback is a determinant factor for students writing progress. As a result, the researcher chose this tool with the intent of identifying teachers feedback presentation on students' writing. The researcher tried to collect students assignment sheets, and then picked valuable information from the students written work, so the discussion is organized on the basis the assignment sheets; moreover, sample students sheet that contain written feedback are attached at the appendix part.

4.5.1 Clarity of the Written Feedback

As far as the researcher is concerned, majority of the teachers' written feedbacks did not have clarity and comprehensiveness. As the researcher tried to see the students' written works, the teachers' feedback lacked specificity. It means that most of the comments were general; they did not clearly indicate which area of weakness the students should focus on; for example, the teachers used expression, like "Don't repeat the same words, and "title" -are unclear which words he or she means, what the student should do with the title. The teachers' feedback also lacked neatness, so it did not incorporate learners with different learning style.

4.5.2 Comprehensiveness of the Written Feedback

The teachers did not seem to identify which writing features better fits with which kind of writing because most of the comments centered on mechanics and spelling errors, but little attention was given to content and organization. Moreover, some of the students' written works were not commented properly, but teachers simply gave marks.

The positive comments did not show any direction because they were stated at word level; for example, the teachers emphasized on words, such as nice, good try, very good, so they did not explain which issue was good and which needed an improvement.

Hence, the teachers' written feedback did not cover the most important aspects of language, so had little significance to students writing skill improvement.

4.5.3 Nature of Teachers' Written Feedback

As the researcher observed, the teachers' written feedback on students' writing concentrated on positive and negative comments depend on the teachers' practice of feedback provision. Some of the negative comments were discouraging for the students; for example, the teachers used expressions, like “lack clarity at all,” and order word, such as “not allowed here, revise your sentences again and an unrelated idea is not allowed. However, according to the researcher it would be better to provide comments that focus on both positive and negative; for example, it is good idea, but ..., you tried to state your ideas in such a way, but it's somewhat unrelated, and it would be better if you mentioned the title etc. The researcher feels the feedback provider should worry for the expressions while he/she provide comments. In conclusion, most of the teachers' comment focused on negative comments and do not keep the students feeling.

4.5.4 Teachers' Feedback Giving Strategies

As the researcher saw from the students' written work, most of the teachers relied on indirect feedback because the teachers circled up on the erroneous part of sentences. However, regarding the correction of the errors, there was lack of consistency because the teachers either replace with correct one or leave it to be corrected by the students.

As the researcher observed, teachers did not use consistent format of providing feedback because their written feedback was placed in various position. Teachers wrote their comment on top of the erroneous statement, they wrote at the bottom of the sheet, and they also circled the erroneous word or phrase as well; therefore, this may lead the students to confusion because they cannot identify which comment they should focus on, besides the students may not also be encouraged to redraft their writing due to the fact that they comments lack clear organization.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

The main objective of this study was to assess the Practices of EFL teachers' written feedback on students' writing writing. The subjects of this study were seventy (70) students, and seven (7) EFL teachers. The students were chosen through systematic random sampling, whereas the EFL teachers were selected purposively. The study aimed to answer the following questions.

1. How do EFL teachers give written feedback on students' writing?
2. What do students feel towards EFL teachers ' written feedback to their writing?
3. How often do EFL teachers give written feedback on students writing?

Data for this study was gathered using questionnaires, interview and document analysis. Questionnaires were designed for participant students, whereas interview was prepared for teachers . The questionnaires included both open and close ended. Questionnaires for students were structured, while the interview sessions were semi-structured. The researcher used descriptive survey design involving qualitative and quantitative methods. After the quantitative data were collected, they were categorized and coded, so the researcher fed the raw data into SPSS version 20. Consequently, the results were described numerically and textually. Moreover, the qualitative data were given detail explanation on the basis of the participants ideas. According to the results of this study, it can be concluded that EFL teachers' written feedback Practices written feedback practice did not play a vital role in improving students writing skill, so the researcher recommended that writing without written feedback is unlikely to show significant change in students' writing, so teachers should work hard to improve their written feedback practice .

5.2 Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn based on the findings of the study: The study revealed that majority of the teachers focused on locating errors, rather than correcting error selectively and writing feedback for each error.

The result from both teachers and students interview showed that teachers had lack of knowledge on written feedback, so the students were not helped as needed.

The study find out that almost all teachers provided written feedback in a very limited period of time, thus written feedback was untimely. The study identified that teachers written feedback was not given based on the characters of students writing since most of the written feedback on students writing focused on spelling and grammar usage. On the other hand, teachers written feedback mainly concentrated on either strong or weak side, rather than on both sides. In addition to this, as the document analysis showed written feedbacks were not encouraging, that is, they did not seem to involve students as an active role player in their own learning. On the teachers did not have format to explain their comments.

The result indicated that teachers did not create opportunities for revision after the students received written feedback. On the other hand, results from document showed that teachers did not have clear format to explain their comments, thus it had negative impact in the revision process.

As the result of the findings revealed that teachers had lack of enough knowledge on provision of effective written feedback; likewise, both teachers and students considered writing as secondary, at the same time, written feedback could not produce an impact on the students' writing.

The result from interview with teachers explained that English language teachers do not set measurable and detailed plan while they discuss on the continuous assessment on writing; as a result, teachers were forced not to take responsibility towards the ongoing writing process and feedback.

The result indicates that even the teachers that had better educational level and understanding were at the same status with the other teachers due to the fact the theoretical framework was not changed into practice.

To put in a nut shell, the result revealed that teacher written feedback was ambiguous, it did not show any direction that leads to revision, it did not follow formal requirements, it concentrated on weakness, so it was unconstructive.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are forwarded: According to the researcher, written feedback needs scientific knowledge in order to address to writers properly. For this reason, teachers should increase their knowledge on feedback, and then should teach their students about the role of written feedback to improve writing skill.

As far as the researcher is concerned writing and feedback could be effective if they are practiced continuously; therefore, teachers should let their students draft and re-draft; besides they should evaluate the progress on their writing.

Teachers should have a clear format for their written feedback, that is, the teachers should know where and how to give written feedback. Moreover, in providing written feedback, teachers should think of the students' interest and level because this may help them vary the way they provide written feedback.

Written feedback on student's writing seemed to center on the same features of writing, but teachers should identify the nature of students' writing and provide feedback in correspondence with the features of writing.

Teachers should know that if feedback is delayed, students will not be benefited from it, so teachers should adjust their time in order to address feedback as soon as possible.

Teachers should be informed that written feedback that focuses on either strong or weak side is less likely to help students develop their writing, so teachers written feedback should contain positive, negative and direction towards revision.

From the researcher's point of view, as a cart without horse is nothing, teachers without students active engagement might be unsuccessful; as a result, students should pay attention for the teacher written feedback.

Teachers and students should know that feedback on students' writing could be understood well if there is two way communications, so both of them should create conducive environment to talk with each other on the provided feedback.

In teaching and learning process department heads and supervisors have a vital role to run works properly, so they should work with teachers cooperatively and arrange situation to solve any challenges immediately, besides should assess what seems the progress of written feedback and its contribution for students.

Finally, the implication of this study is teachers written feedback needs further investigation in order to bring significant change on students writing; as a result, other researchers could develop an experimntal research probably on the title "The effect of teacher written feedback on students' writing.

Reference

- Alamrew G/Mariam (2005). A study on the perception of writing, writing instruction and students' writing performance.(Unpublished PhD Dissertation. AAU: Addis Ababa University).
- Askew, S. (2000). *Feedback for Learning*. New York. Taylor & Francis e - library.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in Support of Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition*, 14, 191-205.
- Bitchener, J & Ferris, D.(2012). *Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing*. New York. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Bitchener, J, Young, S & Cameron, D. (2005). The Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 14, 191-205.
- Brookhart, S. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. United State of America. ASCD Publications.
- Burke, D. & Pieterick, J.(2010). *Giving Students Effective Written Feedback*. Open University Press. Bell & Bain Ltd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chandler, J.(2003).The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 12, 267-296.
- Coffin et al. (2003). *Teaching Academic Writing: A Toolkit for Higher Education*. London. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Cohen, A. and Robbins, M. (1976). 'Toward Assessing inter language Performance: The l'(relationship Between Selected Errors, Learners' Characteristics, and Learners' Expectations', *Language Learning*, 26, PP: 45-66.

Denscombe, M.(2003). *The Good Research Guide: for small- scale social research project* (2ndedn). Open University Press.

Dheram, P. K. (1995). Feedback as a two-bullock cart: A case study of teaching writing. *ELT*

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative and Edge, J.* (1989). *Mistakes and Correction*. Longman.

Ellis, R. (2009). A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97-107.

Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing Teachers to Respond to student writing. *Journal of Second ELT Journal* 44(4).

Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and Students' revision: Teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.

Grami, M. A (2004). *The Effect of Teachers Written Feedback on ESL Students Writing: A Study on a Saudi ESL University-Level Context*, University of Essex: Unpublished MA, Thesis.

Gray, D, E. 2004. *Doing Research in the Real World*. London: Sage Publications, Ltd.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1989). *Spoken and Written Language*. Victoria. Deakin University Press.

Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3rd edn). London. Longman.

Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*. 77(1): 81– 112.

Heaton, J. B. (1988). *Writing English Language Tests*. London. Longman. Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Hinton, P, R. et al. 2004. *SPSS Explained*. New York.

Taylor & Francis e-Library. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: CUP

Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing*. Language

Hyland, K. & Hyland, F. (2006). *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Italo Beriso. (1999). "A Comparison of the Effectiveness of Teacher versus Peer Feedback on AAU Students' Writing Revisions." (PhD Dissertation, Addis Ababa University). Keh, C. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44, 94-304. Learning.

Keh, C.L. (1990). *Feedback in the Writing Process. A model and method for implementation*.

Kothari, C. R. (2004). *Research Methodology. Methods and techniques (2nd, ed)*. New Delhi.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kroll, B. (2001). Consideration for Teaching an ESL/EFL Writing Course. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (3rd ed.)* (pp. 219-232): Boston. *Language Writing*. 16, 165-193. *Language Writing*. 17, 102-118.

Lee, I. (2003). L2 Writing Teachers' Perspective, Practices, and Problems Regarding Error Feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 8, 216-237.

Linse, C. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Young Learners*. New York. Mc Graw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Mc Donough, et al. (2013). *Materials and Methods in ELT. A teacher's Guide (3rd edn.)*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. UK.

Mekonnen Abebe. (2009). Students' Perception and the Significance of Feedback in the Writing Class: A case study of Bole Senior and Preparatory School. Addis Abeba University. Mixed Methodologies. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nation, I. S.P.(2009). Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing. New York. Taylor & Francise eLibrary.

Nelson, M. and Schunn, C. (2009). The Nature of Feedback: How Different Types of Peer Feedback Affect Writing Performance. *Instructional Science*, 37, 375-401.

Nicol, D. (2010). From Monologue to Dialogue: Improving Written Feedback Process in Mass Higher Education, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. 35(5), 501-517.

Nunan, D (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Peterson (2010). *Enhancing Student Writing Using Effective Feedback*. London. Longman. Pincas, A. (1984). *Writing in English*. London. Mac Millan. Press.

Raimes, A.(1991). Out of the Woods: Emerging Traditions in the Teaching of Writing. *TESOL Quarterly*. 25(3), 407-430.

Razali , R.& Jupri, R. (2014). Exploring Teacher Written Feedback and Students Revision on ESL Students' Writing. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. 19(5), 63-70.

Richards, J. C. and Lockhart, C. 1994. *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*.

Semke, H. (1984). Effects of the Red Pen: *Foreign Language Annuals*, 17(3), 195-202.

Scales, P. (2008). *Teaching in the Lifelong Learning Sector*. McGraw-Hill. Open University.

Sharma, P. (2013). English in Ethiopia. *Science, Technlogy, Arts Journal*. 2(1), 74-85. Wolloga University.

Singh, Y, K.(2006). *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistics*. New Delhi. New Age International(P), ltd.

Sommers, N.(1982). *Responding to Student Writing*. 33(2), 148-156. Steele, V. (2004). *Product and Process Writing*. Retrieved on 5th Sept. 2010.

Stern, L.A. & Solomon, A. (2006). *Effective faculty feedback: The road less traveled*.

Straub, R. (1996). *The Concept of Control in Teacher Response: Defining the Varieties of “ Directive and Facilitative” Commentary*. 47(2), 223-251.

Tamene Abdisa & Yemanebirhan Kelemework. (2014). *The Practice of Feedback Provision in Teaching Writing Skills: Adu Sigimo Highschool Grade 10 in Focus*. Jimma University.

Taras, M. (2003). *To feedback or not to feedback in student self-assessment*. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28 (5), 549-565. *Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 427-431. *Teaching*, 39, 77-95.doi: 10. 1017/So26144806003399.

Taye.(2005).*The effect of written feedback (PhD Dissertation, Addis Ababa University)*.

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

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wen, Y. (2013).*Teacher Written Feedback on L2 Students Writing*. *Journal of Language*.

Weigle, S. (2002).*Assessing Writing*.Cambridge. CUP.

Williams, J, D. (2003). *Preparing to Teach Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. *Writing*, 11, 22-41.

Zamel, V. (1982). *Writing: The Process of Discovering Meaning*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16 (2).

Zhan, L. (2016). *Written Teacher Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Perceptions, an Actual Teacher Performance*. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*. *English Language Teaching*; 9(8), 73-8

Appendix A

Addis Ababa University
College of Social Science and Humanities
Department of Foreign Language and Literature

Students' Questionnaire The purpose of this questionnaire is **assess the Practices of EFL teachers' written feedback on students' writing**, so your response will be used only for research purpose, and you are kindly requested to provide your genuine responses.

Thank you in advance!

Background information: please mark with the sign " X" about your personal data.

Grade 9th and 10th Students

General Direction: In the following list you will find different items that deal with your belief towards teacher written feedback, so please mark with the sign " X" for each of the item according the following scales.

Strongly agree =5 Agree = 4 Neutral = 3 Disagree = 2 Strongly disagree = 1

Students' belief towards teacher's written feedback

No	Item	5	4	3	2	1
1	The teacher provides written feedback on selective errors.					
2	The teacher's written feedback focuses only on locating the errors.					
3	The teacher writes feedback for each error.					
4	Teacher's written feedback is timely.					

5	The teacher' s feedback shows clear direction for next task.					
6	The teacher' s written feedback is clear and complete.					
7	The teacher' s written feedback helps me to improve my writing skill.					
8	The teacher' s written feedback covers features of writing.					
9	The teacher feedback match with my interest and level.					
10	The teacher has good practice on written feedback.					

General Direction: In the following list you will find different items that deal with how often different course of action of written feedback happen, so please mark with the sign “ X” for each of the item according the following scales. The rating scales’ are weighed as follow:

Always =5 Usually = 4 Sometimes = 3 Rarely= 2 Never = 1

		5	4	3	2	1
1	How often do you discuss on the given feedback with your teacher?					
2	How often does your teacher' s written feedback show strength?					
3	How often does your teacher' s written feedback explain weakness?					
4	How often does your teacher state both strength and weakness?					
5	How often does your teacher provide you successive tasks?					
6	How often does your teacher create you an opportunity to revise?					
7	How often does your teacher append you repeat errors to present work?					

Appendix B: Classroom Observation Checklist

Date of Observation _____

Code of the Teacher _____

Total Time of the Lesson _____ Minute _____

Points to be observed during classroom interaction

No	Teachers practice of written feedback	T1		T2		T3		T4	
		Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
1	Does the teacher teach writing? Which approach does the teacher uses?								
	Process								
	product								
2	Does the teacher give written feedback on the students writing?								
3	Students are given enough time to comment each other work and to write second draft								
4	Role of teacher								
	1. Judging / evaluating 2. Facilitator								
5	Which type of written feedback was being practiced?								
	3.1. Teacher written feedback as whole class								
	3.2. self -written feedback								
	3.3. peer feedback								
6	Does the teacher give, homework, assignment to correct?								
7	Are there any challenges that influence the implementation of written feedback in the classroom?								
	Work load								
	Lack of enough time								
	Students interest								
	Lack of students motivation								

	Lack of teacher training								
8	Does teacher comments motivating and interests the learner?								
	Does a teacher comments								
	a. on each student writing								
	b. as whole class								
	On which of the students writing does the teacher provide feedback?								
	a. first draft								
	b. Second draft								
	c. Last version								
9	Kind of feedback being used								
	Direct								
	Indirect								
10	Which type of written feedback does the teacher use most?								
	Praise								
	Criticism								
	Suggestion								
11	Does a teacher explain all the comments?								

Appendix C

Teacher interview Questionnaires

1. How do you give written feedback for your students?
2. Why do you give written feedback?
3. What are the challenges to provide effective written feedback?
4. What do you recommend that teachers do to provide effective written feedback?
5. How often do you give written feedback for your students?

Samples of teachers' interview

1. **Researcher:** How do you give written feedback for your students?

Teacher: I feel that my feedback consider students' level of performance because students who cannot perform well cannot be treated equally with high achievers, so I try to give detail feedback for low achievers.

2. **Researcher:** Why do you give written feedback?

Teacher: I think that I provide feedback on students' writing in order to help them improve their writing skill.

3. **Researcher:** What are the challenges to provide effective written feedback?

Teacher: It seems to me that I have lack of knowledge on feedback, so my students may not get enough support to improve their writing.

Researcher: What do you recommend that teachers do to provide effective written feedback?

