

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES, JOURNALISM
AND COMMUNICATION

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

Post Graduate Program (Regular)

**Assessing Teachers' Written Feedback Provision Techniques: the Case of two
Addis Ababa Preparatory Schools, Grade 11 in Focus**

By

Woldesilase Taye

MAY 2019

Addis Ababa

**Assessing Teachers' Written Feedback Provision Techniques : the Case of two
Addis Ababa Preparatory Schools Grade 11 in Focus**

**BY
WOLDESILASE TAYE**

**A Thesis Submitted to Department of Foreign Languages and Literature in
Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts
(MA) in English Language Teaching (ELT)**

**MAY 2019
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES, LANGUAGE STUDIES,
JOURNALISM AND COMMUNICATION
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

As thesis research advisor, I hereby certify that I have read and evaluated this thesis prepared under my guidance, by Woldesilase Taye entitled: Assessing Teachers' Written Feedback Techniques and its Effect on Students' Writing in EFL Writing Class and students' experience of practicing the feedback: the Case of two Addis Ababa Preparatory Schools Grade 11 in Focus; Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in English Language Teaching (ELT) conform to the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

BY

WOLDESILASE TAYE

Approved By Examining Committee

Melaku Wakuma (PhD)

Advisor

Signature

Date

Examiner

Signature

Date

Examiner

Signature

Date

Abstract

The aim of this study was to assess teachers' written feedback implementation techniques. In line with this the study also aims at finding out if students use the feedback provided by the teachers. To achieve the objectives proposed, relevant data were collected through corrected written documents, teachers' interviews, and students' questionnaire. The result obtained from the corrected written document revealed that two of the four teachers used underlining and or circling the errors and didn't indicate the types of the errors while the other two teachers crossed on all the errors or stretch- out with an arrow and write the correct version. Some of the corrections were not clear, as students reported in the questionnaire. And about students' experience of practicing their writing in line with the feedback they are provided with is very low for some reasons. For instance, their teachers hand writing and the feedback she/he provided was not clear and also their own carelessness were some of the reasons. The analysis of the data showed that the written feedback provided by the teachers lacked clarity, teachers didn't use clue, and they didn't involve students in the process of correction, most of the students didn't revise their writing and correct their writings. It is therefore, recommended that teachers should involve students in the process of correcting errors, and they also need to encourage students and check their works after giving the feedback. They must use clues or any clear ways in providing written feedback and create a common understanding on the codes they uses. Students ought to pay attention for the correction that they receive from their teachers and try to correct their errors in the light of the feedback they are provided with. Moreover, teachers need to update their knowledge of feedback provision techniques. They are needed to be provided short-terms capacity building training.

Acknowledgments

First and for the most my heartfelt and special thanks go to the Almighty God for He has never forsaken me and being my all strength and success throughout my work. I would really like to extend greater thanks to my candid advisor Dr. Melaku Wakuma, for his concise and incessant support, scholarly advice, insightful and critical comments.

My sincere thanks also go to my wife Firanol Dawit, my mother-in-law w/ro Hana Abate, Mr. Crispen Zana and his family and Genet Tamirat for their care, financial support and advice throughout the way. My great appreciations also go to my dearest friends Tagesse Elias, Adane Yohannes, Alebachew and those whom I didn't mention their names, who stood on my side by the time I was in a big challenge to get this chance to be a regular student being sponsored by Shone Town Administration.

I would also like to thank all the communities of Miskaye Hizunan and Kolfe Keranio Secondary and Preparatory School.

Last but not least, I am also indebted to all relatives and others friends who supported me with materials that I was in need of and mostly my gratitude to secretary, Typist for her skillful support in typing and retyping this paper from the beginning up to the final work.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	ii
CHAPTER ONE	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the problem	3
1.3. Objectives of the Study	6
1.3.1. General Objective	6
1.3.2. Specific Objectives	6
1.4. Significance of the study	6
1.5. Scope of the study	7
1.6. Limitation of the study	7
1.7. Organization of the study	7
CHAPTER TWO	9
Review of Related Literature	9
2.1 The Purpose of Writing.....	9
2.1.1 Accuracy and Fluency	10
2.1.1.1 Accuracy.....	10
2.1.1.2 Fluency	10
2.1.2 Writing Tasks	11
2.1.2.1 Controlled Writing.....	11
2.1.2.2 Guided Writing	11
2.1.2.3 Free Writing	12
2.1.3 Writing and feedback.....	12
2.2 Feedback.....	14
2.2.1 The Concept Feedback	14
2.2.1.1 The potential of feedback	15
2.2.1.2 The role of the learner in the feedback process	16
2.2.1.3 Feedback in FL writing.....	17
2.2.1.4 Teacher feedback practices	18

2.2.1.5 Students' understanding of feedback in writing	19
2.2.2 Written Feedback.....	20
2.2.3 Is Form Feedback Necessary?	22
2.2.4 ESL/EFL Learners and Form Feedback	23
2.2.5 Some Important Issues in Feedback	23
2.2.6 How Feedback Works: Reducing the Discrepancy between Current and.....	25
2.2.7 Using the Four Levels and Three Questions to Untangle Some Thorny	26
2.2.8 Who Should Provide Feedback?.....	29
2.2.8.1 When to Provide Feedback?	30
2.2.8.2 How to Correct Errors.....	30
2.2.8.3 What Kinds of Errors Should Be Corrected?.....	33
2.2.8.4 Do Students Make Use of Feedback for Revisions?.....	33
2.3 Related Research Works	34
CHAPTER THREE	37
Research Design and Methodology	37
3.1 Research Design.....	37
3.2 Participants of the Study	37
3.3. Sample and Sampling Technique.....	38
3.4 Data garnering Methods	38
3.4.1. Document analysis.....	38
3.4.2 Interview	39
3.4.3. Questionnaire.....	39
3.5. Data garnering procedure.....	40
3.6 Method of Data Analysis.....	40
CHAPTER FOUR.....	42
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	42
4.1 Background information of the subjects'	42
4.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of Subjects.....	43
4.2 Analysis of the data obtained through the students' written documents corrected by teachers.....	43
4.2.1. The written (corrective) feedback provided by teachers and the types	44

4.3 Analysis and Interpretation of the data obtained through Teachers' Interview	47
4.3.1 The types of written feedback provision techniques teachers use	48
4.3.2 Students' understanding of the feedback they are provided and if teachers explain how to use.....	50
4.4. Students' Reactions to the written feedback	56
4.4.1 Students' reaction on the techniques of feedback provision by the teacher	56
4.4.2 The extent students understand the teacher provided feedback	59
4.4.3 Students' practice of using the provided feedback.....	61
4.4.4 Students' Thought.....	62
4.5 Findings and Discussion.....	64
4.5.3 The clarity of the written feedback implemented.....	66
4.5.4 The students experience of making use of the provided feedback	67
CHAPTER FIVE	68
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	68
5.1 Summary	68
5.2. Conclusions.....	68
APPENDICES	76
APPENDIX A.....	76
APPENDIX C	83
Appendix D.....	86

List of Tables

Table 1: Teachers' background information:.....	43
Table 2. Techniques used in providing written feedback	57
Table 3. Students' understanding level of the written feedback provided by their teachers.	59
Table 4. Students' practice of using feedback.	61

CHAPTER ONE

1.1. Background of the Study

English language is given as a single course at all level of education curriculum in Ethiopia. In some part of the country from primary second cycle up to the tertiary level, English language is used as the medium of instruction. For instance, in SNNPR starting from grade 5 and in Addis Ababa starting from grade 7 English is used as a medium of instruction and in some other areas too. This shows that English language in the education system of the country has a great place. Thus, English language has been given the highest period in a week and it is one of the compulsory subject in Ethiopian education system. Almost the highest educational materials are designed and written in English, not only in education areas but in nonacademic issues also. For instance, most business project works, commercial issues and several governmental programs are organized and prepared in English language.

Among the four language skills writing is one of the most important skill where people express their feelings though this skill. According to White (1989), until the end of 1950s, language teaching was highly influenced by the audio-lingual approach. During that time, writing skill was regarded as being somewhat inferior form of the other language skills particularly speech. Besides, the focus of teaching writing was mainly on the achievement of linguistic knowledge for the approach was accuracy oriented (White, 1989). Therefore, attempts to teaching writing were carried out by merely giving students a topic of some kind and asking them to produce a 'composition' without further help (Nunan, 1989). Moreover, writing is hated by many students. Part of the distaste was related to the associations students make with it. As to the reason Richards (1995) states that writing process was learned mostly in an environment of constant criticism and repeated failure.

Currently, writing skill is one of the most demanding skills in the world of academy that students should cope up it. Although it is the most difficult skill to master easily, in learning to write students need a great deal of support especially an appropriate way of feedback provision. The poor knowledge in the language skills can affect the learners' academic achievement in their respective field of study. In line with this, pupils' future is largely dependent on the success in it. Therefore, it has given the highest period in a week (Ed Training policy of Eth 2002).

Though Students learn the language as a subject matter starting from grade one their competence is poor. Elementary school levels as Stoddert (1986) are very poor and it is extremely difficult for them to follow secondary schools, school instruction concurrently and the level English acquired by students in secondary schools. When we come to our country's context, most students are poor at writing in the academic requirements. When they are given assignments they face a massive challenge in producing a certain text they are asked to do at the preparatory level. Even, at the tertiary level at most they just download them from internet and submit as it is without making any edition. According to some educators, it is too low for them to be able to pursue their tertiary education where English is totally the medium of instruction (Seime 1999:15).

Therefore, feedback in improving students' writing has a great importance. According to Sadler (1989), feedback is usually defined in terms of its informational content and highlights the knowledge and skills that teachers need in communicating this information successfully to learners. To communicate information successfully Sadler (1989) explains that teachers need to have knowledge about the skills that learners have to develop and need to be able to recognize a good piece of work when they see it. Moreover, they need to describe what sets a good piece of work apart from a not so good piece of work and communicate to learners how improvements can be made. However, feedback can also include the effect or the change involved as can be seen in Ramaprasad's (1983) definition: Feedback is information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way (Ramaprasad 1983:4). Ramaprasad's (1983) definition of feedback in an education setting consequently implies that information about what the learner has achieved (the actual level) in relation to what the learner is supposed to achieve (the reference level)needs to be used to minimize the gap between the two levels.

The Dictionary of Education (1973:302) defines feedback as "the process of interchanging of information on the part of the human beings in communication; it is a problem solving mechanism." In addition to the above definition, Wondwossen (1992: 5) in his M.A. thesis states, feedback as "teachers' remark or expression and correctness or incorrectness of students' statement of subject matter."

Feedback can work in several different ways. If there is a challenging task at hand, receiving feedback can produce more efforts from students on future work. Feedback has a higher success rate when there is a clear goal set. The more specific the goal, the more effective it is because it creates more focus and feedback from the students

Hattie and Timperley (2007) state four task levels of feedback: They say that feedback can be about a task or product and can include direction on how to improve. For example, the first one is when a teacher hands back a paper with notes about how to improve it. Secondly, feedback can be directed to assist the learning process to help students better understand a task, such as answering a question. The third level of feedback can be looked at as personal feedback. It can have a focus on the self-evaluation part of an assignment to see if a student can work through a task by themselves by using techniques that were already taught. This level can increase student's self-efficacy and boost self-esteem levels. The last level of feedback is personal feedback that is unrelated to a task. It is usually a general form of praise such as saying "you are a great student!"

The use of feedback has become an important practice by teachers in the classroom. Though research has proven it to be beneficial, it is not always practiced by teachers. The type of feedback, timing of its use, and way it is used can have positive effects on students in the classroom. In their research article *The Power of Feedback*, John Hattie and Helen Timperley define feedback as "information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance or understanding" (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Feedback often occurs after a student's response, or when information is provided about the specific task at hand. Simplified, it is a teacher's response to a student's work. Therefore, this study aims to assess the types of written feedback provision techniques that teachers use at the current schools.

1.2. Statement of the problem

The topic of the study is to address the current problems at school in relation to writing tasks and written feedback provision technique. From the observed experience, the highest percentage of academic work and activities are carried out by one of the most important but less practiced language skill in teaching and learning activity in our country's school context, which is writing

skill. For instance written exams, reports, notices, assignments, project works and so on are carried out through writing especially at the higher institutions and a good writing skill is required to do so. Therefore, the concept of feedback is the most important issue in developing students' writing skill for both academic and non-academic purposes. Thus, to make our students good writers, providing feedback on their written works in the appropriate manner has an important effect. Nowadays, most of the literate people, including students use technology's result to exchange messages easily and fast through writing. However, their writing is mostly filled with ample sort of errors. Hyland (2003) notes that 'providing written feedback to students is one of the ESL writing teachers' most important tasks. In the same manner, ESL students also reported on a desire they have that their linguistic errors be corrected and they strongly believe that it is teachers' responsibility to provide such feedback. In short, ESL teachers have to correct surface level errors and students want their teachers to do the same. Zhang (1995), for instance, asked this question to 81 Asian ESL college students who had full exposure to teacher-, peer- and self-feedback:

Giving a choice between teacher feedback and non-teacher feedback-that is feedback by peers or yourself-before you write your final version, which will you choose?

(Zhang 1995, pg. 215)

Students' responses suggested that 76 (94%) of students preferred teacher feedback to peer- or self-feedback. Zhang, therefore, concluded that ESL learners unequivocally favored teacher feedback over peer feedback. He, however, cautioned that his study was designed to examine the relative appeal of the three types of feedback and therefore "it should not be misinterpreted to mean that peer feedback is detrimental to ESL writing or resented among ESL learners. It may well be that all three types of feedback such as, teacher feedback, peer feedback and self-correction are beneficial, although with varying degrees of appeal (pg.219)". His assertion was supported by the studies of Carson and Nelson (1996) and Nelson and Carson (1998) of 6 ESL college students (including 3 from China), in which all participants prioritized teacher feedback to peer feedback given that teachers had richer experiences in writing and writing feedback than peers and thus they could provide higher quality feedback. In this sense, we can observe that the empirical studies commonly suggested that ESL/EFL learners prioritized teacher feedback to peer feedback for their writing. I the researcher, in my teaching experience also observed that

students are mostly dependent on teachers' feedback. They need a confirmation from their teachers on the feedback they are given by anybody else than their teachers.

A feedback is like a mirror that can help the learner to see how his/her progress is. Thus, the concept of feedback is center in learning to write. As soon as the feedback is given, the learners can realize how successful their works are and what they need to improve. Therefore, providing supportive feedback on students' failures to notice the errors they commit has a massive value since feedback allows us to minimize the learners' opportunities of making errors frequently. Otherwise, without feedback on their performance, learners can think they have mastered something when they have not. Therefore, students writing development occurs only when mistakes are corrected, ideas are clarified, and suggestions for improvement are given through feedback (Keh, 1990).

Some of the researches previously conducted on feedback are Wondwossen (1992), Italo (1999) , Temesgen (2008), Zerihun (2009) and Animaw (2011). Wondwossen (1992), focused on the oral feedback provision behavior of grade eleven teachers' and he found that most teachers spent in providing forms of oral feedback .Italo's (1999) objectives are to see the effectiveness of different feedback methods on students writing revision, which feedback is dominantly used at present time and to suggest feedback methods that promote pupils writing skills at AAU. Temesgen's (2008) study is also, to explore the Adama university graduate students writing anxiety level during feedback and in which features of writing the given comments are more focused on. Zerihun 's (2009) objective was to see the relation between students feedback perception and their writing proficiency and he came up with when students perception is positive their writing proficiency increases and the vice versa. Animaw's (2011) objective was to find the relationship between teachers' oral feedback provision in a certain government EFL classrooms and their beliefs and he found that there was a miss mach. Most of the research works conducted in relation to feedback were ten (10) and more years ago, where the large class size, lack of awareness and material shortage about feedback has been seen as big challenges. Currently however, all of the high school teachers are (BA) degree holders and some are (MA) master degree holders. Therefore, a better method of implementing written feedback is expected as they are supposed have awareness.

Therefore, this study is different from the other ones in terms of the focus and the study site as well as the time. To the knowledge of the researcher there is no any research work on the kinds of teachers' written feedback provision techniques in EFL classrooms at preparatory school level. Thus, this study attempts to fill this gap by assessing the kinds of written feedback techniques EFL teachers use in correcting the students' writing and the extent it promotes students' writing performance in case of Miskaye Hizunan and Kolfe Keranio Preparatory School: G11 in focus. And the researcher wanted to answer the following questions

1. What kinds of written feedback provision techniques do EFL teachers use most?
2. How far do students' read and practice the feedback they are provided?
3. How far do students understand the written feedback they receive from teachers?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The general objective of this study was to assess the techniques EFL teachers use in giving feedback on students' writing and students' experience of practicing the feedback.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

1. to identify types of written feedback techniques EFL teachers most use in providing correction on students' written works
2. to find out if the students understand the techniques used to provide the written feedback on their writings, and if it guides them.
3. to examine students' experience of reading and practicing the provided feedback

1.4. Significance of the study

Understanding the concept and nature of written feedback provision techniques in the teaching/learning process in the classroom and making the necessary improvement is hoped to facilitate the process.

Providing feedback to a student on time and properly will result in a better written work of a student. Therefore, the overall research result is assumed to be most important in that:

It could show some insights on the written feedback provision techniques that EFL teachers practice in correcting students writing. Anyone who intends to provide supports for teachers in the form of capacity building trainings can benefit from the results of this study. Universities, colleges, and institutions which trains teachers the methodology may be benefited from the results shown as the gaps that teachers have in providing corrective feedback provision techniques. Teachers also benefit in getting awareness and upgrade their knowledge on how to give written feedbacks to help students in their writing activities. Moreover, future researchers who would like to investigate further by providing a reference point.

1.5. Scope of the study

The scope of the study was limited in two Secondary and Preparatory Schools at Addis Ababa.. This study mainly focuses on the Techniques Grade 11 EFL teachers use in providing written feedback on students' writing activities and the extent it promotes students' writing performance: in the case of Miskaye Hizunan Medihaialem Church Secondary and Preparatory School and Kolfe Keranio Secondary and Preparatory School at Addis Ababa. Therefore, the data collection was also limited to grade 11 students writing tasks with teachers' feedback, and to students' reaction towards the given feedback.

1.6. Limitation of the study

During the study the researcher faced some challenges, the first one was when students were asked to go to the hall to fill the questionnaire some of them were disinterested. The second challenge was that it was difficult to collect the written documents at once. Although there was a challenge, the researcher tried to solve the difficulty through discussion and convincing the subjects.

1.7. Organization of the study

The study was divided into five chapters. The first chapter was about the background of the study, statement of the problem, and objective of the study. Chapter two was about the review of the related literature and some related research works. Chapter three is about the design and

methodology of the research. Chapter four was about the result and discussion of the research. Chapter five was about the conclusion and recommendation of the.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Generally speaking, this chapter has three parts. The first part attempts to review what the literature has to say about writing skills. The second part deals with the importance and relevant issues of written feedback and the third one is related to foreign and local research works on written feedback.

2.1 The Purpose of Writing

In writing, there should be known the features and the aims of ones writing on why do we write? And how clearly do we write?

Writing is one of the essential skills of a language used as a means of communication, as a means of permanent record, as a form of expression, etc. (Italo, 1999). People write, therefore, to express their feelings, ideas, opinions belief's, anger, happiness, and so on. The writing could also be done based on given piece of information or based on our own imagination creativity. For communication being the aim or different writings, therefore, people write to achieve different purposes. As far as writing in the classroom situation is concerned, Byrne (1988:14), cited in Getnet (1993:7), puts as:

Teachers need to make students aware that any piece of writing is an attempt to communicate something: that the writer has a goal or purpose in mind; that has to establish and maintain contact with reader; that has to organize material and that does this through the use of certain logical and grammatical devices,

Our writing has different addresses and different purpose, which also differs along several dimensions, especially those of language topic and audience (McDonough and Shaw, 1993). As to Hunt (1992), the purpose for which students need to write in English should be carefully considered and reflected in the kind of exercises given to them. The writer's aim, even at a basic level, must be to convey his/her message in such a way as to affect the reader as she/ he intends. How he/she does this will vary according to his/her purpose for writing the kind or writing task, etc. (Atkins and et al, 1996). In the same way, Leki (1986) says, "Part of the rhetorical context

and part of the content of student writing is determined by who the audience of the writing is and what the purpose of the writing is".

2.1.1 Accuracy and Fluency

In writing, in the earlier time a writer might focus either on the grammatical aspect of a text or on the meaning transmitted to the reader. Technically speaking, the former is called accuracy and the latter, fluency.

2.1.1.1 Accuracy

Accuracy is one aspect of writing which needs consideration while teaching writing given the amount of attention that teachers need to pay to, however, if the teacher is pre-occupied with element of accuracy such as grammar, spelling and punctuation while treating students: written work, students may not express the ideas for the fear of being corrected by the teachers for every deviation. As Krashen (1982) states, the objective of the lesson may determine whether or not students need to focus on accuracy (form) or fluency (content) of the language. In relation to this, Pincas (1982:23), for instance, points out "In traditional composition students are expected to demonstrate that they have mastered certain structures or vocabulary and the teacher will be looking for mistakes". Thus, there is a higher degree of control by the teacher while students are doing mechanical exercises where they are supposed to use the correct forms of words and grammatically correct sentences. However, Ur (1996: 163) states, "One of our problem in teaching writing is to maintain a fair balance between content and form."

2.1.1.2 Fluency

Atkins, et al, (1996:138) state "Many grammatical: errors are relatively unimportant in the sense that they do not affect meaning or communication." Similarly, Pincas (1982:23) also puts as follows:

If the aim is to achieve a reasonable communicative competence, then the teacher will be more interested in whether the student has managed to put together a piece of writing that could fulfill a broad communicative function, e.g. a reasonably set-out letter, a logically organized descriptions, a set of coherent instructions and so on.

The approach stresses writing with purpose. In real life, we normally have a reason for writing and we write to or for somebody. This does motivate students to write, and shows how writing is a form of communication, and thus, it is important to devise situations that allow students to write purposefully. For example, they can write to one another in the classroom or use writing in role-play situations.

2.1.2 Writing Tasks

Generally speaking, writing activities can be divided into three levels or writing: controlled, guided and free (Atkins et.al., 1996; Pincas, 1982; and Raims, 1983). As students' progress in their grade levels and academic performance, they are to provide with fewer and fewer number of controlled writing tasks. Thus, the degree of control on the part of the teacher is expected to lower and that students are supposed to have got more freedom of expression while trying to get their ideas come across.

2.1.2.1 Controlled Writing

Controlled exercises are the most common exercise types emphasized in most English classes. There is little room for making errors and they are easily controlled by the teacher in the sense that there is/are limited answer(s). In other words, in controlled writing, students are not allowed to write their own ideas and that the teacher knows what they are writing. Because the teacher has complete control over what the students are writing, there is little opportunity for making mistakes. Such writing activities involve copying sentences from a substitution table, or filling - in blanks where students are required to supply probably only one possible answer (Atkins et al., 1996; Pincas, 1982; and Raims, 1983).

2.1.2.2 Guided Writing

As the term 'guided' suggests, students can possibly be provided with some hints or guidance as to what to do by such writing activities. On top of what they are provided with, students have the opportunity to add their own ideas in which they also make mistakes. In this regard, Rivers (1981 :302) States, " At the guided writing stage, students will be given more freedom in the selection of lexical items and structural patterns for their written exercises." Though an emphasis is still given to accuracy, teachers are supposed to have a more tolerant attitude towards errors made by

students while doing guided writing activities. Besides, such activities are believed to be the basis for teaching paragraph writing (Atkins et al., 1996). Examples of such activities include notes from listening, notes from parallel passages, dialogue completion, questions to answers and charts, tables and diagrams (Atkins et al., 1996).

2.1.2.3 Free Writing

In free writing tasks, students are provided with topics choose from or to choose their own topics. Then, they are supposed to produce their own written texts using their own ideas; here they are free to write; what comes into their mind using their own choice of lexis or structure.

In free writing activities, the teacher is not in a position to provide his/her students guidance in terms of language or content. By doing so, students are likely to make errors. Examples of such writing activities included writing a letter of explanation, writing questions for a quiz and writing a short story (Atkins et al., 1996).

In all these types of tasks, teachers read students' writing critically and give feedback in order to improve their writing skills, Feedback, according to Chaudron (1988), is a major means through which teachers inform learners' correctness of their target language production.

2.1.3 Writing and feedback

Communication across nations and cultures in a global world assumes possessing the ability to use language for communicative purposes. In particular the importance of the ability to write in a foreign language (henceforth EFL) is being widely recognized, not only for purposes such as studying and working, but also for personal reasons (Weigle 2002). The Internet, with arenas such as Facebook, Twitter and blogs, has opened up possibilities for more people to write, share, read and comment on written texts. What is more, writing is also regarded as a tool for thinking. As we write we express our feelings, thoughts and ideas, we learn to understand ourselves and at the same time, we learn to understand the feelings, thoughts and ideas of others. In other words, people try to make sense of which they write when they write (Ivaniç 1998). The 'identity' potential inherent in writing may also play a part in language learning since it may either restrict or promote the process of language learning (Gee 1996) depending on how the learners are

valued and/or value themselves in an educational context. Consequently, writing is an important tool for communicating, thinking and learning.

The importance of writing means that EFL teachers have an important task to teach writing. However, it seems to be a demanding skill for teachers to teach and a demanding skill for pupils to master. Despite the fact that EFL writing instruction has been influenced by different approaches such as process-based and genre-based approaches that have aimed to support writing instruction (Grabe & Stoller 2009), teaching EFL writing is still not an easy task. Maybe EFL teachers need more knowledge about EFL writing and EFL writing instruction to make the task less difficult.

To give effective written feedback in EFL writing has been of central concern for many teachers of writing (Hyland 1998) across the various approaches to FL writing instruction. Not only has written feedback been of central concern for its potential to support and improve pupils writing but also for its motivational potential. For this reason feedback in FL writing has received considerable attention, especially corrective feedback (CF). However, CF has also been a question of debate. Since Truscott's article (1996) about the potential harmfulness of grammar correction, others (Ferris 1999) have tried to counter Truscott's view. Ferris (1999) proposed that the potential harmfulness does not lie in the corrections as such but that harm can be caused by low quality feedback. Other studies (Fathman & Whalley 1990; Ashwell 2000; Chandler 2003) have been carried out to explore what factors influence the effectiveness of corrective feedback for written errors.

An understanding of the EFL writing process implies a description of the linguistic knowledge component, and an understanding of the feedback process requires insight into learners' role in that process. Fields that can help us understand the language knowledge component and the learner's role in the feedback process is the field of language assessment. The field of language assessment has tried to describe the ability to use language for communicative purposes (Bachman & Palmer 2010) and has also tried to describe the notion of feedback (Sadler 1989; Council of Europe/Skolverket 2009; Stobart 2012).

2.2 Feedback

In this part, an attempt is made to review various issues related to written feedback. These are, the concept of feedback, is form feedback necessary? ESL/ EFL learners and form feedback: are they different from their native counterparts? Some important issues in feedback, do students make use or feedback for revisions?

2.2.1 The Concept Feedback

Feedback says to a student, “Somebody cared enough about my work to read it and think about it!” Most teachers want to be that “somebody.” Feedback matches specific descriptions and suggestions with a particular student’s work. It is just-in-time, just-for-me information delivered when and where it can do the most good.

The Dictionary of Education (1973:302) defines feedback as "the process of interchanging of information on the part of the human beings in communication; it is a problem solving mechanism." In addition to the above definition, Wondwossen (1992: 5) in his M.A. thesis states, feedback as "teachers' remark or expression and correctness or incorrectness of students' statement of subject matter.” The concept of feedback is further stated by Brooks (1971: 172) as follows:

If the purpose of communication is to exchange meaning accurately, to influence another person so as to satisfy ones need and to respond so as to mean some means of correcting faulty messages, misconceptions and misunderstandings, incorrect responses are necessary. That 'means', for correcting our shared meanings and responses and making them more accurate is feedback.

Feedback is therefore, a means through which communication, in the process of teaching and learning is enhanced. However, there were debates about the importance of feedback in improving students writing competence. (In this study the phrases like written feedback, form feedback, grammar feedback, feedback, error correction, correction marking, comment, etc. are used to mean the same thing and used interchangeably.)

According to Sadler (1989), feedback is usually defined in terms of its informational content and highlights the knowledge and skills that teachers need in communicating this information

successfully to learners. To communicate information successfully Sadler (1989) explains that teachers need to have knowledge about the skills that learners have to develop and need to be able to recognize a good piece of work when they see it. Moreover, they need to describe what sets a good piece of work apart from a not so good piece of work and communicate to learners how improvements can be made. However, feedback can also include the effect or the change involved as can be seen in Ramaprasad's (1983) definition: Feedback is information about the gap between the actual level and the reference level of a system parameter which is used to alter the gap in some way (Ramaprasad 1983:4). Ramaprasad's (1983) definition of feedback in an education setting consequently implies that information about what the learner has achieved (the actual level) in relation to what the learner is supposed to achieve (the reference level) needs to be used to minimize the gap between the two levels. Using Ramaprasad's (1983) definition as a point of departure Slander (1989) expands the notion of feedback by including the concept of self-monitoring. By doing so he also highlights what is needed by the learner to understand and consequently use feedback:

The learner has to (a) possess a concept of the standard (or goal, or reference level) being aimed for, (b) compare the actual (current) level of performance with the standard, and (c) engage in appropriate action which leads to some closure of the the gap (Slander 1989:121).

2.2.1.1 The potential of feedback

The idea that feedback has the potential to affect learning and motivation has caused feedback to be regarded as a powerful tool (Hattie & Timperley 2007). As the quote below illustrates feedback involves an emotional aspect that also needs to be considered.

“Feedback does not operate in a vacuum; even task-based feedback still involves strong emotional and motivational reactions”. These have to be taken into account if feedback is to help move learning forward. (Stobart 2012:241)

Rowe (2011) investigated students' perceptions of feedback at Australian universities with the aim of understanding why students were dissatisfied with the feedback they received from their tutors. A government report, prior to Rowe's investigation, showed that most university students experienced teachers as not showing a personal interest in their progress and those students wanted a higher degree of personal involvement from their tutors. Rowe (2011) sought

to investigate this issue further by using a student feedback questionnaire and found that the majority of responses expressed the value of feedback for learning purposes but many responses also expressed the personal and emotional functions of feedback. According to the students' responses good feedback can encourage, reduce anxiety and reassure students that they are on the right path in their learning process. Respect and caring were also two important personal dimensions in the function of feedback forwarded by the students (Rowe 2011). The study by Rowe highlights an important dimension that needs to be considered in the provision of feedback, the personal dimension.

However, the potential of feedback is not always regarded only in positive terms. *The Common European Framework of References for Languages* (CEFR) highlights that feedback has a potential weakness because it is the learner who has to understand and use the feedback in order for it to function and therefore feedback can also be a potential weakness of approaches that use assessment for formative purposes to improve learning. Feedback only works if the recipient is in a position (a) to notice, i.e. is attentive, motivated and familiar with the form in which the information is coming, (b) to receive, i.e. is not swamped with information, has a way of recording, organizing and personalizing it; (c) to interpret, i.e. has sufficient pre-knowledge and awareness to understand the point at issue, and not to take counterproductive action and (d) to integrate the information, i.e. has the time, orientation and relevant resources to reflect on, integrate and so remember the new information. This implies self-direction, which implies training towards self-direction, monitoring one's own learning, and developing ways of acting on feedback (Council of Europe/ Skolverket 2009:186).

2.2.1.2 The role of the learner in the feedback process

The responsibility of the learner was put forward in Sadler's (1989) definition. For learners to be able to compare their performance with standards or another performance, they need to have the ability to self-assess. The assumption underlying self-assessment is the importance of the learner's active engagement in all the phases of the language learning process (Oscarsson 1997). This position, advocated by cognitive and constructionist approaches to learning, highlights the pivotal role that learners have in the feedback process and consequently in the process of learning. Learners' reflection on and construction of already acquired concepts plays an important part in building new knowledge (Gipps 1994). In the field of second and FL learning it

has been assumed “most learners of language have a certain capacity for determining their own language ability” (Oscarsson 1997:176). However, this capacity needs to be supported by some sort of measuring standard, such as scaled descriptions of performance and by self-assessment training. Moreover, affective factors have also shown to play apart in self-perceived competence in a language. Underestimation of language ability seems to be frequent for anxious learners as well as for female learners (Oscarsson 1997).

Learners’ engagement in taking appropriate action and thus affecting learners’ outcome, might also be attributed to learner options (Stobart 2012). Even if teachers follow feedback recommendations and provide feedback that is informative, directed at the appropriate level and focused on task it may not automatically lead to learners taking the appropriate action. (Stobart 2012) illustrates these learner options by seeing feedback as a “gift from the teacher” (Stobart 2012:241). The gift-metaphor makes it clear that learners have a range of options and actions when unwrapping this gift. Stobart (2012) points out those pupils can negotiate, accept and use feedback to try to improve their work, or they can change or reject it (Stobart 2012:241). The options Stobart presents are interesting because they highlight the diversity of options that can be involved in the use of feedback.

2.2.1.3 Feedback in FL writing

The different approaches and theories that have influenced FL writing have also influenced FL teachers’ feedback practices. For example, the introduction of process approaches changed the focus of attention and the role of feedback (Hyland & Hyland 2006). To help students during the writing process, teachers started to give feedback and suggestions on how to do draft revision. Interactionist theories influenced writing instruction by stressing the dialogic nature of writing and highlighting the importance of a real reader and reader response. The influence of interactionist theories encouraged teachers to make use of multiple feedback sources and peer-feedback. The introduction of genre-oriented approaches in FL writing also influenced teachers’ feedback practices. Feedback became a means for pupils to make rhetorical choices which give them access to new literacy skills, both academic and professional ones. Due to these influences teachers’ feedback practices may be quite different.

2.2.1.4 Teacher feedback practices

The messages conveyed to learners through teacher comments and the comments learners choose to use or ignore in the revision process were researched by Nancy Sommers (1982). She studied the commenting styles of 35 teachers at two American universities on students' first and second drafts and conducted interviews with both teachers and their students. Even if the research is not up to date and the context of the study is very different to that of the present study, the research findings inform this study. Findings showed that when teachers comment on learners' texts, learners often focus attention on the teachers' purpose in commenting and not their own purpose in writing a particular text. In other words learners comply to a great extent with the teacher's purpose. Also comments were directed at editing and developing at the same time which students found contradictory and confusing. Another finding reported was that learners did not know what comments were the most important to address. No 'scale of importance' was provided and the way the comments were written made this even harder.

Another finding was that even all teacher comments were addressed in a draft it did not automatically lead to text improvement. Thus, the effort involves on the part of the pupil and the teacher led to no evident improvement, resulting in frustration from the both parties. Sommers (1982) found that a lot of teacher comments were expressed in the same way regardless of the particular text and consequently learners also found these comments vague and hard to address. The non-specificness of teachers' comment to pupils' texts was also something that Lee (2007) found. Lee (2007) investigated those feedback practices of 20 lower secondary English teachers in Hong Kong and findings showed that almost all the feedback points provided by teachers focused on form. There were only a few feedback points on content and even fewer on organization. Lee (2007) also identified three types of feedback that the teachers used to different extents. The majority of errors received direct feedback, in other words the teachers corrected most of the errors. The teachers also used correction symbols such as 'vb' for 'verb form' to make explicit what type of error had been made. The least frequent type of feedback that the teachers used was locating the error by either underlining or circling it. Lee (2007) suggests that the reason for the high use of direct feedback by teachers might be related to contextual factors outside the classroom. Worth noticing is that none of the teachers in Lee's study used task-based criteria when assessing students' writing, making it hard for the students to understand how

their writing performance relates to the specific writing task at hand. Another issue that Lee (2007) raises and that can become problematic is that teachers may focus feedback on form and not on content and organization, but nevertheless assess content and organization as well as form.

2.2.1.5 Students' understanding of feedback in writing

Since Truscott's (1996) article about the potential harmfulness of error correction in writing, substantial research has focused on investigating what factors affect the efficacy or inefficacy of corrective feedback (henceforth CF). Factors such as: the type of feedback, the amount of feedback, the mode of feedback and the source of feedback have been explored, as well as learner proficiency level, learners' attitudes towards feedback, learners' aptitude, motivation, and anxiety, learner noticing and interpretation of feedback and learners' age. Although a considerable proportion of CF studies have examined the effects on oral production, research on written production has also been conducted. Russell & Spada (2006) conducted a meta-analysis of research that "examined the relationship between CF and the development of L2 grammatical accuracy." (Russell & Spada 2006:134). Out of the fifty-six studies in the meta-analysis twenty-two focused on written errors. The most frequently investigated written CF type was the indication of the location of errors followed by the provision of direct correction and then the coding of error types. The findings suggest, although the studies involved in the meta-analysis are few, that CF is effective for increasing grammatical accuracy.

One study examining the efficacy of CF on written production is Chandlers'(2003). Over 10 weeks two groups of high intermediate East Asian college students, an experimental group and a control group, were compared. In the experimental group the participants had to correct their errors. Errors in the participants' drafts were underlined and the marking of errors was done comprehensively. In other words different types of errors such as spelling, verb tense, idioms and punctuation just to mention a few, were underlined as opposed to marking selectively, where one type of error is focused such as for example spelling. Findings showed that the experimental group with students who were required to correct their errors improved significantly more in terms of accuracy (correctness in English), compared to the control group of students who were not required to correct their errors (Chandler 2003). This suggests that drawing learners' attention to a 'gap' and making learners correct their errors increases, in this case, accuracy in

subsequent writing. Accuracy increases even though it means, as in the study of Chandler, merely making learners rewrite their text and copying the teacher’s corrections. The results of Chandler’s study also showed a significant increase in fluency (minutes per 100 words) for both groups during this period, maybe due to the fact that they actually wrote a lot.

Informed by the results from the first study Chandler (2003) set out to investigate the effectiveness of four types of teacher feedback as seen in the table below:

Four types of feedback (Chandler 2003)

Example of Types of feedback

Correction	I have a bycycle. [bicycle]
Underlining with Description	I have a <u>bycycle</u> . [spelling]
Description of type only	I have a bycycle. [spelling]
Underlining	I have a <u>bycycle</u> .

Findings from the second study showed that not all of the feedback types had the same effect in increasing accuracy. The most effective type of feedback for short term accuracy improvements was correction followed by underlining with description. The reason for this might be found in the high degree of explicitness involved in both types of feedback.

2.2.2 Written Feedback

The study of teachers' written feedback to students' writing and the theory of writing instruction in theories of development and learning (Vygotsky, 1978; Brophy, 1981 and Anderson, 1982) response play a central role. Hence, learning writers, like learners of other skills, need to know when they are performing well and when they are not. However, for learning writers the issue of feedback is especially significant. These writers need response not only for monitoring their own progress, but so that they learn to take another's perspective and adapt a message to it (Flower, 1979). Theoretically, constructive feedback offers such writers a means of discovering their readers' needs. This review will show that in effect, most learners do not receive such feedback.

Writing theorists view the issue of feedback as problematic, because "...feedback to complex processes is usually inadequate and the level of mastery that the social environment supports is quite short of what that culture actually seems to need" (Bereiter and Scardamalia, 1982, p. 59). Along these lines, it has been pointed out by a number of writing instruction theorists (e.g. Sommers, 1982) that in learning to write, feedback, provided and processed ineffectively, may inhibit the writer's motivation for writing. According to them, ineffective feedback may divert the writer's attention from his or her own purposes and focus that attention on the teacher's intentions.

A considerable number of recent studies have dealt with the questions of the provision and processing of written feedback to learning writers. On the whole, the current view is that written feedback is probably the least useful type of response students get to their writing (Freedman, 1987). Yet, because written feedback is the most common form of writing instruction, theorists are still searching for a way to describe the parameters of constructive response to students' writing. They are still trying to understand the conditions under which teachers' written comments can actually help writers elaborate their ideas and incorporate them into coherent forms within the classroom context.

Whether or not written feedback is a useful means of responding to students' writing, it is interesting to examine the body of research on feedback to students' writing, because these studies indicate changes in views on writing instruction in general and on the context in which it should be studied in particular. Although responding to student writing is an important and meaningful area of teachers' work, it is often described in negative terms, referred to as frustrating (Ferris, Pezone, Tade, and Tinti 1997), grueling and anxiety-ridden (Stern and Solomon 2006), tedious and unrewarding (Hyland 1990). Teachers, despite their efforts, are described in disparaging terms—as composition slaves (Hairston 1986) and as paternalistic figures who appropriate student writing (Brannon and Knoblauch 1982). Although there is research that shows students value teacher feedback and find it useful to help them improve their writing (Leki 1991), negative effects of teacher feedback have been reported in the literature, such as frustration and confusion (Mantello 1997), and student under-achievement and under-expectation through unfocused marking (OFSTED 1996). Since Truscott (1996) sparked a heated debate on the efficacy of error correction by proposing its abolition, the topic of written

corrective feedback has received increasing attention from researchers in different parts of the world.

2.2.3 Is Form Feedback Necessary?

The discussion about giving grammar errors' feedback (form- feedback) has been arguing, and one of a 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 stand against grammar correction, were the aim of continuous debate either in favor or against. It is worth noting that some earlier researchers have also concluded to stances similar to these of Truscott's but the main difference is that they do not overtly recommended teachers, to completely stop giving grammar feedback anymore as Truscott do.

Cohen and Robbison (1976), for example, argue that the correction of students' compositions is often ineffective in reducing errors. However, they have an explanation for their findings that teachers correct errors inconsistently. Ferris and Hedgcock, 1998 also believes that "teachers" comments have little impact on student writing." 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, it is commented on teachers written feedback that it is: Large number of short, careless, exhausted, or extensive comments (Sommers, 1982). But with respect to his radical ideas, Truscott's (1996) article yet remains the most controversial for he does not attribute the 'failure' of inadequacy caused by teachers, students, or teaching contexts but because of form feedback itself.

Many studies (Grami, 2005; Ferris, 1991, etc.) give practical evidence that grammar-correction in fact does help students improve their accuracy as opposed to Truscott (1996). The main weak point or Truscott's (1996) paper, according to Grami, (2005), 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 completely to ESL/EFL contexts as the students in the latter environment struggle with their L2 and errors are definitely expected from them. 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 that teachers feel morally obliged to correct all mistakes in their L2 students'

work. This finding may shed some light on why teachers correct 'form' errors. Ferris (1999) also notes that "L2 students themselves are very much concerned about. Accuracy and they will ask for their errors to be corrected by their teachers."

2.2.4 ESL/EFL Learners and Form Feedback

Although ESL/EFL learners' success in ESL/EFL composition is the ultimate goal of the whole literature of teaching learning writing, it seems that their point or view of the whole issue has been long ignored or, in best cases, did not receive the attention it deserves (White and Arndt, 1991 and Grami, 2005). L2 students' writing has been of great significance to teaching writing and is well considered by writing teachers and pedagogy theorists alike (Perris, 1999). Ferris (1999) describes the practice of giving reedback as "indispensable." Hyland (2003) also notes that providing written feedback to students IS one or the ESL/ EFL writing teachers most important task in the same manner. ESL students were, also responded to overwhelmingly desire their linguistic errors to be corrected and they strongly believe that it is teachers' responsibility to provide such feedback (Grami, 2005). In short, ESL teachers have to correct surface-level errors and students want their teacher to do so. The bottom line is that as L1writers usually have no limitation in their linguistic competence, they can focus on more theoretical, notional, abstract ideas. This is, however, not the case with L2 learners where they are still struggling with their lower language proficiency and linguistic errors, therefore, occupy the prominent status (Raid, 2000; Radecki and Swales, 1998; Ferris and Hedgcock, 1998; Kepner, 1991; and Hylund,..2003).

2.2.5 Some Important Issues in Feedback

The first question to ask is, how effective is feedback? We answer this question by referring to the usual effects of schooling on student achievement and then comparing them with the evidence related to feedback. Hattie (1999) reported a synthesis of over 500 meta-analyses, involving 450,000 effect sizes from 180,000 studies, representing approximately 20 to 30 million students, on various influences on student achievement. This analysis included more than 100 factors influencing educational achievement and covered various aspects of those typically identified, such as attributes of schools, homes, students, teachers, and curricula. The average or typical effect of schooling was 0.40 (*SE* 0.05), and this provided a benchmark figure or "standard" from which to judge the various influences on achievement, such as that of feedback.

Responding to student writing once seen as the writing teacher and certainly the most time-consuming one is a complex process which also requires the teacher to a number of critical decisions (Clece-Murcia,1991). Clece-Murcia (1991:251) also states that the teacher has to address the following key questions in responding to student writing:

- 1. What are the general goals within the writing course of providing feedback to student writers?*
- 2. What are the specific goals of providing feedback on a particular piece of writing?*
- 3. At what stage of the writing process should feedback be offered?*
- 4. What should students do with the feedback they receive?*

Similarly, while emphasizing the vitality of feedback provision, John son (1995) quoted in Ur (1996:243) reveals, "for successful acquisition of skill, the learner needs feedback on how well he / she is doing, hence the importance of provision of constant and honest assessment" Feedback on an individual learner's particular profile offers diagnosis and remedial measures and replaces traditional summative grading.(Candlin,1981: 12). Thus, without feedback learning will be slow and errors can become ingrained resulting in fossilization (McGraw-Hill, 1997). Besides, regarding the role of feedback, Cliford (1981) cited in Wondowossen (1992: 10) has to say:

- Feedback generally increases motivation
- Feedback usually improves subsequent performance
- Feedback given punctually is more effective than that given long after the task has been completed.
- When knowledge or (results is not provided, individuals tend to develop substitutes. For example, they may match peers and decided whether their performance is better or worse.

Generally, the more specific the knowledge of performance the more rapidly performance improves. However, excessively detailed feedback on early trails of complex tasks may prove to be confusing and detrimental.

2.2.6 How Feedback Works: Reducing the Discrepancy between Current and

Desired Understanding

There are many possible ways for students to reduce the gap between current and desired understandings in response to feedback, and they are not always effective in enhancing learning. Those likely to be effective include the following. Students can increase their effort, particularly when the effort leads to tackling more challenging tasks or appreciating higher quality experiences rather than just doing “more.” We are more likely to increase effort when the intended goal “is clear, when high commitment is secured for it, and when belief in eventual success is high” (Kluger & DeNisi, 1996, p. 260). Students may also develop effective error detection skills, which lead to their own self-feedback aimed at reaching a goal. Such error detection can be very powerful, provided students have some modicum of knowledge and understanding about the task on which to strategize and regulate. In addition, students can seek better strategies to complete the task or be taught them, or they can obtain more information from which they can then solve problems or use their self-regulatory proficiencies

Some strategies to reduce the gap are less productive. Students may abandon goals and thus eliminate any gap, and this often leads to non-engagement in the pursuit of further goals (Bandura, 1982; Mikulincer, 1988; Steinberg, 1996). They may choose to blur the goals, combining them with so many others that after performing, they can pick and choose those goals they attained and ignore the others. Alternatively, students can change the standard by setting less challenging goals, accepting performance far below their capabilities as satisfactory.

There are also multiple ways teachers can assist in reducing the gap between actual performance and desired goal attainment. These include providing appropriate challenging and specific goals. Specific goals are more effective than general or nonspecific ones, primarily because they focus students’ attention, and feedback can be more directed (Locke & Latham, 1984). The goals and associated feedback are also more likely to include information about the criteria for success in attaining them than more general goals.

Teachers can also assist by clarifying goals, enhancing commitment or increased effort to reaching them through feedback. Goals can also be made more manageable by narrowing the range of reasonable hypotheses (Sweller, 1990). More generally, teachers can create a learning

environment in which students develop self-regulation and error detection skills (Hattie, Biggs, & Purdie, 1996). How feedback contributes to these processes depends largely on the focus of feedback and the level to which it is directed. In the next section, we develop a framework to assist in identifying the circumstances likely to result in the more productive outcomes.

2.2.7 Using the Four Levels and Three Questions to Untangle Some Thorny

Feedback Issues

There are four levels of feedback issues: the timing of feedback, the effects of positive and negative feedback, the optimal classroom use of feedback, and the role of assessment in feedback.

The Focus of Feedback: The Four Levels

The focus of feedback is critically important, and in this point, it is claimed that there are four major levels and that the level at which feedback is directed influences its effectiveness. First, feedback can be about a task or product, such as whether work is correct or incorrect. This level of feedback may include directions to acquire more, different, or correct information, such as “You need to include more about the Treaty of Versailles.” Second, feedback can be aimed at the process used to create a product or complete a task. This kind of feedback is more directly aimed at the processing of information, or learning processes requiring understanding or completing the task. For example, a teacher or peer may say to a learner, “You need to edit this piece of writing by attending to the descriptors you have used so the reader is able to understand the nuances of your meaning,” or Third, feedback to students can be focused at the self-regulation level, including greater skill in self-evaluation or confidence to engage further on a task. For example, “You already know the key features of the opening of an argument. Check to see whether you have incorporated them in your first paragraph.” Such feedback can have major influences on self-efficacy, self-regulatory proficiencies, and self-beliefs about students as learners, such that the students are encouraged or informed how to better and more effortlessly continue on the task. Fourth, feedback can be personal in the sense that it is directed to the “self,” which, is argued below, is too often unrelated to performance on the task. Examples of such feedback include “You are a great student” and “That’s an intelligent response, well done.”

1. The Timing of Feedback

There has been much research on the timing of feedback, particularly contrasting immediate and delayed feedback. Most of this research has been accomplished without recognition of the various feedback levels. For example, immediate error correction during task acquisition (FT) can result in faster rates of acquisition, whereas immediate error correction during fluency building can detract from the learning of automaticity and the associated strategies of learning (FP). Similarly, in their meta-analysis of 53 studies, Kulik and Kulik (1988) reported that at the task level (i.e., testing situations), some delay is beneficial (0.36), but at the process level (i.e., engaging in processing classroom activities), immediate feedback is beneficial (0.28) (see also Bangert-Drowns, Kulik, Kulik, & Morgan, 1991; Brackbill, Blobitt, Davlin, & Wagner, 1963; Schroth & Lund, 1993; Sturges, 1972, 1978; Swindell & Walls, 1993).

Another example demonstrating that the effects of immediate feedback are likely to be more powerful for FT and delayed feedback more powerful for FP was provided by Clariana, Wagner, and Roher Murphy (2000). They found that the effectiveness of delayed compared with immediate feedback varied as a function of the difficulty of items in their test of information taught in a series of lessons. The effect sizes from delayed feedback were -0.06 for easy items, 0.35 for midrange items, and 1.17 for difficult items. These authors suggested that difficult items are more likely to involve greater degrees of processing about the task, and delayed feedback provides the opportunity to do this, whereas easy items do not require this processing and so delay is both unnecessary and undesirable.

2. The Effects of Positive and Negative Feedback

Kluger and DeNisi (1996) noted that both positive and negative feedback can have beneficial effects on learning, and the argument presented in this article is that the untangling of these effects depends more on the level at which the feedback is aimed and processed than on whether it is positive or negative. Specifically, negative feedback is more powerful at the self- level, and both types can be effective as FT, but there are differential effects relating to commitment, mastery or performance orientation, and self-efficacy at the FR level.

At the self- level (FS), it has already been noted that no praise is more effective than praise if accompanied by FT. Furthermore, there is much evidence to suggest that negative feedback or

disconfirmation can be more potent than positive feedback or confirmation at this self-level (Brockner, 1979; Brunet, Huguet, & Monteil, 2000; Campbell & Fairey, 1985; Hattie, 1992; Janoff-Bulman & Brickman, 1982; Kinch, 1963, 1968; Okun & Sasfy, 1977; Shrauger & Sorman, 1977). Swann (1985) and Swann and Hill (1982) found that individuals will go to great lengths to confirm their self-perceptions by attending most closely to feedback information that fits their view of the self and by trying to arrange their environment to acquire further self-confirming evidence. Individuals also tend to reject or ignore negative accounts of their behavior that differ from their own (Greenwald, 1980; Markus, 1977; Tesser & Campbell, 1983) or invoke an external frame of reference (Marsh, 1987, 1990).

3. Feedback and Classrooms

This feedback model highlights the demands on teachers if they are to teach effectively. First, they need to undertake effective instruction. To reiterate, feedback is what happens second, and to make the feedback effective, teachers need to make appropriate judgments about when, how, and at what level to provide appropriate feedback and to which of the three questions it should be addressed. It is difficult to document the frequency of feedback in classrooms, except to note that it is low.

4. Feedback and Assessment

There are major implications from this review of feedback for assessment in the classroom. Assessment can be considered to be activities that provide teachers and/or students with feedback information relating to one or more of the three feedback questions (at the FT, FP, or FR level). Such a definition places emphasis on devising assessment tasks that provide information and interpretations about the discrepancy between current status and the learning goals at any of the three levels: about tasks, about the processes or strategies to understand the tasks, and about the regulation, engagement, and confidence to become more committed to learn.

This contrasts with the more usual definition of assessment, an activity used to assess students' levels of proficiency. This usual definition places more emphasis on the adequacy of scores (and less on the interpretation of these scores). Crooks (1988) and Black and Wiliam (1998) demonstrated there is little evidence that such classroom testing has assisted in the learning

process. Black and Wiliam, for example, reviewed 578 publications relating to the role of assessment in learning and concluded that classroom assessment:

Typically encourages superficial and rote learning, concentrating on recall of isolated details, usually items of knowledge which pupils soon forget . . . teachers do not generally review the assessment questions that they use and do not discuss them critically with peers, so there is little reflection on what is being assessed. (p. 17)

There are many ways in which teachers can deliver feedback to students and for students to receive feedback from teachers, peers, and other sources. The implication is not that we should automatically use more tests (Bangert-Drowns, Kulik, & Kulik, 1991). Rather, for students, it means gaining information about how and what they understand and misunderstand, finding directions and strategies that they must take to improve, and seeking assistance to understand the goals of the learning. For teachers, it means devising activities and questions that provide feedback to them about the effectiveness of their teaching, particularly so they know what to do next. Assessments can perform all these feedback functions, but too often, they are devoid of effective feedback to students or to teachers.

2.2.8 Who Should Provide Feedback?

It is obvious that correction of student's written work is a time-consuming business especially in large classes. Thus, in order to provide correction or remedial feedback, teachers can use anyone of the strategies or in combination: self-correction, peer correction, and teacher correction. Though traditionally it appears that teachers are the sole providers of the majority of written feedback in classroom situations, many language scholars and researchers argue that self and per-correction play vital roles in responding to students' written papers (Taye, 2005). This is especially important on the process approach to teaching writing where the students are required to produce multiple drafts before the final product. The idea is that when students involve themselves in the process of correction, they can be autonomous learners, become active learners and can have the practice to experiment with the language. In relation to this, Edge (1989:5'2) says, "involving learners in Judgments about correctness helps them to become more accurate in their own use of the language." In addition, the strategies of using self- and peer- correction are

important in solving the very time-consuming business of correcting students' written work in large classes (Doff, 1988; &Ur, 1996).

2.2.8.1 When to Provide Feedback?

It appears that most teachers do not provide feedback during the writing process. Instead, they provide feedback to students' final drafts, that is, when the writing task is over. While suggesting the importance of immediate feedback, Byrne (1988: 124) points "If you can correct something in class, while the students are engaged in writing and everything is fresh in their minds, this is likely to be more effective than looking at a mass of corrections several days after the event." It has also been noted that it is important to follow a process approach to teaching writing where by teachers give feedback at different stages in the writing process, (Hedge, 1988). In this approach, Students are more likely required to write more than one draft. Besides, students are supposed to revise what they have produced either individually or in groups.

Celce-Murcia (1991:260) also notes that "Errors must be dealt with at an approbation stage of the composing process." In fact, editing or correcting errors on first drafts can be a counter-productive activity, possibly exacerbating whatever in securities students might have about their writing and drawing their attention away from the other kinds revision work that must be attended to (Celce-Murcia, 1991). Besides, Zamel (1985) suggests that commentary on the first draft is likely to send more immediate pedagogical goals than that given on, a final product. In addition to this, she further states, in the process approach to teaching writing, teachers should respond to ideas on earlier draft and on grammar in later drafts.

2.2.8.2 How to Correct Errors

It is obvious that ESL/ EFL students write with mistakes and it becomes necessary for us to devise ways of dealing with errors so that they do not become the sole focus of the piece of writing (Raims, 1983). There are, of course, number of ways by which teachers correct student's writings. One of the techniques is correcting all the students' written errors. This kind of technique (direct correction by the teacher) however, is believed to be the traditional method (Byrne, 1988; and Raims, 1983).On the other hand, Edge (1989:56) says. "Correction does not mean making everything absolutely correct; correction means helping people learn to express themselves better." But if everything is always corrected, correction itself becomes the ultimate

purpose of writing (Edge, 19831). This way of correction as is also suggested by other researchers does not help students in experimenting with the language or solve their problems themselves, and hence they are likely to be dependent on the teacher. Similarly, Doff (1988), points out that so many corrections are likely to discourage students as they could think that they did almost nothing correctly.

Components of feedback on students writing there are three main kinds of written feedback (Comments)

- Editorial feedback
- Directive feedback
- Facilitative feedback

1. Editorial Feedback method

Editorial Feedback method is the way that one comments in the following manners.

- Rewritten words, phrases, sentences
- Corrections
- Additions
- Labeling grammatical errors (e.g., verb tense)
- Re ordered materials...
- No overall or general feedback

2. Directive feedback method

Directive feedback method is the way clearly comments or tells or coaches a writer what to do or not to do.

- Avoid repeating your introduction in your conclusion. Close the discussion with your insights”.
- Use a semicolon between two sentences. This is a comma splice.”

- Provide an example to make your point clear. This takes out the guess work”.

3. Facilitative Feedback

Facilitative feedback asks students to engage with their work more critically (e.g. revise argument, consider audience, or offer another perspective).

“According to Foucault, what is the relationship between seeing and power? Show your understanding of the theory”

“Did you consider looking at the issue from the parents’ perspective to present a stronger counter argument?”

“Do all teenagers use Facebook or is this an assumption? This claim requires research and support” Lou Kelly (University of Iowa).

A teacher, according to Raims (1983), Celce- Murcia (1991) and Byrne (1988), can point exactly to an error by circling or underlining it in the text and writing the symbol in the margin. Alternatively, as Raims (1983), Celce- Murcia (1991) and Byrne (1988) further state if the teacher only writes the symbol in the margin, then it is the student's task to figure out exactly where and what the error is and correct it as well. Although the latter method is, of course, more demanding in that it requires students to identify the error and where in the text it occurs, Byrne (1988) points out that it is getting so important. Ultimately, they will have to examine, evaluate and improve their own work which is part of the process of drafting, correcting and writing final versions (Byrne, 1988).

Robb et. al (1986) sums it up that the more direct techniques or feedback do not tend to produce results commensurate with the amount of effort required of the instructor to draw the student's attention to the surface error generally, as is concluded by Celce-Murcia (1991). The 'best' approach to feedback on errors must undoubtedly derive from considering the circumstances of the individual student coupled with the goals of the course and the stage of the composing process a particular draft reflects.

2.2.8.3 What Kinds of Errors Should Be Corrected?

Due to time constraint and difficulty of dealing with every error, the teacher should know about the types of errors and which should be corrected first. As Nunan (1989:78) states « ... the seriousness of the error and the kind of correction strategy to be used depends on the objective of the lesson and the context in which the instruction takes place." So, all the errors should not be corrected and it is better to recognize global and local errors. Hendrickson (1978), cited in Atkins et al. (1996: 127), says that "Errors that lead to misunderstanding of a message (global errors) should be treated first than errors that do not hinder the message (local errors)." Therefore, correction or errors should depend on the kind of errors.

In the treatment of errors teachers have to be selective. They should consider the objective of the lesson. In other words, they should treat the kind of errors that affect the communication process and students' further progress. If the teacher assumes error is the problem of most students in the class, he/she should not ignore it.

2.2.8.4 Do Students Make Use of Feedback for Revisions?

Obviously, the whole value of feedback provided to student cannot be ascertained unless students make use of all the necessary comments for revising their drafts. Despite its type, a carefully provided feedback can contribute to the improvement of student writing.

In cases whether students really consider the feedback given to them or not, research findings have shown quite discouraging results in L1 situation. For instance, Korll (1999), cited in Taya (2005) has collected the following findings from various research works.

(1) Students fail to read the written comments on their papers, caring only about the grade (Burkland & Grim, 1986);

(2) Students don't understand or indeed misinterpret the written comments, and they find themselves unable to make appropriate change in future drafts (Hayes and Daiker, 1984);

(3) Students use comments to psych out a particular teachers' personal agenda only hoping « to make the teacher happy" in the future (Freedman, 1987); and

(4) Students become hostile at the teachers' appropriation

of their text (Leki, 1990)

If these findings are true for L1 situation Taye (2005) and Zamel (1985) predicts, it is likely to be the case in L2 situation, therefore, regardless of whatever strategies teachers develop to provide feedback on students' paper, as Kroll (1991:257) advises that "students must also be trained to use the feedback in ways that will improve their writing on the next draft of a particular paper or on another assignments."

In conclusion, it is only when students are initiated to incorporate comments or ideas provided by their peers or teacher that the act of writing becomes meaningful for both the students and the teacher; and that students writing skills will usually be improved.

2.3 Related Research Works

There are some local studies on feedback which are believed to be related to the present study. Among them, Getent's (1993) M.A. thesis analyzes the responding behavior of sophomore English teachers of Addis Ababa University (AAU) to students' writing. An investigation is made on what features of writing the instructors focus on while providing feedback; at what stage they intervene to give feedback; how their students react to the feedback; how their students react to the feedback given to them. An analysis of the data reveals that while providing feedback, Sophomore English teachers concentrate on low-order concerns and rarely or never attend to high-order concerns. It is also pointed out that instructors respond to students after they complete their writing tasks' and not before they write or as they write. It is also observed, as the paper further notes, that instructors often use a narrow range of feedback technique such as direct correction of errors and students also employ very few strategies in handling feedback.

The other local related work is Italo's (1999) Ph.D. dissertation that compared the effectiveness of teacher versus student feedback on AAU students writing revisions. In his study, Italo found that both teacher feedback and peer feedback are equally effective in improving student writing. Italo also concludes that, students' writing improved significantly because of the feedback given by teachers for writing tasks.

Taye's (2005) M.A thesis is also a study which tries to see whether written feedback has significant contribution to promoting students' writing skills, at what stage feedback should be given, by whom and how feedback is provided to student writing; and if students make revisions, as a result of feedback provided or not. And he found that the written feedback did not seem to improve students' writing skills. He added that the reason why the students writing do not change might be ascribed to the teachers' wrong strategies of giving written feedback on the students' lack of awareness about the role of revisions in the improvement of their writing skills.

Tesfaye Solomon's (1995) research is on the effectiveness of learner self-correction of written errors in the EFL classroom. In his study, Tesfaye found out that learner self-correction of written errors became successful when errors were provided with clues for students to correct by themselves. Wondowossen Tamirat (1992), also conducted a research on the oral feedback behavior of teachers. By so doing, wondowossen reported that teachers spent a large share of the class time (29%) for the purpose of providing feedback on students' work in the form of error treatment.

As regards international related research works, there are two controversial ideas. On the one hand, John Truscott (1996) and Cohen & Robinson (1976) reject every possible positive effect of written feedback given by language teachers to their students in order to improve students' writing and minimize their errors. And he concluded by recommending all language teachers to completely abandon giving comments concerning surface errors. Ferris (1999), Lee (1997) and Grami (2005), on the other hand, believes that the application of written feedback is crucial and of great significance for betterment of the students' writing skills. Moreover, Grami (2005) also studies Saudi ESL student' beliefs and preferences of their teachers' written feedback. They expressed their strong belief of its importance and applicability. According to Ferris and Roberts (2001), cited in Grami (2005), knowing about students' attitude and preferences about error feedback and their own assessment of their weaknesses in writing is important. Their preferences have been neglected by many previous error correction studies and reviews.

Even though studies are carried out on various issues related to feedback there is a lack of study that has a look at into feedback provision methods of EFL teachers in the actual writing class specifically on grade 11 students' written work and students' reaction on the methods of feedback provision of their teachers. Therefore, this study sees on the contrary to Taye's (2005)

conclusion of the in effectiveness of feedback in improving students' writing skill. Although Taye (2005) doubted that, the reason for not improving students' writing with the given feedback might be teachers' misused strategy of feedback provision, the researcher wants to prove this if that is really the case.

The researcher, therefore, strongly believes on the importance of written feedback in improving pupil's writing skill if the appropriate methods of written feedback provision are implemented on students' written work. To bring our students' performance into the world of competition with the standard qualification of writing start teaching writing at the high school level with the necessary and valuable help (support) in their writing activity will lead into successful achievement. Moreover, Ferries (1999, Lee (1997) and Grami (2005), believe that the application of written feedback is crucial and of great significance for betterment of the students writing skill.

Therefore the present study will try to contribute to the field of EFL writing by providing insights into the understanding, the methods of feedback provision and use of teachers' written feedback from the pupils' perspectives.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Design and Methodology

The purpose of this study was to assess the kinds of feedback techniques EFL teachers use in the writing class of grade 11 and the extent to which the techniques implemented promote students' writing ; it also provided information about, the design of the study, the subjects of the study, the research instruments used and the procedures followed in their construction and the garnering of the data as well as the method of analysis of the data was presented.

3.1 Research Design

The purpose of this study was to assess the kinds of written feedback provision techniques grade 11 teachers' use in EFL writing class and the extent to which the techniques implemented promote the students' writing. So, the researcher collected and analyzed not only narrative data, which is customary for qualitative research, but also numerical data, which is the norm for quantitative research so as to address the objective of the study. According to Selinger and Shohamy (1989), with the descriptive survey research design, researchers incorporate methods of collecting or analyzing data from the quantitative and qualitative research approaches in a single study. Thus, in the study, descriptive evaluative research design was employed since it allowed the researcher to evaluate and describe the current situation of the participants of the study using both narrative and numerical data.

3.2 Participants of the Study

To assess the types of written feedback provision techniques used in grade 11 EFL classes, all grade 11 English teachers of Miskaye Hizunan Medihanalem and Kolfe Keranino Medihanale Secondary and Preparatory Schools and selected students of grade 11 were taken as the participants of the study. The reason for choosing the two schools was just to see if the techniques teachers use in providing feedback were different from one another although the main purpose was not that. The researcher involved all the available four teachers under this study by analyzing their written feedbacks on students' writing and by interviewing them. He also involved 90 grade 11 students 45 from each school in this research out of the total 453 students

by making them fill in the questionnaires. The reason why students were included in the study was to crosscheck the responses already provided by the teachers.

3.3. Sample and Sampling Technique

After identifying and deciding the major source of data, the next step was deciding the population and the representatives of the total population. Since it was difficult to use all grade eleven students from all sections of the schools, the researcher employed systematic sampling. Systematic sampling is the kind of random sampling in which the selection of the first unit of the sample from the population is based on randomization. The remaining units of the sample were selected from the population at fixed interval of n , where n was the sample size (Pannerselvan, 2004). Consequently, the researcher randomly selected the sample from each room by picking every 5th student without bias. Regarding the teacher participants, availability sampling was employed. So, all the available who were male English teachers taken as the participants of the study.

3.4 Data garnering Methods

The required data to be analyzed was collected using a written document analysis with the teacher feedback, teachers' interview and students' questionnaire for both the teachers and the students.

3.4.1. Document analysis

The first method was the written documents of the students' which were corrected by their teachers. The researcher believed that the row, fresh, real and natural information about written feedback was obtained from the written assignments or written tasks of the students followed by teachers' feedback. The main work relied on the feedback given by the teachers after the written works of the student. Thus, the written feedback provided the intended data for the researcher on the kinds of written feedback provision techniques that each teacher implements in the EFL classroom. Document analysis as a major instrument was used to garner data in this study. The document was the written works of grade 11 students accompanied by teacher's written feedback. The analysis was made with the checklists on what types of error correction techniques

do the teachers used in correcting the students writing and to what extent the feedback provided was clear to the students.

3.4.2 Interview

An interview was chosen as one of the research methods as the number of the teachers under the study was only four (4). Employing interview was intended to enhance the reliability of the data obtained through questionnaire and the document analysis. Thus, the other tool that the researcher employed to collect data was the semi structured interview since this interview was flexible and often more preferable than the structured and the unstructured ones. Selinger and Shohamy (1989) point out that the use of interview as a data collection instrument permits a level of in-depth information, free response and flexibility that cannot be obtained by other procedures. The semi-structured interview was held with teachers to listen to how the teachers provide written feedback. This interview allowed the collection of data in the participants' own words thereby affording the researcher an opportunity to discover the interpretation and meaning they gave to their actions. Five interview questions were prepared based on the research title and the research questions of the study. They were administered to the four teachers who taught English in grade eleven in the school. Follow up questions were also forwarded. Each interview took between eight and ten minutes. While taking some notes, it was recorded using mobile phone appropriately.

3.4.3. Questionnaire

The other method used was students' questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed after clear orientation was given to students. The students were assured that the responses gathered through the questionnaire were used only for the research purpose and therefore, they were encouraged to provide their genuine responses to the best of their understanding without any reservation.

The questionnaire was prepared using plain language and expressions in order to be clearer. However, to avoid confusion if there was any, it was translated into Amharic. 90 students were divided into two groups 45 students in each. Orientation was given to each group separately to minimize possible misunderstanding and to increase the opportunity for the students to ask questions and look for clarifications easily. The orientation was made by the researcher moving in the rooms while the rest were supervised by the other teachers of the school. The researcher

was also freed to provide necessary clarifications and guidance leaving the supervision for the teachers assigned in each class. An hour was allocated to complete the questionnaire including giving direction and explanation.

So, a questionnaire was prepared for students where some of them were slightly adopted from Zerihun Endale and the rest were structured by the researcher as it suits the study. The choice to adapt them was made to make the technical terms clear and easily understandable by the students since technical terms were employed. Fifteen close and open-ended items were developed to collect valid and relevant data from student participants of the study.

The questionnaire has consisted fifteen (15) open-ended items. Students' questionnaire was intended to figure out whether the teachers use different techniques in providing written feedback and if it helps students in improving their writing. In order to help them easily understand the message in each item, the questions which were designed for the students were translated into Amharic version, the commonly used language of the students. The questions helped the researcher to find out whether teachers' written feedback provision techniques enable the students to improve their writing.

3.5. Data garnering procedure

To accomplish the objective of this study, the following procedures were followed by the researcher. First, document analysis checklist, interview questions and close and open-ended questionnaires were prepared. Then, the corrected written document was handed. Next, English teachers from both schools were interviewed. Finally a questionnaire was distributed to the sample students of the two schools. After that, the data gathered through each tool was organized. Next, the data gathered through document analysis, and interviews were summarized thematically. Following that, the data gathered through questionnaire were tabulated quantitatively and summarized qualitatively. Then based on the collected data, conclusions were made.

3.6 Method of Data Analysis

On this stage all the garnered data using the designed tools were ordered sequentially as they actually took place according to the plan. First, the written document of students with the

teachers' feedback was analyzed and the data obtained through teachers' interview were analyzed thematically. Then after, about the data obtained through students' questionnaire, it was tabulated so that the number of students along with their percentage in each item was described. For this analysis, frequency distributions were used. Thus, quantitative data obtained from respondents were analyzed and tallied according to their thematic group. The data obtained from students' questionnaire was used to crosscheck the responses gained from teachers' semi-structured interview and the written document analysis. Secondly the results from each method were described and interpreted. Thirdly, the research findings were presented and discussed. Finally conclusions were made and recommendations were suggested.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Background information of the subjects'

As pointed out in the preceding chapters, the main purpose of this study was to assess if the written feedback that teachers provide for students has a positive impact on their writing. This is done with presentation; analysis and discussion of the data obtained from the written document, teachers' interview, and students' questionnaire. For the sake of convenience, the results gathered are revealed and discussed under three parts.

1. Demographic Characteristics of Subjects

The focus of this part is on identifying subjects' background information. These include their experience and if there is any supportive training they had on job.

2. Teachers' actual work on providing written feedback and the way they think how it has to be done

Under this section what teachers exactly did and what they think should be done is the concern. And how they feel about the importance of the provided feedback and its extent in improving students writing has to be seen. Here the concern was assessing the types of written feedback provision techniques teachers' used on students' written work. So, in this part the data gathered through written document analysis and teachers' interview was presented.

3. Students' reaction on the feedback provided and their experience of practicing it

In this part, students' response on the importance of the written feedback they are provided by their teachers and the actual practice using the feedback are revealed and discussed.

In this study there are four teachers whose written feedback documents were to be analyzed, discussed and interpreted.

The reason to do so was each teacher teaches different sections. Therefore, the data was taken from the classes each teacher teaches. so, it was crucial to see each teacher's techniques used to provide written feedback and comments on the students' written work

✓ Keys: teachers in this study were four and they are coded as **T1, T2, T3, and T4**. Therefore, all through the paper the teachers were symbolized in that manner.

4.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of Subjects

The focus of this part is on identifying subjects' background information. These include, sex, age, and experiences.

Table 1: Teachers' background information:

No.	Teachers	Work experience	Any additional training or supplementary courses you have had
1	T1	9 at high school	No, we need it much.
2	T2	8 years at all	No, it is very crucial though.
3	T3	11 years	Yes, 80 hrs. Training by British council on all skills including feedback provision techniques.
4	T4	10 years	No, that has to done most importantly.
Total	4		

The information presented in the table 1 above, shows that all the teachers are matured enough and well experienced to teach at this level. Moreover, except teacher TD who was conducting his MA thesis, all the other teachers are MA graduates. Regarding the additional capacity building training except TC, who had 80 hrs. Skills Development Trainings including techniques of feedback provision, all the other teachers didn't get any capacity building trainings.

4.2 Analysis of the data obtained through the students' written documents corrected by teachers

As it was discussed under methodology part, the document analysis was the major data gathering method that the researcher employed in this study. This method helped the researcher to find out

the reliable, actual and real practice of teachers' on types of written feedback provision techniques.

4.2.1. The written (corrective) feedback provided by teachers and the types

To assess the types of corrective written feedback and comments that the teachers provided on students' writings a checklist was prepared based on the coding systems From Teaching Skills by Byrne (1988) and Chandler's (2003). The obtained data was revealed and discussed as follows.(see appendix-A written doc. with feedback)

From the observed facts of the data obtained through the document analysis, two of the four teachers' practice of written feedback provision techniques was either by underlining or circling on the error and leaving it without writing the correct version and not showing the errors with clue. One of the teachers provided the feedback by crossing on the erroneous part and wrote the correct version over it. The other remained one of the four teachers provide feedback by pointing out the erroneous part with an arrow and starring it out and write the correct version in the margin. This implies that most of the teachers under the study provide the written feedback by either underlining or circling on the error and leave it as it is. On the other hand a fully edited (direct correction method) was implemented. However, there are varieties of techniques implemented in providing written feedback among the subjects of the study.

Of all the teachers under the study, none of them used either codes or a clear clue on students' paper in providing written feedback. This shows that students may face difficulty in figuring out what their exact errors are and fail to revise their writing accordingly. As cited in Skills Development Methodology Tesfaye (1996) giving clue for students in correcting their errors it makes easier to know their exact errors and students find it interesting and motivated to correct their works. All the teachers under the study pay the huge attention to the grammar and mechanics during correcting students' writing tasks (see appendix-A P2-3). For example:

-You didn't use any punctuation mark at all and it is poor grammar.

-Spelling and grammar errors were highly seen. This is not good

On the contrary to this, almost all the teachers except one of the teacher who slightly touches little aspects of organization, the others did not focus on the organization part which is the high-level feature of writing (see appendix A P1-2). For instance, T2 wrote:

A good organization, coherence and unified writing

This indicates that as some of the researches in the country showed the highest concern of the most teachers in one or the other aspect of language teaching emphasis on grammar lesson rather than writing; while the organization in the writing activity is the corner stone.

In the same manner, all the teachers totally pay a great attention to the form and they almost ignored the content in providing feedback to students also (see appendix-A P1-15-). This also implies that the teachers' way of feedback provision technique limits the flow of the idea in the students mind as they are forced to fully stick on the form. As Krashen (1982) states, the objective of the lesson may determine whether or not students need to focus on accuracy (form) or fluency (content) of the language. In relation to this, Pincas (1982:23), for instance, points out "In traditional composition students are expected to demonstrate that they have mastered certain structures or vocabulary and the teacher will be looking for mistakes". Thus, there is a higher degree of control by the teacher while students are doing mechanical exercises where they are supposed to use the correct forms of words and grammatically correct sentences. However, Ur (1996: 163) states, "One of our problems in teaching writing is to maintain a fair balance between content and form."

4.2.2 The written (general written comments) on students' paper (See appendix A)

According to the information obtained from the corrected documents of students on (appendix A p1-15) regarding the general written comments provided on students' paper, three of the four teachers didn't provide enough general written comments or written feedback on students' written works. Two of them provided only little amount which means almost none. On the other hand, one of them provides some amount of general written comments which consists of both positive and negative features. For instance:

Comment T1, - *You are poor in both spelling and sentence structure. So careless.*
 - *Write your name even properly.*

-Do you know what you wrote?

- *Some grammatical errors and punctuation mark errors were seen.*

So try to act accordingly.

On the contrary to that, one of the rest teachers provided some amount of general written comments which consists of both positive and negative features. For instance:

Comment T2:

-*Spelling errors and grammatical errors were highly seen*

which is not good.

-*Neat hand writing and good coherence and unified writing.*

-*Your paragraph is good but where is the concluding idea?*

In a very little manner, the other teacher provided little amount of a general written comments which is totally of negative features.

Comment T3

-*Some words are miss-spelled.*

-*This is not an essay. Try to organize your sentences in well.*

-*Do you know what did you write? Is it a note or an essay?*

-*Your punctuation is not proper (is not good).*

This indicates that, the teachers are missing the most important part of providing written feedback. According to Harmer (2006:109) in less controlled writing activities, it is crucial to provide comments such as “I am very happy to read this, It has very interesting idea” and the likes.

Regarding the clarity of the feedbacks provided to help students as the data obtained through the checklist, almost the feedbacks that all the teachers provided lacks clarity. In addition the comments they wrote didn't guide students to practice in line with the feedbacks that they are provided. Since they didn't use any ways of coding or clues which can make easier to find their errors, it is still difficult to understand for students to correct their errors and improve their writing. On the other hand, the written comments or feedbacks that are provided by most of the teachers are discouraging (appendix A P3-4). For instances,

You are poor at spelling and grammar; even you don't know how to write your own name. Your hand writing is very bad.

This shows that there is lack of awareness amongst the teachers on how to write general comments on students' paper in providing feedback and there something has to be done.

Regarding the amount of both the corrective written feedback and the general written comments, as observed from students' paper it was not enough (refer appendix-A P12-13). This indicates that teachers under the study didn't provide the intended amount of feedback that they required to address during the feedback provision. About the extent the feedback helps students improve their writing, almost it has little significance. As the result showed all the teachers in providing feedback, they focus on grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary (form in general) (see appendix A P5-7). Atkins, et al, (1996:138) state "Many grammatical: errors are relatively unimportant in the sense that they do not affect meaning or communication." Similarly, Pincas (1982:23) also puts as follows:

If the aim is to achieve a reasonable communicative competence, then the teacher will be more interested in whether the student has managed to put together a piece of writing that could fulfill a broad communicative function, e.g. a reasonably set-out letter, a logically organized descriptions, a set of coherent instructions and so on.

And the general comments were not clear and easily understandable because they didn't give clues. So, it was of less importance in helping students improve their writing.

Frankly speaking, the feedback that are provided by more than half of the teachers lacked clarity (refer appendix A p8-10), it has no directive nature, is not motivating, has no clue to the point the errors type exactly. Therefore, the role that the provided feedback plays in students writing improvement is of the less effect.

4.3 Analysis and Interpretation of the data obtained through Teachers' Interview

In addition to the written feedback document analysis, the researcher prepared five interview questions for the teachers under the study. The interview questions' emphasis were on the types of written feedback techniques teachers use in providing feedbacks to students, whether students

understand them, if teachers give students an explanation on the techniques they used and encourage them to practice accordingly, the extent the feedback provided helps students improve their writing and the experience of students in practicing their writing in line with the feedback they are provided by their teachers. The presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data obtained through teachers' interview are as follows:

4.3.1 The types of written feedback provision techniques teachers use

In order to have the closer understanding about the types of written feedback provision techniques teachers used, the researcher posed an interview question to the teachers if they provide feedback. All the teachers responded they provide feedback and they used varieties of techniques. For instance, T1 says:

I use various techniques in providing feedback; sometimes I use an arrow to show the errors that students' committed. In the other context I revise the whole sentence, and I also use codes to show their specific errors like, Cap= capitalize, P= punctuation, and so on

As the result obtained from the first interviewee, it indicates that as many scholars pointed out T1's feedback provision technique are acceptable. However, the feedbacks provided were of fewer amounts, the coding techniques he mentioned were not available in the documents analyzed. This implies that there is a miss much between what he actually did on students' paper and what he said. This was also happened on students' questionnaire results that teachers didn't give them enough amounts of feedback and they didn't give them a clear directive clues or codes. The second interviewee, which is T2, says:

As to me, I often use a direct teacher corrective method or techniques or revised technique. The reason I am using this technique is that I have evaluated my students and I came up with the result that my students' have a big difficulty in understanding the other ways of providing them feedback than the way I do. I even don't use codes. I write the full word if I want to show their errors.

As can be seen from the second interviewee's response, the teacher used one of the commonly applied ways of feedback provision techniques. This teacher addressed a little more areas than

the other three teachers in providing feedback for students. The ways this T2 provided the feedback implies that the students have no access to practice their writing in line with the feedback they are provided. The teacher corrects each and every error in the students' work and there is no way for students to correct themselves. Generally speaking, this way of feedback provision technique doesn't allow students' to participate in the process of correcting their errors and make use of the provided feedback by their own ways. The third interviewee, which is T3, says:

I usually make a deep look at my students' writing starting from the names. I look at spellings, titles of the topic, punctuation, sentence structure, grammar in general and the meaning of the text. When I correct their errors I just use a full word and correct everything. I also use codes to show their errors in an easy way; I use codes especially when I feel tired or get bored.

As the result obtained from the third interviewee reveals, the teacher uses some of the techniques commonly identified as the methods of feedback provision techniques. From the observed facts in the document analysis, this teacher provides the necessary feedbacks which are the correct versions on the margin and the feedback he provided in the documents analyzed were not that much enough amount. This implies that, this teacher's practice of feedback provision technique is similar with that of teacher T2. He didn't give chance for students to correct themselves. He responded that he also used code or clue in providing feedback on students' paper, but it is not occurred in the actual written document on students' paper. This again indicates that a miss mach happened between the actual work and what the teacher said. The fourth interviewee, which is T4, says:

I often underline on the erroneous part on students' work during my feedback provision session. I use this way because of the large class size that I have in each section. Not always, but I sometimes use codes to make clear their error when I feel that the error is serious.

From the response of the fourth interviewee, the obtained information reveals that this T4, provided his feedback for students by underlining the erroneous part and sometimes show their errors by using codes and the technique he used to provide written feedback were some of the

commonly applicable feedback provision techniques. According to the information in checklist to analyze the written document, the feedbacks provided by underlining on the errors were of the fewer amount. There were no any codes that are used to clarify students' error in the observed documents. This shows that though the teacher provided feedback, there was a very little amount. There is also a miss much between what was seen in the document about the codes and what the teacher said in the interview.

Generally speaking, two of the teachers corrected almost all the error that they come across and the feedback provided in the documents, were not enough and they didn't address the most import parts of the written works of the students' paper as whole. Except T2, all the others said they use codes during feedback provision sessions, while they are not and this was also what students confirmed. As Nunan (1989:78) states « ... the seriousness of the error and the kind of correction strategy to be used depends on the objective of the lesson and the context in which the instruction takes place." So, all the errors should not be corrected and it is better to recognize global and local errors. Hendrickson (1978), cited in Atkins et al. (1996: 127), says that "Errors that lead to misunderstanding of a message (global errors) should be treated first than errors that do not hinder the message (local errors)." Therefore, correction or errors should depend on the kind of errors.

4.3.2 Students' understanding of the feedback they are provided and if teachers explain how to use

The researcher forwarded an interview question to the teachers' under the study to find whether students understand the feedback their teachers provide them and if they give explanation on the techniques they use. Half of the respondents said only some of the students understand the feedback they provide while the other half interviewees reported that more than half of their students understand the feedback they provide. Regarding the explanation on the feedback they provide two of them said they rarely give explanation. On the other hand, one of the respondents reported that he has never explained about the techniques he uses in providing feedback. In contrast, the other one teacher replied that, he often checks up whether the students understand or not and then explains. For example, T1 says:

I think my students sometimes understand the way I provide them the feedback, but not all students do that only some students understand it. Regarding the explanation I rarely do that.

From the data obtained of the first interviewee, it reveals that the few students understand the way he provides feedback and he rarely gives an explanation about his techniques used in providing feedback. This shows that the problem of not understanding may be created because of not explaining on the techniques used. The second interviewee, T2 says:

Most of my students understand the techniques I use in providing feedback. I often ask them whether they understand it or not, and they their responses are positive which means “yes we do” and if not I explain it.

As can be seen from the second interviewee’s response, the techniques that T2 uses to provide feedback are understood by most of students and he also give an explanation on the techniques he uses. This implies that, most students understand the techniques that T2 uses because of his explanation on the techniques he used. The third interviewee’s (T3) response is as follows:

About my students’ understanding of the techniques that I use to provide feedback, yes most of my students understand the way I provide them feedback. Concerning the explanation on the techniques I use, frankly speaking I don’t give any explanation. However, some students come to me and ask me saying “Teacher what do you mean by this?” then I explain it to them and this is my fault.

As the information obtained from the third interviewee reveals, the teacher said most of his students understand the techniques that he uses in providing feedbacks. However, he reported that he doesn’t give explanation ever on the ways he uses to provide feedback, but he said some students come and ask me on the points they don’t understand and he explains on that. This creates some confusion between the ideas “most students understand it and some students come to me and ask the points that they are not clear with”. From this one can understand that, there may be some other students who don’t understand but afraid of the teacher or have some other reasons that don’t let them ask the teacher. The fourth interviewee’s response as follows:

Most of the students in my classes didn’t understand the feedback I provide them. I sometimes explain on the techniques I use, but regarding the checking up and encouraging them I didn’t do .

As can be seen from T4's response, most of the students in his class don't understand the feedback he provides although he gives them explanation on the techniques he uses in providing them the feedback. As the report indicated, students may not understand the techniques that the teacher used because they didn't check up the feedback they are provided.

Generally, most students don't understand the way their teachers provide them feedback for several reasons: the first one is teachers don't explain on the techniques they use and the feedback they provided by itself was not clear as students' report. The second one is that students don't look at their corrected paper to revise their writing and so on.

4.3.3. Students' experience of using the provided feedback and teachers' follow up and encouragement

The researcher posed a question to the interviewees to find out whether students use the provided feedback and if teachers checkup and encourage them to practice in line with the provided feedback. Almost all the respondents reported that only few students use the feedback they provide to them. Moreover, three of the respondents said that they do not checkup and they also do not encourage their students to practice based on the feedback they are provided. Only one of the teacher said he follows up and encourage them. For instance, the first interviewee, T1 says:

Few students make use of it. I sometimes, check when I think the errors are serious and encourage them to correct their work. Most students don't use because of several reasons. To mention some, the first one is the activities (writing tasks) are not consistent they are far apart each other and the second reason, they may not understand and thirdly they are very careless.

From the information obtained of the first interviewee, the result reveals that only fewer students make use of the feedback provided and he sometimes checkup and encourage them to practice accordingly. He claimed that most students don't use because of certain reasons. This indicates that students don't make use of the provided feedback because may be the writing tasks are not consistent to keep on practicing, or the teacher may not checking up their trial and may not encourage them to practice in line with the provided feedback. The second interviewee's (T2) response is as follows:

Yes, more than half students make use of it, I check and encourage them. Saying to them, even though teachers provide you feedback

but if you don't use it, it will be good for nothing. Some students don't use. The reason behind this is, they found it difficult to understand and they do not pay attention too. In addition, the teacher my feel bored and don't give clear and appropriate correction.

As can be seen from the second interviewee's (T2) response, one can understand that most of the students make use of the feedbacks they are provided. He also said that he checks up and encourage students to practice in line with the feedback that they are always given. On the other hand he reported that some of the students don't practice because of not understanding the way teachers provided and being careless of reading what is in the corrected paper. This shows that some students use because of the teacher's follow up and encouragement. However, there are still around 30-40% of students don't use the feedback they are provided. Therefore, to involve the rest students seems something has to done from both teachers and students side. The third interviewee's (T3) response is as follows:

Yes, they do, but some like five to ten (5-10) students. They come to me and ask me while they face difficulty to understand. But I don't check and encourage them to use in line with the feedback provided. Most students don't make use of it because of various reasons. The biggest reason they don't pay attention, and they also fail to understand things in general.

From the information obtained of third interviewee, it can be deduced that almost all students don't make use of the feedback that is provided by their teachers because of some reasons. As the report indicates, apart from providing feedback the teacher doesn't checkup if students use the feedback provided and he also doesn't encourage them to practice based on it. Therefore, it shows that something has to be done make students pay attention and make use of the feedback provided. Otherwise, providing feedback would be a waste of time rather than helping students in improving their writing performance. The four interviewee's (T4) response is as follows:

The interested students do that, like some of them. The highest number of students don't use. I check up sometimes when I give general comments. Most, students are under writing and they don't want to do writing activities. Rather they want to focus on grammar lesson.

As can be seen from the fourth interviewee's response, fewer students make use of the provided feedback for several reasons. On the other hand the teacher checks up only sometimes whether students practice in line with the provided feedback and he doesn't encourage them to revise their writings accordingly. From this, we can deduce that students don't make practice may be as the report shows they give emphasis to grammar lesson since most of the exams are of grammar type. Moreover, the experience of the teacher in checking up and encouraging is less and this was the same with the students' response for the same question. So this needs a special attention to help students in their writing.

4.3.4 Teachers' Thought

Finally, teachers were asked the way they think teachers as a whole should do to improve students' writing. All of them said they need short term trainings. The also reported that the training they had in the university was not enough to treat students' error. They added that they have to go hand in hand with the changes in the world. For example, T1 said,

Alright, the first and the most things should be done is we need to be provided capacity building short term trainings that help us to provide a proper way of written feedback. In addition to this we teachers have to update ourselves and prepare appropriate and ample writing tasks and activities for our students to Practice their writing. Trainings that can build teachers capacity is also required to be planned by the bodies concerned.

This shows that teachers have gaps in providing the appropriate way of providing the written feedback. The second teacher, T2 said,

That is a good idea, we teachers and students should be work hand in hand. We don't need to pay our total attention to grammar lesson only. Moreover, we teachers should provide a clear and helpful feedback. In here one of the Elite's quotes comes in to my mind. Teaching is not telling it is an art. We need to help our students as possible as we can. Finally, we language teachers need a continuous training since we master on it.

From this, we can understand that teachers are required to do a lot to update themselves in order to help students. Moreover, both teachers and students focus should be balanced between grammar and the other aspects of language. T3 said,

A teacher has to see everything that a student fails to cope up and correct him/her. In general teacher who directly came from universities as a flow graduate can be face a big challenge in teaching writing itself and giving appropriate feedback too. Therefore, trainings that can fill the gaps are mostly needed.”

As can be seen from here, teachers ought to stick on correcting their students’ error and trainings required for teachers who especially employed newly. T4 said,

It needs both the teachers and students’ commitment. The key point here is writing and feedback practice should be started from the lower grade if this doesn’t happen at lower grades, students will be found below the standard when they get at preparatory level. Teaching writing is not an easy task; it is really difficult for us, the teachers even. We actually need more updating ways in a form of training specifically writing and the right feedback provision techniques.”

All the teachers shared the same/common point of view that they need short terms capacity building trainings to fill their gaps in providing appropriate written feedback and improve their teaching approaches to teaching writing skill. They also responded that both from teachers and students part highest commitment is required to improve students’ writing performance. Moreover, they said as possible as they can they should try to provide clear and appropriate feedback that can help learners show progress in their writing performance.

From this one can understand that the intended improvement was not obtained because of several reasons. Some of the reasons were lack of capacity building trainings to fill teachers’ feedback provision techniques gap, lack of both teachers and students’ commitment on their parts and unclear and inappropriate provision of feedback from teachers’ side. Generally speaking, most of the responses obtained from the teachers’ interview, miss much with their actual written feedback provision techniques they implemented on students writing. Moreover, students also confirmed that in most areas there is a miss much created between the teachers’ interview responses and the students’ questionnaire responses. Using feedback in a classroom can be as simple as writing a few notes on a student’s essay, math homework, quiz, etc. Correcting a paper and writing or telling a student how to find the right answer allows the student to understand the concept better and know why they got it wrong and how they can correct it. Feedback is an important factor in today’s classroom, and should be implemented in every classroom.

4.4. Students' Reactions to the written feedback

This part provides answer for some central research questions of the study. Accordingly, the results of the kinds of written feedback provided, the practice of students' in line with the feedback provided, the clarify of the feedback provided and its extent to improve students writing performance are revealed and discussed as follow.

4.4.1 Students' reaction on the techniques of feedback provision by the teacher

The following data is collected from the subjects in order to ask what kinds of written feedback techniques do teachers use in providing feedback on students' writing is revealed.

Keyes: 5=Strongly Agree, 4= Agree, 3= Undecided, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly Disagree

Table 2. Techniques used in providing written feedback

No.	Item	Respondents	
		Frequenc	Percent
1	My teacher uses codes or clues in providing me written feedback V=verb P= punctuation Cap=capitalization, T=Tense Wo=Wrong word order, S/p=Singular or plural S=Spelling		
	Strongly Agree	2	2.32
	Agree	17	19.77
	Undecided	8	9.30
	Disagree	27	31.4
	Strongly Disagree	32	37.21
	Total	86	100
2	He/she circles or underlines on my error and indicate with codes or clues and leave it to me to correct it by myself		
	Strongly Agree	5	5.81
	Agree	7	8.14
	Undecided	9	10.47
	Disagree	47	54.65
	Strongly Disagree	18	20.93
	Total	86	100
3	He/ she simply puts an "X" or "" mark and leave it without any clues to find my errors		
	Strongly Agree	10	11.63
	Agree	20	23.26
	Undecided	5	5.81
	Disagree	37	43.02
	Strongly Disagree	14	16.28
	Total	86	100

4	He/she circles or underlines on my errors, cancels it out and then writes the correct version		
	Strongly Agree	7	8.1
	Agree	38	44.2
	Undecided	4	4.7
	Disagree	22	25.6
	Strongly Disagree	15	17.4
	Total	86	100

As can be seen from the first item of table 2, most of the respondent subjects 37.20% reported that they strongly disagree with the idea if their teacher uses clues or codes in feedback provision. A considerable portion 31.39% of the respondents also said they disagree with the same issue of using clues or codes in providing feedback. This in general shows that teachers as whole don't use codes in providing feedback for students. However, most of the teachers in the interview said, they coded in providing written feedback and this contradicts with both their actual correction techniques and the students' response in the first item of the above table.

In the second item of the same table the overwhelming majority of the respondents 54.65% reported that they disagree with the statement "My teacher provides the feedbacks with codes and clear hints and leave them to me to correct my errors by myself". In the same manner sizeable number 20.93% of subject students said they strongly disagree with the same idea if the teacher used clues and codes to make easy for students to correct themselves. This reveals that their teachers' CWF provision techniques don't give students' opportunity to revise and correct themselves with code and clear clues.

In the third item of the same table, the highest number of respondents 43% replayed that their teachers don't simply put an "X" or "/" and they don't give them grades only. In contrary a considerable portion of respondents 23.26% reported that their teachers simple put an "X" or "/" mark and give them grades only without showing their error. This indicates that teachers try to provide feedback but it is of a small amount as it was also observed from the corrected written document.

In the fourth item of the same table, most of the respondents 44.2% said their teacher underlined or circle and cancelled out the erroneous part then writes the correct version. Sizeable portion of the respondents 26.5% reported that their teachers do not write the correct version after they underline or circle on their errors.

Generally, teachers under this study tried to provide feedback, but it is insufficient. They didn't use clear codes and clues. On the other hand, some of them tried to correct everything they come across in the areas they covered in correcting which means they don't involve learners in the process of error correction.

4.4.2 The extent students understand the teacher provided feedback

In this part, respondents were asked about how far they understand the feedbacks they are provided and their response is presented as follows.

Table 3. Students' understanding level of the written feedback provided by their teachers.

No.	Items	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percent
2.1	I don't have difficulties in understanding the feedbacks my teacher provides me	6	6.97
	Strongly Agree	6	6.97
	Agree	12	13.95
	Undecided	8	9.3
	Disagree	40	46.5
	Strongly Disagree	20	23.26
	Total	86	100
2.2	I can't easily understand the feedback that I am provided	8	9.3
	Strongly Agree	8	9.3
	Agree	30	34.9
	Undecided	14	16.28
	Disagree	24	27.9
	Strongly Disagree	10	11.63
	Total	86	100

2.3	I understand only some of the feedback that my teacher provides me	9	10.47
	Strongly Agree	9	10.47
	Agree	30	34.9
	Undecided	15	17.4
	Disagree	23	26.7
	Strongly Disagree	9	10.47
	Total	86	100
2.4	I do not understand any of the feedback my teacher provides me	15	17.44
	Strongly Agree	15	17.51
	Agree	40	46.51
	Undecided	11	12.79
	Disagree	20	23.25
	Strongly Disagree	10	11.63
Total		86	100

As can be seen from the table 3 above, the majority of respondents 46.5% reported that they disagree with the view I don't have difficulty in understanding the feedback provided by my teacher. Considerable portion 23.26% of the respondents said they strongly disagree with the point that I don't have difficulty in understanding the feedback provided by my teacher. This indicates that students have difficulty in understanding the feedbacks they are provided. As observed in the corrected documents there were no clear and directive clues that can make easy for students to understand the intentions of the provided feedbacks.

In the same table above of item two, when students asked to show their stand for the statement "I can't easily understand the feedback that I am provided", the majority 34.9% of the respondents reported that they agree that they can't easily understand. Sizeable portion of respondents 27.9% said that they disagree with the statement, I can't easily understand the feedback that I am provide. While some 16.28% of respondents rated for undecided. This reveals that there are some students who can easily understand the intention of the feedback they are provided while the majority of the respondents unable to easily understand the way the feedback is provided.

In the third item of the same table 5, Most respondents 34.9% reported that they agree with statement I understand only some part of the feedback that I am provided. A considerable portion of the subjects 26.9% said they disagree with the same statement, I understand only some part of the feedback I am provided. This indicates that most students understand some part of the feedback they are provided with, while some of the students understand a little more than the other student

For the fourth question of the same table III, the overwhelming majority of respondents 46.5 % reported that they don't understand anything of the feedback they are provided. Sizeable portion 23.25% of the respondents reported that they disagree with the statement I don't understand anything of the feedback they are provided by their teacher.

As the result shows in the table III above, most of the feedback techniques used by the teachers were not understandable by the students. Therefore, if there is difficulty in understanding the provided feedback, it may affect their interest of revising their writing base on the feedback they are provided.

4.4.3 Students' practice of using the provided feedback

In this students were ask if they use the feedback provided and how often they practice their writing in line with the given feedback and their response is presented as follows:

Table 4. Students' practice of using feedback.

No.	Items	Respondents	
		Frequency	Percent
4.1.	The teacher encourages us to practice our writing based on the feedback provided		
Variables	Always	1	1.16
	Usually	9	9
	Sometimes	14	16.27
	Rarely	20	23.25
	Never	26	48.83
	Total	86	100

4.2.	My experience of reading and practicing my writing in line with feedback my teacher provides me is	2	2.32
	Always	2	2.32
	Usually	14	16.27
	Sometimes	18	20.93
	Rarely	20	23.25
	Never	32	37.20
	Total	86	100

As can be seen from table 6, Almost the majority of the respondents 48.83% reported that the teachers never check and encourage them to practice their writing in line with the feedback provided. Sizeable portion 23.25% of the respondents said that their teachers rarely checkup whether students their writing in line with the feedback provided and encourages them to revise their writing accordingly. This confirms what teachers reported in the interview part.

In the second item of the same table, when students were asked to tell how often they practice reading the feedback they are provided. Most subjects 37.20% said they never read and practice based the feedback they are provided. A considerable portion of respondents 23.25% reported that they rarely read and use the feedback they are provided to revise their writing. On the other hand, 20.93% of subjects under the study said that they sometimes read and practice their writing in line with the provide feedback. This result shows that there was similarity between what teachers reported in the interview and the students' responses in the table above. So most of the students don't use the feedback they are provided may because their teachers don't checkup and encourages them to practice accordingly.

As the result shows teachers' feedback provision was not accompanied by checking up and encouraging students to practice their writing in line with the feedback they receive. Moreover, students have very less experience of using the feedback they are provided. Therefore, it indicates that some improvement should be done on this concern.

4.4.4 Students' Thought

4.4.4.1. Students were asked what factors affect them to not read and use or practice the feedback they receive from their teachers. The overwhelming majority of the respondents

said, their teacher feedback is not clear including the hand writing of the teacher, the teacher does not specifically show them their errors. For instance:

S1 - The feedback that teachers provided us is not clear their hand writing is not readable.

S2 - I want my teacher shows me my errors clearly with some explanation.

Moreover, they said they need an explanation on the feedback they are provided both orally and in written form. They added that they need teachers' checkup and encouragement. In contrast, sadly enough respondents said that it was their own carelessness. For example:

S3 - The problem is our weakness to read what the provided feedback wants us to do with.

S4 -I think it is our carelessness to read and even to as if there is something not clear.

4.4.4.2. Students were asked to suggest what has to be done from both teachers and students side in relation to feedback provision techniques and practicing it to improve their writing.

Almost all students reported that they want to be good at writing and they said their teachers should give them a clear explanation on the techniques they implement on the main errors /problems. Like saying,

S5 -We have to know exactly the kinds of errors we make often.

S6 -We want produce a good writing and need an appropriate help from our teachers.

S6 -We have to ask our teachers for explanation though they don't give us.

They added, when we come to students we need to pay attention for practicing our writing based on the given feedback and we also have to ask teachers to explain what our errors are. Then, the students reported that they need more attention and appreciation on their every trial.

4.5 Findings and Discussion

The kinds of written feedback techniques that teachers implemented, the clarity of the techniques, the extent it helps students in improving their writing performance, and the students' experience of making use of the feedback provided.

4.5.1 Major Findings of the Study

A. Findings of the document analysis

- ✓ Teachers under the study used varieties of techniques in providing written feedback to their students; however, it has of a small amount than the expectation.
- ✓ In providing the feedback none of the teachers used either a code or a clear clue to make the feedback easily understood.
- ✓ Most of the written feedback that provided to the students was not clear and rather discouraging than encouraging students to use them. Therefore, the effect of the feedback provided had little significance in improving students writing.
- ✓ The focus of the provided feedback was more of form/on grammatical features of the language.
- ✓ Students were not given opportunities to involve in the process of correcting their errors. The correcting process was solely done by the teachers.

B. Findings from teachers' interview

- ✓ Teachers under the study didn't use any codes and /or clues in providing feedback and they didn't provide any explanation on the way they provided the feedback. As a result students failed to understand the intention of the provided feedback by their teachers.
- ✓ Students didn't use the provide feedback because of several reasons.
- ✓ Teachers didn't check whether students using the feedback to correct their writing or not. Moreover, they didn't encourage students to revise their writing based on the provided feedback.
- ✓ Teachers needed training on the current practice of written feedback provision.

C. Findings from students' questionnaire

- ✓ Teachers under the study used varieties of techniques in providing feedback, but the feedback was not enough and also it was not clear as teachers didn't use any codes or any clear clues to help students to easily understand what the feedback was attempted to do with.
- ✓ Even though teachers provided some amount of feedback, there were situations that they give only grades without any feedback having something to be corrected in the text.
- ✓ Only few students understood some of the corrections provided by the teachers. Whereas, the other most students didn't understand any of the provided feedback.
- ✓ Teachers didn't check their students' work after providing the feedback and they also didn't encourage them to practice in line with the provided feedback.
- ✓ Most students didn't read the corrected work because teachers didn't provide their students' a clear and guided way of feedback. As a result, students found the feedback provide by their teachers was less significant in improving their writing.
- ✓ Students seriously needed their teachers' appropriate help that can enable them to produce a good writing.

4.5.2 Kinds of written feedback techniques

It is obvious that ESL/ EFL students write with mistakes and it becomes necessary for us to devise ways of dealing with errors so that they do not become the sole focus of the piece of writing (Raims, 1983). There are, of course, number of ways by which teachers correct student's writings. One of the techniques is correcting all the students' written errors. As the result obtained from the written document showed that, the techniques used are underling or circling by two teachers of the four teachers, crossing out the error and writing the correct version, is used by one of the other teacher, and pointing out by arrow and writing the correct version in the margin is used by the other remaining teacher. This means two of the teachers correct all the errors and this is meant the red pen syndromes as stated in Mark and Richard (2002:78). These techniques are some of the commonly used ways of providing feedback. According to Byrne, (1988) and Raims, (1983) this kind of technique (direct correction by the teacher), however, is believed to be the traditional method. On the other hand, Edge (1989:56) says. "Correction does not mean making everything absolutely correct; correction means helping people learn to express

themselves better." But if everything is always corrected, correction itself becomes the ultimate purpose of writing (Edge, 1983:1). As this way of correction is also suggested by other researchers it does not help students in experimenting with the language or solve their problems themselves, and hence they are likely to be dependent on the teacher too. Harmer (2006:110) when handing back students' written work (on paper), or computer 'reviewing program' to give feedback on word-process documents we can use a number of devices to help them write more successfully in the future:

Responding: one way of considering feedback is to think of it as 'responding' to students' work rather than assessing what they have done. When we respond we say how the text appears to us and how successful we think it has been-and, sometimes, how it could be improved. Such responses are vital at various stage of writing process cycle (Harmer, 2006).

In summary, teachers used varieties of correcting techniques; however, the provided feedback was not enough. Most of the corrections were not guided and encouraging, in addition, teachers didn't used codes or clues in their written feedback. As cited in Skills Development Methodology Tesfaye (1996) giving clue for students in correcting their errors it makes easier to know their exact errors and students find it interesting and motivated to correct their works

4.5.3 The clarity of the written feedback implemented

The results obtained from all the tools employed regarding the clarity of the techniques used, showed that they were not clear that students couldn't understand and unable to figure out what exactly their error were. A teacher, according to Raims (1983), Celce- Murcia (1991) and Byrne (1988), can point exactly to an error by circling or underlining it in the text and writing the symbol in the margin. Alternatively, as Raims (1983), Celce- Murcia (1991) and Byrne (1988) further state if the teacher only writes the symbol in the margin, then it is the student's task to figure out exactly where and what the error is and correct it as well. Although the latter method is, of course, more demanding in that it requires students to identify the error and where in the text it occurs, Byrne (1988) points out that it is getting so important. Ultimately, they will have to examine, evaluate and improve their own work which is part of the process of drafting, correcting and writing final versions (Byrne, 1988).

In this study teachers didn't use an easy way to direct students to read the feedback provided. Moreover, there were no codes or any form of clues in the corrected papers which may be helpful for students to easily identify their common errors. The other thing was that teachers tried to cover all error types at the time which is the most difficult attempt. This could affect the students' attention and it didn't show them where they needed to focus in reading and revising the errors they committed. Feedback gains the upper hand because it gives students more specifics as to what can be improved, helping them learn the lesson better

4.5.4 The students experience of making use of the provided feedback

Learners' engagement in taking appropriate action and thus affecting learners' outcome might also be attributed to learner options (Stobart 2012). Even if teachers follow feedback recommendations and provide feedback that is informative, directed at the appropriate level and focused on task it may not automatically lead to learners taking the appropriate action. (Stobart 2012) illustrates these learner options by seeing feedback as a "gift from the teacher" (Stobart 2012:241). The gift-metaphor makes it clear that learners have a range of options and actions when unwrapping this gift. Stobart (2012) points out those pupils can negotiate, accept and use feedback to try to improve their work, or they can change or reject it (Stobart 2012:241). The options Stobart presents are interesting because they highlight the diversity of options that can be involved in the use of feedback.

As the result from all the employed tools showed, students' experience of making use of the provided feedback is low. The claims for this reason were as teachers, they said students didn't pay attention on the feedback they provided; the writing tasks are far apart from each other to be stick on, most teachers said they don't checkup and encourage them to read and practice their writing in line with the provided feedback. Using Ramaprasad's (1983) definition as a point of departure Slander (1989) expands the notion of feedback by including the concept of self-monitoring. By doing so he also highlights what is needed by the learner to understand and consequently use feedback:

The learner has to (a) possess a concept of the standard (or goal, or reference level) being aimed for, (b) compare the actual (current) level of performance with the standard, and (c) engage in appropriate action which leads to some closure of the gap (Slander 1989:121).

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter, the researcher intended to provide summary, conclusion and recommendations based on the findings obtained in the study. It is crucial to consider the objective of the study assessing the teachers' written feedback and its effect on students' writing.

5.1 Summary

The researcher planned through this study to find out the techniques EFL teachers used to provide written feedback on students' writing and its effect in improving students' writing. To achieve the objectives of the study, the researcher used three research methods, document analysis as the major method, interview, and questionnaire to triangulate the findings. The data obtained through all the three methods showed that teachers used underlining on the errors and circling techniques in providing feedback on students' writing. The feedback provided by the teachers under the study lacked clarity, and the process of correction didn't involve students. Teachers didn't check students work after providing the feedback and they didn't encourage students to revise their writing based on the provided feedback. Students on the other hand didn't pay attention to the provided feedback and they didn't try to edit their errors.

5.2. Conclusions

From the results obtained through written documents, teachers' interview, and students' questionnaire the researcher has drawn the conclusion as follows:

- ✚ It was found that two of the teachers under the study used underlining on the errors and/or circling techniques in providing written feedback and leave it out without a clear indication of students' errors. On the other hand, the other one teacher used crossing out the erroneous part and then write the correct version on the top of each and every error, and the technique the other teacher used was pointing the errors starting out by arrow and then writing the correct version in the margin.
- ✚ Half of the techniques used were not directing, and the other half techniques were not involving students. They didn't give students' chance to revise their errors and correct by

themselves. Moreover, the feedback provided was not enough; they were of a small amount and they mainly focused on a certain grammar and mechanics issues.

- ✚ The feedback provided by the teachers was not clear for students that they didn't easily understand since teachers didn't show what they are good at and what they are expected to improve for the next time. Moreover, teachers tried to correct every aspect of error at the time which is a very difficult task to address everything at a time. For instance, they correct vocabulary, spellings, and grammar elements and so on. Having that effortful task and in some cases with a large class size trying to address each and every error at a time can be boring and the time might be insufficient.
- ✚ Students were not interested in the feedback they were provided currently. Some of the techniques used were rather discouraging than encouraging the students to write better.
- ✚ Students' experience of using the provided feedback by their teachers' was found to be very little. As the written tasks are far apart from each other in their textbook, students forget the way they were corrected in the previous writing session and they also ignore it.
- ✚ Although teachers provide written feedback, they don't check whether students use or not and at the same time they don't encourage them to read and practice in line with the feedback they provide them. In addition to this, students fail to read the written things because of unclear handwriting of their teachers. Moreover, students were careless to read the written feedback and revise their writing. They thought writing doesn't appear in the national and in most school exams.
- ✚ It has found that teachers need a consistent on-service capacity building training regarding how to manage the students' errors in their writing tasks and on how they can be helpful to their students. Students also suggested that they want to improve their writing; however, their teachers didn't help them properly.

5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher would like to suggest the following recommendations:

- ✚ Teachers provided the written feedback fully edited, in some case only underlining and /or circling on the error without using any clue. Regarding this, it is better to show students' error clearly using different codes and leave it to students to revise their work and correct by themselves. This is how students involve in the process of error correction and it is the way that helps them to learn more and it becomes unforgettable for the next work.
- ✚ Teachers didn't give explanations after they provided the feedback and students didn't understand what the teachers intended to say. Instead of reacting in such manner on students error, they need to give a clear feedback and they ought to explain what their intention is at least as a general overview whether in a written form and /or orally to help students understand and get interested in reading the provided correction and practice it in line with the provided feedback. Moreover, teachers tried to provide certain amount of feedback, they didn't check it up. Instead of this, teachers ought to check up whether students use the feedback they are provided or not and they also need to encourage them to revise their writings using correction.
- ✚ Teachers tried to address all types of the errors that students made at a time which might consume a lot of time, energy and attention in relation to the number of student in the class. Regarding this issue, teachers must divide among the corrections they should address at time in order to provide a clear, specific and enough amount of feedback. As presented in Harmer (2006:112) '**focusing**', they ought not try to cater all the errors at once, rather they need to correct some like, one or two types of errors at a time and others at the next time. This way they can manage their time, may not get bored, make easier and more interesting and also be helpful to students in really making them revise their writing and improve their writing.
- ✚ Students didn't pay attention to the feedback their teachers provided them because of several reasons. For instance the unclear feedback with unclear handwriting. Regarding this, teachers ought to pay attention on their ways of feedback provision techniques. On

the other hand, students also need to pay attention for writing tasks in general and try to practice writing by writing using the amount of written feedback they are provided by their teachers. Students need to consider that writing skill is one of the most important and demanding skill in both academic and business world. Moreover, it has to be taken into account that nowadays most of the communications are taking place in writing same texts than calling on the telephone or talking face -to -face communication in the real life vital situation. And in the world of academy most of the activities are carried out through writing though it is not happening a lot at this level of learning classes. Above all, learners must become more and more responsible for their on learning, and teachers must become responsible for their own teaching. In this way, their work will be constantly revitalized.

- ✚ Teachers didn't use appropriate and effective technique in providing their written feedback. It is obvious that in every learning procedure providing appropriate feedback play the major role in helping learners to achieve their objectives. Therefore, teachers must come into the classroom with the right, helpful, and motivating ways to enable the learners to improve their writing performance throughout their learning time and become competitive.
- ✚ Teachers didn't provide enough amount of feedback and they don't have the required and the necessary information (knowledge) about the techniques of written feedback provisions. Regarding this, it is recommended that they ought to update themselves by reading on what different literatures say. They really have to find the easiest way of helping students in providing feedback, since they are the only one there that students rely on.
- ✚ Teachers didn't get capacity building training, especially on the current ways of practicing feedback provision techniques. Therefore, The Sub Cities need to find a way to provide the necessary and timely supplementary on-service training regarding the written feedback provision techniques in collaboration with the Addis Ababa City Administration, Universities, and NGEOS which work on education area, and so on.

References

- Atkins, J. Hailom Banteyrga and Nuru Mohammed (1996). *Skill Development Methodology Part-II*. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.
- Best, J.W. & Kahn J.V. (2003) *Research in Education* (9th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Brooks, A. and Grundy, P. (1990). *Writing for Study Purposes: A Teacher's Guide to Developing Individual Writing Skills*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Byrne, D. (1988). *Teaching Writing Skills*. London: Longman UK Group Ltd.
- Celce- Murcia, M. ((991). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (2nd ed.). Boston: Massachusetts.
- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Class Rooms: Research in Teaching Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, .A (1987). "Student Processing of Feedback on Their Compositions." In Wenden, A. and Rubin, J. (eds.), *Leaner Strategies in Language Learning*, prentice Hall International, PP:57-69.
- Cohen, A. and Robbins M. (1976) 'Toward Assessing Interlanguage Performance: The relationship Between Selected Errors, Learners' Characteristics, and Learners' Expectations', *Language Learning*, 26, PP:45-66.
- Edge, J. (1989) *Mistakes and Correction*. London: Longman UK Ltd.
- Educational Policy of Ethiopia (2002) Ministry of Education: Addis Ababa.
- Falchikov, N. (1995). Improving Feedback to and from Students, in P. Knight (Ed.) *Assessment for Learning in Higher Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Fathman , K. and Whaley E. (1990). "Teacher Response to Student Writing: "Focus on Form Versus Content." In *Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom*, (ed.), Barbara Kroll, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ferris, D. (1999). " The case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Truscott (1996)" *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8/ 1" PP: 161-184.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Students Writing*, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. and Hedgcock, J. (1998), *Teaching ESL Compositions Purpose, Process, and Practice*, Lawrence ER/ Baum Associates
- Ferris, D. and Roberts B.(2001). "Error Feedback on ESL Students' Writing classes: How Explicit Does it Need to Be?, *Journal of Second Language teaching*, 10,pp: 161-184.
- Getnet Tizazu (19(3). "*The Responding Behavior of Sophomore English Instructors of AAU to Student Writing*".(MA Thesis), Addis Ababa University, (Unpublished).
- Grami, M. (2005). "The Effect of Teachers' written Feedback on ESL Students' Perception: A study in A Saudi ESL University- Level Context; *AFECLS E-Journal*. 2/4
- Harmer, J.(200J).*The Practice of English Language Teaching* (3td ed.). Edinburgh Gate.
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77 (1), pp. 81-112.
- Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Pres.
- (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henderickson, M. (1978)."*Error Correction in Foreign Language Teaching; Recent Theory, Research and Practice*
- Hunt, O. (1992). *Teach-English: A Practical Methodology Course for Trainee Teachers*: Addis Ababa: Ministry of Education.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Italo, B. (1999). "A comparison of the Effectiveness of Teacher Versus Peer Feedback on Addis Ababa University students' writing Revisions.(Ph.D. Dissertation), Addis University, (Unpublished)
- Keh, C.L. (1990) "Feedback in the Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation", *ELT Journal* 44/4, PP: 295-304.
- Kepner, C.G. (1991). "An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second Language Writing Skills", *The Modern Language Journal*, 75,PP:305-315.
- Krashen, S.(1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Kroll, B. (1991). Teaching writing in the ESL Context -in Celce-Murcia (Ed.)(1991) *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*.(2nded.). Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Kumar, R. (1996). Research Methodology. A step- By- step *Guide for Beginners*.
London: Sage Publications.
- Lee, I. (1997), ESL 'Learners' Performance in Error Correction in Writing", *System*, 25/4, PP: 465-477.
- Leki, I. (1986). "*ESL Student Preferences in Writing Error Correction*". Paper presented at the Southeast Regional TESOL Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Leki, I. (1995). "The Preference of ESL Students for Correction in College-level writing Classes." *Foreign Language Annuals*, 24, PP:203-218.
- McDonough, J. and C. Shaw.(1993) *Materials and Methods in ELT*. Oxford: Black Well.
- Nunan, D. (1989)). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pincas, A. (1982). *Teaching English Writing*. London: Longman.

- Radecki, P.M and Swales , J .M.(1988). "ESL Student Reaction to Written Comments on Their Written Work", *system*, 16/3, PP: 355-365.
- Reid, J. (2000). "Responding to ESL Students' Texts: The Myths of Appropriation", In Silva, T and Matsuuda, P.K. (eds.). (2000), *Landmark Essays on ESL Writing*, Hermagoras Press, PP: 209-224.
- Raimes, A. (1983) *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rivers, W.M (1981) *Teaching Foreign Language Skills* (2nded.). Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Robb, S. and et al. (1986) "Salience or Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality." *TESOL Quarterly*, 20,83-93.London: Sage Publications.
- Sommers, N. (1982)."Responding to Student Writing", *College Composition and Communication*, 33/2, PP: 148-156.
- Taye Chefo (2005). "*The Effect of Teacher Feedback of 1stYear Students Writing: Debre Markos College of Teacher Education in Focus*", (M.A.Thesis) Addis Ababa University, (unpublished).
- Truscott, J. (1996). "The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2Writing Classes", *language Learning*, 46/2, PP: 327-369.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, R. and Arndt V. (1991).*Process Writing*. London: Longman.
- WondwossenTamirat (1992) "*Classroom Feedback Behavior of Grade 11English teachers*" (M.A. Thesis), Addis Ababa University,(Unpublished) .
- Zamel, V. (1985) "Responding to Student Writing". *TESOL Quarterly*, 19/1,79-101.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

1. Coding:- Some teachers use codes, and can then put these codes either in the much neater, less threatening, and considerably more helpful than random marks and comments. Frequently used symbols of this kind refer to issues such as word order, spelling, or verb tense as in the following table:

SYMBOL	MEANING	EXAMPLE
S	Incorrect spelling	I received your letter
WO	Wrong word order	We know well this city. Always I am happy here
T	Wrong tense	If he will come, it will be too late.
C	Concord Subject and verb do not agree	Two policemen has come. The news are bad today.
WF	Wrong form	We want that you come That table is our
S/P	Singular or plural form wrong	We need more informations
Λ	Something has been left out	They said λ was wrong. He hit me on λ shoulder
[]	Something is not necessary	It was too much difficult
?M	Meaning is not clear	Come and rest with us for a week. The view from here is very suggestive.
NA	The usage is not appropriate	He requested me to sit down.
P	Punctuation wrong	Whats your name He asked me what I wanted?

From *Teaching Writing Skills* by D Byrne (Pearson Education Ltd)

2. Four types of feedback (Chandler 2003)

Example of Types of feedback

Correction	I have a bycycle. [bicycle]
Underlining with Description	I have a <u>bycycle</u> . [spelling]
Description of type only	I have a <u>bycycle</u> . [spelling]
Underlining	I have a <u>bycycle</u> .

Corrected Written Document

A. Checklist for the Occurrence of the CRF techniques and comments on students' paper

No	Elements of feedback	Techniques used in providing feedback	Occurrence of the techniques			
			fully	partially	rarely	Never
1.	Corrective written feedback	I. Underline or circle on the error and write the correct version				
		II. Underline or circle on the error and doesn't write the correct version				
		III. Point out the error with an arrow out to the margin and write the correct version				
		IV. Cancel over the error and writes the correct version above the erroneous part				
2.	Using codes/symbols or clues	Underline or circle on the errors and point it using different codes or clues				
3.	Grammar and mechanics	I. The teacher focuses on grammar and mechanics while correcting the errors				
		ii. The teacher corrects all the errors				
4.	Organization	The teacher focuses on structure like coherence and cohesion				
5.	Content and Form	I. The teacher focuses on content(meaning) rather than form				
		II. The teacher focuses on form rather than content				

B. The extent the written feedback techniques used contribute on students' writing performance

No.	Strategies used	Extents of contribution				
		A lot	Significant	To some extent	Little	Never
1	The teacher writes general comments either in a positive or negative way on students' paper.					
2.	The comments provided on students' paper were encouraging.					
3	The teacher directs/ guides students to improve their writing by using the feedback he/she provides.					
4	The feedbacks and the comments teachers provided are clear to students to figure out their errors easily.					
5	The feedbacks and comments provided on students' can help students improve their writing performance.					
6	The feedbacks and comments that teachers provided motivate students for the second writing session.					

APPENDIX B

Teachers' Interview

Dear teacher, the aim of this this interview is to see your written feedback provision techniques and its impact on students writing. So, I politely request you to respond genuinely for the questions to be forward to you.

This section asks you general questions about your personal information

1. **Interviewer:** What kinds of written feedback provision techniques do you use on students writing? Do you use any codes to show students' error?

Interviewee: _____

2. **Interviewer:** Do students understand the ways you provide feedback? Like codes or any other form? Do you give them information any information or explanation about the codes or any techniques you use in providing feedback?

Interviewee: _____

3. **Interviewer:** Do students make use of the feedback you provide them to correct their writing? Do you checkup and encourage them to use it?

Interviewee: _____

Interviewer: If some of them don't use why do they not use it? What do you think the reason is?

Interviewee: _____

4. **Interviewer:** Which technique of error corrective/ written feedback provision technique best help students improve their writing? Why?

Interviewee: _____

Interviewer: what do you suggest we teachers should do in providing feedback to improve our students writing performance and what is expected from students?

Interviewee: _____

The responses of the four teachers for the interview questions

IQ1: What is your level of teaching profession BA or MA degree? How many years of working experience do you have? How old are you? And have you had any capacity building training especially regarding the feedback provision methods?

Teacher A: “I am an MA TEFL graduate from AAU and I have 9 years of teaching experience. I am 40 years old. I haven’t had any training. We need more training on how to provide feedback.”

Teacher B: “I am an MA TEFL graduate from AAU and have 8 years of teaching experience. I have never had any additional training apart from the university.”

Teacher C: “I am an MA literature graduate from AAU and I have 11 years of teaching experience. I am 29 years old. I have had 80 hours GQIEP training on the 4 language skills. It includes how to provide feedback? The training was provided by British Council.”

Teacher D: “I am a BED and I am writing my MA ELT thesis. I have 10 years of teaching experience. I am 34 years old. I haven’t had any additional training apart from the university.”

Interview Q2. Do students understand the ways you provide them written feedback, like codes or any forms you use? If not what do you do?

TA: “Sometimes. Only some students understand”

TB: “I think so; most of the time I ask them and they said so”

TC: “Yes, the do; most of them understand it”

TD: “Most students do not check their feedback even. So they don’t understand.”

IQ3. Do you give them information or do you explain about the codes or any forms you used to provide feedbacks and comments on students' paper to let them understand better?

TA: "No, not often. I rarely don't do that."

TB: "Yes, of course. I explain to them often."

TC: "No, most of the time I don't, but some five to ten students come to me and ask me. Teacher, what do you mean by this? And so on" And I explain to them. This is my fault."

TD: "Yes, I once give general feedback and comments as a whole."

IQ4. Do students make use of the feedbacks and comments they are provided? Do you check and encourage them to use it? If they don't make use of it what are the reasons?

TA: "Few students make use of it. I sometimes, check when I think the errors are serious and encourage them to correct their work. Most students don't use because of several reasons. To mention some, the first one is the activities (writing tasks) are not consistent they are far apart the second reason, they may not understand and the third they are very carelessly."

TB: "Yes, more than half students make use of it, I check and encourage them. Saying to them, even though teachers provide you feedback but if you don't use it, it will be good for nothing." Some students don't use. The reason behind this is, the found it difficult to understand and the do not pay attention too. In addition, the teacher my feel bored and don't give clear correction.

TC: "Yes, they do, but some like five to ten (5-10) students. They come to me and ask me while they face difficulty to understand. But I don't check and encourage them to use in line with the feedback provided. Most students don't make use of it because of various reasons. The biggest reason they don't pay attention, and they also fail to understand things in general."

TD: "The interested students do, like some of them. The most number don't use. I check up sometimes when I give general comments. Most, students are under writing and they don't want to do writing activities. Rather they focus on grammar lesson."

IQ5. Which techniques of error correction/written feedback provision techniques best help students improve their writing performance?

TA: “I think the best way of providing feedback is pointing out them with different codes or clues those guide them and leave for students to correct their errors by themselves.”

TB: “In my point of view, direct teacher correction or revised correction written feedback provision technique is best. The teacher should correct each and every error by writing full words not a code like “V”, “P”. I checked my students and decided to do so. But not for ever I have to change some time in the future.”

TC: “From my experience, I always circle and give or write the correct word on the top or in the margin. All the errors should be corrected in that manner I think my way is the best”

TD: “This is the crucial point. It depends on the class size. If the class size is small, just writing the correct answer. But the best way for any of it is using several codes and clues.”

IQ. 6. Finally, what way do you suggest we teachers should do to improve our students’ writing performance and what is expected from students side?

TA: “Alright, the first and the most things should be done is we need to be provided capacity building short term trainings that help us to provide a proper way of written feedback. In addition to this we teachers have to update ourselves and prepare appropriate and ample writing tasks and activities for our students to practice writing. Trainings that can build teachers; capacity is also required by the bodies concerned.”

TB: “That is a good idea, we teachers and students should be work hand in hand. We don’t need to pay our total attention 10 grammar lessons only. Moreover, we teachers should provide a clear and helpful feedback. In here one of the Elite’s quote come in to my mind. Teaching is not telling it is an art. We need to help our students as possible as we could.”

TC: “A teacher has to see everything that a student fails to cope up and correct him In general teacher who directly came from university as a flow graduate can be face a big challenge in teaching writing itself and giving appropriate feedback too. Therefore, trainings that can fill the gaps are mostly needed.”

TD: “It needs both the teachers and students’ commitment. The key point here is writing and feedback practice should be started from the lower grade if this doesn’t happen at lower grades, students will be find blew the standard when the get at preparatory level. Teaching writing is not

an easy task; it is really difficult for we the teachers even. We actually need more updating ways in a form of training specifically writing and the right feedback provision techniques.”

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire for Students

Dear student, the aim of this questionnaire is to figure out the effect of your teachers’ written feedback on your writing performance and your reaction towards the methods your teachers’ use in giving feedback on your written works. Therefore, the purpose of the researcher through this questionnaire is to find ways will enable you to write better. Ultimately, this will help to improve teachers’ written remarks and students’ writing ability on the other hand. So, don’t feel any negative effect up on your answer whether it is positive or negative. In order to get a good and reliable solution, your genuine answer and suggestion will be very important. Feel free and be responsible in giving your answer and suggestion. Use (✓) mark in front of each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the idea.

Notes:

1. The information that you will provide here will never be revealed to a third person (party) without getting your consent. However, your personal information (name and age) will never be revealed to any other person.
2. You are free to ask me questions if any confusing or ambiguous situation in the questions.

Remember: there no obligation to answer questions that you feel discomfort in answering them.

Section I

This section asks you to answer some general questions about your background:

1. Sex
2. School... Grade/Section.....
3. Age.....

(Just tick the correct answer or the most suitable one

Keyes: 5=Strongly Agree, 4= Agree, 3= Undecided, 2= Disagree, 1= Strongly Disagree

1. Kinds of written feedback techniques that teachers used to provide feedback.

In this part students show how their teachers provide them written feedback and the techniques they use.

No	Items	SA	S	Un	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
1.1	My teacher uses codes or clues in providing me written feedback V=verb P= punctuation Cap=capitalization, T=Tense Wo=Wrong word order, S/p=Singular or plural, S = Spelling or plural S=Spelling					
1.2	He/she circles or underlines on my error and indicate with codes or clues and leaves it to me to correct it by myself					
1.3	He/she simply puts an “X” or “” mark and leave it without any clues to find my Errors					
1.4	He/she circles or underlines on my errors, cancels it out and then writes the correct version					

2. The extent students understand the provided feedback and able to use in line with the provided feedback

In this part, respondents will provide information about how far they understand the feedbacks they are provided and /or if they face any difficulty in understanding it.

	Items	SA	A	Un	D	SD
		5	4	3	2	1
2.1	I don't have difficulties in understanding the feedbacks my teacher provides me					
2.2	I can't easily understand the feedback that I am provided with					
2.3	I understand only some of the feedback that my teacher provides me					
2.4	I do not understand any of the feedback my teacher provides me					

3. Students' practice of reading and using the provided feedback to improve their writing

In this section students' reflect if they use the feedback provided and how often they practice their writing in line with the given feedback and their response.

No.	Items	Variables				
		Alway	Usually	Sometime	Rarely	Never
4.1.	The teacher's experiancw of checking up whether we use the feedback and encourage us to practice our writing based on the feedback provide					
4.2.	My experience of reading and practicing my writing in line with the feedback r teacher provides me is					

1. Students' suggestion on factors affecting them to not use the provided feedback and to improve their writing what should teachers do in providing feedback and also what students need to do from their part.

4. Students' Thought

5.1 What hinders you to not use the feedback that teachers provide you? Write some reasons. _____

5.2. What should we teachers and you students need to do in providing feedback and using it to improve your writing performance? Write some ideas. _____

Appendix D

The Amharic version

የተማሪዎች ቃለ መጠይቅ

ውድ ተማሪ የዚህ ቃለ መጠይቅ ዓላማ በጽሁፍ ክህሎት/ሽ ጽሁፋዊ ሥራዎች/ሽ ላይ ስለምስጠው የግብረ መልስ ወይም እርምጃ ላይ ያለህ/ሽን ግንዛቤ ለማወቅና በመምህር/ሽ የግብረ መልስ አሰጣጥና አስፈላጊነት ላይ ያለህ/ሽን አስተያየትና ሀሳብ ለማወቅ ነው። እናም የዚህ ጥናት ውጤት ዋና ዓላማ የሚሆነው በጽሁፋዊ ክህሎት/ሽ እና ጽሁፋዊ ሥራዎች/ሽ የተሻል/ሽ እንድትሆን/ኒ ነው። ስለዚህ የጽሁፍ ክህሎት/ሽ የተሻለ እንዲሆን የሚያስችለው በዚህ ሀሳብ ዙሪያ ለተጠየቁ ጥያቄዎች ሀቀኛ እና እውነታነት ያለውን ሀሳብ ወይም መልስ መስጠት ስትችል/ዩ ነው። በመሆኑም የምትሰጠው/ጪው ሀሳብ አዎንታዊም ይሁን አሉታዊ ቢሆንም ምንም አይነት የስህተት ስሜት ሊሰማህ/ሽ አይገባም። ስለዚህም ትክክለኛ ሀሳብህን/ሽን በግልጽና ኃላፊነት ባለው መልኩ የ(✓) ምልክት በመጠቀም አመልክት/ቺ

በመጀመሪያዎቹ ክፍሎች 1-3 ላሉት መልስህን/ሽን የምትሰጠው/ጪው በሚከተሉት ላይ የተመሰረተ ይሆናል፡፡

- 1. ጣም እስማማለሁ
- 2. እስማማለሁ
- 3. ሀሳብ የለኝም
- 4. አልስማማም
- 5. በጣም አልስማማም

ከክፍል ሶስት (3) እስከ አራት(4)ባሉት ውስጥ ሌሎች አይነት አማራጭ ይኖራሉ፡፡

- 1. ሁል ጊዜ
- 4. ዘወትር
- 3. አንዳንድ
- 2. አልፎ አልፎ
- 1. በጭራ

እንድሁም: 5. በጣም 4. በከፍል 3. በተወሰነ 2. በጥቂቱ 1. በጭራ የሚሉ አማራጮች ይኖራሉ፡፡

ስለዚህ በዝህ መልኩ መልሶቻችሁን በመስጠት እንድትተባበሩኝ በአክብሮት እጠይቃለሁ፡፡

አመሰግናለሁ፡፡

1 መምህር በጽሁፋዊ ስራዎች/ሽ እርማት/ ግብረ-መልስ በምሰጡበት ወቅት ምንዕይነት ስልቶች ይጠቀማሉ

ተ/ቁ	አማራጭ ሀሳቦች	ወሳኝነቶች				
		5	4	3	2	1
1:1	መምህር ግብረ መልስ ወይም እርማት በምሰጠኝ ወቅት ስህተትን ለመለየት የተለያዩ ምልክቶችን ይጠቅማል። ለምሳሌ: verb=v, punctuation=p, spelling=s, singular or plural=s/p, capitalization=cap... ወዘተ...					
1:2	ስህተቱን ለማሳየት ያከቡበታል ወይም ያሰምሩበት እና ችግሩን በኮድ(በምልክት) እንደ v:s:p በማለት ያሳዩኛል.					
1:3	የ “x” ምልክት አድርጎ ብቻ ይተወዋል ስህተቱን አይጠቁመኝም /አትጠቁመኝም					
1:4	ስህተቱን በተለያዩ መንገድ ይጠቁመኝ እና እላየላይ በመሰረዝ ትክክለኛውን ነገር ይጽፋሉ ትጽፋለች።					

2: መምህር የሚሰጡትን ግብረ-መልስ ተማሪዎች ምንይክል ይረዱታል? መምህሩን በሚጠቀሙ ስልት ላይ ምን ይክል ገለጻ በማድረግ ለተማሪው ግልጽ ያደርጉላቸዋል የምሉት ሀሳቦች በዝህ ስር መልስ ያገኛሉ።

ተ/ቁ	ጥያቄዎች	አማራጮች				
		5	4	3	2	1
2:1	መምህር የሚሰጡኝን እርማት (ግብረ መልስ ለመረዳት ያዳግተኛል) ይቸግረኛል ::					
2:2	መምህር የሚሰጡኝን እርማት (ግብረ መልስ) በቀላሉ አረዳለሁ ::					
2:3	መምህር የሚሰጡኝን እርማት (ግብረ መልስ) በጭራሽ አልረዳውም ::					
2:4	መምህር የሚሰጡኝን እርማት (ግብረ መልስ) በተወሰነ መልኩ አረዳለሁ።					

3. ተማሪዎች የሚቀርብላቸውን የግብረ-መልስ አንብቦ የመጠቀም እና ጽሁፋዊ አቅማቸውን የማሻሻል ልምዳቸው ምን ያክል እንደሆነ በዚህ ጥያቄ ስር መልስ ያገኛሉ።

አማራጮች: 5 ሁልጊዜ 4 ዘወትር 3 አንዳንድ ጊዜ 2 አልፎ አልፎ 1 በጭራሽ

ተ/ቁ	ጥያቄዎች	አማራጮች				
		5	4	3	2	1
4:1	የሚሰጡኝን የግብረ-መልስ የማንብ እና የመጠቀም/ተግባር ላይ የማዋል ልምዴ፡					
4: 2	መምህር የሚሰጡኝን የግብረ-መልስ መጠቀም አለመጠቀማችንን የመከታተል እና እንድንጠቀመው የማበረታታት ልምዳቸው፡					

4 የተማሪዎች የግልሀሳብ

ተማሪዎች የሚቀርብላቸውን እርማት/ ግብረ-መልስ አንብበው ጽሁፋቸውን ለማሻሻል እንዳይጠቀሙበት የሚያግዳቸው ነገር ምንድነው? መምህራን በምን መልኩ ሲረዱአቸው ይገባል? ተማሪዎችስ በበኩላቸው ምን ማድረግ አለባቸው? ምንስ ይጠበቅባቸዋል? የምሉት ሀሳቦች በዚህ ስር መልስ ያገኛሉ።

4.1 የሚቀርብልህን/ሽን የግብረ-መልስ አንብበህ/ሽ ጽሁፍህን/ሽን እብዳታሻሽል/ሽዬ የሚያግድ/ የሚያስቸግር/ሽ ነገር ምንድነው? የተወሰኑ ሀሳቦችን ጥቀስ/ሽ። 5:1 የጽሁፍ አቅማችሁን ለማሻሻል መምህራን ግብረ-መልስ በማቅረብ በኩል ምን በማድረግ የበለጠ እንድረዱላችሁ ታስባላችሁ? ከእናንተ በኩልስ ምን ማድረግ ይጠቃል? የተወሰኑ ሀሳብ ጥቀስ/ሽ : :

4.2 የጽሁፍ አቅማችሁን ለማሻሻል መምህራን ግብረ-መልስ በማቅረብ በኩል ምን በማድረግ የበለጠ እንድረዱላችሁ ታስባላችሁ? ከእናንተ በኩልስ ምን ማድረግ ይጠቃል?
