



## Original Research

## Perceptions and Practices of Teachers' Written Feedback Provision Strategies on Students' written Composition

<sup>1</sup>Gemechis Denu & <sup>2</sup>Zerihun Buli

<sup>1,2</sup>Wollega University, Institute of Languages Study and Journalism, Nekemte, Ethiopia,  
P.O.Box.395

---

### Abstract

The main objective of this study was to investigate teachers perceptions and practices of their written feedback provision strategies on the students' written composition of grade eleven students in four selected preparatory schools in East and west Wollega zones. In this study, descriptive survey design was used. The four preparatory schools were randomly selected from the two Wollega zones. The total population of grade 11 students at the specified preparatory schools was 2000. As a sample, 20% of the total number of students was used which accounts 400. These sample students were selected using random sampling technique as it gives an equal opportunity for all respondents to be part of the study. Since the total number of teachers is very few, all of them (21) were included with availability sampling technique. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected from both the teachers and students respondents found in the two zones. To get the quantitative and the qualitative data on the teachers' perceptions and practices, questionnaires and text analysis were used. The data collected through questionnaire was computed with descriptive statistics such as percentages, mean values and standard deviation and that of the text analysis was qualitatively analyzed in thematic form. Hence, the finding showed students and teachers perceived written feedback provision is highly significant for enhancing students' composition. The data further revealed that teachers did not practice variety of written feedback strategies as frequently as possible. According to the finding, the reasons for the infrequent written feedback practice were the time consuming nature of feedback, large class size and the students' low performance in producing good compositions. Besides, the finding showed that when written feedback is appropriately provided, students get insights into writing effective compositions. Furthermore, it was reported that feedback helps students to improve their writing, keeps them active and enhances their writing fluency. Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers did not make the required efforts of practicing varieties of written feedback provision strategies that could enhance students' composition. Thus, it is recommended that teachers have to provide varieties of written feedback strategies thereby students come to write an effective compositions.

### Article Information

#### Article History:

Received : 10-08-2017

Revised : 15-09-2017

Accepted : 25-09-2017

#### Keywords:

feedback,  
text analysis, composition,  
perception

#### \*Corresponding Author:

Gemechis Denu

#### E-mail:

[gemechisdenu2012@gmail.com](mailto:gemechisdenu2012@gmail.com)

## INTRODUCTION

Writing has always been difficult for learners of English to write an error-free writing. It is an activity that demands careful thought, discipline and concentration. and it is not just a simple direct production of what the brain knows or can do at a particular moment (Widdowson, 1983; Al Shamsi, 2013). The findings of different researches in this area suggested that teachers need to spend a great deal of time correcting students' written composition so as to enable them learn the elements and process of writing. In light of this, Zamel (1985) argues that focusing on the process of writing is more beneficial for students than focusing on the final product. The process approach focuses on the ideas, which allow students to explore and make discoveries about themselves, experiences and the world.

According to Jamalinesari (2014), writing feedback is more strongly and consistently related to achievement than any other teaching behaviour. When feedback and corrective procedures are used, most students can attain the required level of writing proficiency. Many researchers and experts who recognize its important role in increasing learners' achievements, and its central role in writing development have acknowledged the importance of feedback. In addition to this, Hyland (2001) suggests that feedback is beneficial for both beginners and intermediate students because it makes them evaluate their writing and notice possible points of weaknesses.

Lucy (2001) examined the influence of different types of feedback on students' written composition. She indicated that there is no significant improvement on writing when providing feedback on errors. It is reasonable to accept that feedback is a powerful tool to improve students' writing composition. Consistently, Jamalinesari (2014) found that when teachers effectively employ feedback

procedures, they positively and often powerfully impact the achievement of their students.

Although providing feedback has been seen as a demanding task, teachers expressed their reasons for responding to their student's writing errors. Many teachers indicated that providing comments on writing errors can improve students' writing composition. Some teachers used writing comments as justification for the grades they assign. Other teachers thought that L2 learners appreciate teachers' comments on their writing and students strongly agree that their errors needed to be corrected.

In connection to this, teachers should provide insightful, instructive, encouraging, and therefore effective feedback on different aspects of students' written composition (form and content). Written feedback practices are good foundations to enable students for producing well-organized and well-composed writing. Different researchers have revealed the level of the practices of written feedback in empowering students' written composition. For instance, Lounis (2010) studied feedback strategies from the instructors' point of view and their patterns of teaching writing. The findings showed the students did not only incorporate a considerable proportion of their teacher's comments but they also committed fewer errors. Findings of this research invited other researchers to integrate the multifaceted draft technique into their teaching practices and more importantly to provide feedback on preliminary drafts not on final ones.

Though most of the studies conducted at international level, similar problem seems to appear in Ethiopian preparatory schools. The students' writing proficiency is not as encouraging and satisfactory as it ought to be. Besides, the attempt of teachers on students' written composition remains low. Teachers do not give adequate written feedback that can enhance students' writing performance. For

instance, students poorly perform in 'Writing Skills' course that focuses on the students' paragraph and essay writing capacity. In addition, students are not capable of writing an organized composition/essay, which helps them to work well in the other academic courses that demand writing. This reflects that teachers were not in a position to provide effective feedback on students' composition.

### **The Meaning of Feedback**

Ur (1996, p. 242) defines feedback as information given to the learner about his or her performance of learning task with the objective of improving his/her performance. Keh (1990, p. 294) also defines feedback in the context of writing as an input from a reader with the effect of providing information to the writer for revision. In the context of teaching and learning, feedback can be defined as any form of response by a teacher to students, and from student to student performance, attitude or behavior where it impacts up on performance. According to Drown (2009), feedback appears when "the output of a system becomes an input to the same system causing the system to respond dynamically to its previous products." That is to say, feedback is part of a complex system and sub-systems, which are interrelated and mutually influenced by each other. This system is made up of the feedback source or producer, the feedback itself and the feedback recipient. Feedback is inevitably influenced by its source, yet it is meant to influence its recipient making his or her change prior products.

### **Types of feedback**

There are many types of feedback. Researchers examined and compared between them and showed different results. Al Shamsi, (2013) identifies different feedback types including teacher feedback, direct/indirect feedback, teacher-student conferences, audio taped commentary, email comments and comments written on students' drafts.

### **Teachers' Written Feedback**

Teacher feedback is a kind of feedback that is provided from the teacher to learners during mid- draft or on the final draft for improving the learners' writing ability. In relation to this, several studies have shown that teachers' feedback is not simply disembodied reference to student text rather it is an interactive part of a productive interpersonal relationship between the teacher and students (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). There are different forms of feedback provision methods that teachers utilize to respond to their students' written works will have different forms.

### **Direct Feedback**

Elashri (2013) defined direct or explicit feedback as feedback that occurs when teachers identify errors and provide the students with the correct form of their errors. It shows them what is wrong and how it should be written, but it leaves no work for them to think what the errors are.

### **Indirect Feedback**

Moser and Jasmine (2010) asserts indirect feedback is a situation in which teachers indicate errors have been made but do not provide corrections. Thus, diagnosing and correcting errors are students' responsibilities. This method is more effective than directly correcting the errors. Ko and Hirvela (2010) explained that making a learner try to discover the right form could be often instructive. Moser and Jasmine (2010) who found that the students who used an error code in revising their essays made significantly greater gains than those whose compositions were directly corrected by the instructor support this idea.

### **Teacher Commentary**

In this type of feedback, teachers write their comments on their students' writing in the margin or at the end of the students' writing. This kind of feedback provides detailed

information about meaningfulness of ideas and ways to improve writing. Hyland (2003) distinguished between two types of commentary feedback, which are positive, and negative feedback. He pointed that positive feedback is used to reward students for their writing efforts. On the other hand, negative feedback is provided to criticize writing.

### Teacher-student Conferencing

This technique has become increasingly popular tool in teaching writing in L1 settings (Jacobs & Karliner, 1977; Murray, 1985; Carnicelli, 1980; Simmons, 1984; Zamel, 1985). Recently, this approach has started to become popular in L2 situations as well. In considering second language learners, Zamel (1985) suggested the importance of writing conferences: "We should set up collaborative sessions and conferences during which important discoveries can be made by both reader and writer.

This study aimed at investigating perceptions and practices of teachers' written feedback strategies on the students' written composition of the four selected preparatory school grade 11 students and EFL teachers in East and West Wollega Zones. To this end, the researchers formulated the following research questions.

- How do students perceive the written feedback provision strategies that teachers employ to make students' written composition effective?
- How often do teachers practice different written feedback strategies during writing composition classes?
- What are the benefits of teachers' written feedback in helping students to produce effective composition?
- 

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study is a descriptive survey and has employed both quantitative and qualitative methods of investigating perceptions and practices of teachers' written feedback

provision strategies on the students' written composition of the four selected preparatory schools. Descriptive statistics was used to analyze the data obtained through questionnaire from both teachers and students. Some written compositions were thematically analyzed along the questionnaire.

### Participants of the Study

Four hundred grade 11 students were randomly selected from four preparatory schools in East and west Wollega Zones. That is, 20% of the total populating was used. Available EFL teachers (21) who are teaching in grade eleven preparatory schools were part of the study using availability sampling technique.

### Instruments of Data Collection

The instruments used for this study are questionnaire and composition (text) analysis which are presented hereunder.

### Questionnaire

The researchers used questionnaire as a main data collection instrument. Two sets of questionnaires (one for students and another for teachers) were prepared and administered to collect the necessary data from the respondents. Hence, the five point Likert scale in which are responded in such a way students are required to put a tick mark (√) under the appropriate rating scale (strongly agree, agree, undecided, strongly disagree and disagree). The questionnaires were adapted from previously used sources from literature whose reliability was tested. The questionnaire are put together as parts (part I perceptions part II practices and part III benefits). Administration of the final version of the questionnaires was conducted at the convenience of the respondents at each preparatory school.

### Text Analysis

Teachers' written commentary on students' written compositions is also used as data

gathering instruments in order to support the information obtained through questionnaire. It provides tangible evidence about teachers' feedback provision practices. The researchers assessed students' composition and examined whether EFL teachers provided appropriate feedback to develop the writing skills of the students. An attempt was made to see the extent to which teachers are devoted in providing feedback on students' composition.

**Techniques of Data Analysis**

In this study, questionnaires and text analysis were the instruments used to collect data from respondents of the study. Thus, the data obtained through questionnaire are analyzed through descriptive statistics such as using

percentages, frequencies, mean values and standard deviation by using SPSS and interpreted accordingly. Teachers' and students' responses to open-ended items in the questionnaire, and text analysis are analyzed qualitatively by describing explicitly in words. So, both quantitative and qualitative descriptions are utilized and analyzed qualitatively according to their thematic relation.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

The results of this study are presented in two parts. The first part has got three sections which focus focus on perceptions, practices and benefits of feedback on students' composition. The second part presented results obtained from teachers.

Table.1: Students' Responses on Teachers Perceptions

N	Items	S.A		A		N		D		S.D		Mean	SD
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	Teachers have to correct my written errors	157	39.2	102	25.5	34	8.5	71	17.8	36	9.0	3.68	1.379
2	Teachers have to correct every error I commit	109	27.3	85	21.2	82	20.5	83	20.8	41	10.2	3.34	1.344
3	It is more helpful to give clear and direct instructions about my writing errors than suggesting a correction.	144	36.0	120	30.0	49	12.2	64	16.0	23	5.8	3.74	1.256
4	I always pay close attention to my teacher's written feedback on my writing.	144	36.0	136	34.0	41	10.2	67	16.8	12	3.0	3.83	1.173
5	I do not make the same error once the teacher corrects it.	53	13.2	63	15.8	89	22.2	124	31.0	69	17.2	2.77	1.291
6	I think it is important for teachers to give feedback on students' written work.	109	27.3	85	21.2	82	20.5	83	20.8	41	10.2	3.34	1.334
7	I like my teacher to give detailed and specific comments	122	30.5	63	15.8	69	17.2	122	30.5	86	21.5	2.72	1.360
8	I prefer to be given the correct written answers for my writing errors	53	13.2	63	15.8	88	22.0	125	31.2	69	17.2	2.77	1.291

(SA) strongly agree (A) agree (N) do not know (D) disagree (SD) strongly disagree

Item 1 of the above table revealed that 157 (39.2%) strongly agreed that teachers need to correct the students' written text with errors. In addition, the calculated mean value is 3.68 is greater than the average value which show a positive response to the item. Thus, it can be noted that teachers have the cognizant to correct the students' errors. In support of this, Truscott (1996) contends there is strong belief that error correction is important and influential on students' writing.

With regard to item 2, the above table depicts that most of the respondents 109 (27.3%) tended to believe the teachers have to correct every error they commit during the writing class. The calculated mean of item 2 is 3.34 with the standard deviation of 1.344 regarding the need for error correction on the part of the teacher. Hence, it can be inferred that when students are making mistakes they need the

scaffolding of their teacher as essential points. Indeed, it seems unreasonable to seek assistance from the teacher for whatever mistake they commit. This can influence the endeavor the students make to improve their writing capability. Some scholars explained that correcting every mistake may result in students' adoption of negative attitudes toward writing. The teachers have to leave a room for the students so that they can detect the error and correct those errors on their own.

Looking at Item 3, 144 (36%) of the respondents strongly agree that it is more helpful to give clear and direct instruction about the students' errors. Scholars like Elashri (2013) claims explicit feedback lets them get what is wrong and the teacher shows how it should be written correctly. Students who receive feedback will pay more attention to what they have written beyond their knowledge or awareness, their

work does not meet certain standards. With respect to item 5, 124 (31%) of the respondents disagreed to the item that it seems plausible to generalize from the items presented that still a maximum number of them contended the teacher has to continue providing written feedback to avoid the same mistakes they commit.

Item 6, With respect to the students' perceptions about the importance of giving feedback on the students' written work, 109 (27.3%) revealed they strongly agree with the item and they highly rated the importance of feedback. In support of this, Keh (1990) contends feedback plays variety of functions including recognizing, correcting and improving students'

performance. It also keeps students on track and is an aid to classroom management. Item 7 was prepared to get insights into whether the teacher gives detailed and specific comments for students.

The same table highlights about item 10, which focuses on the students' preferences about the type of feedback given, is correct written answers. In view of this, 125 (31.2%) responded they agree with the item whereas the mean value is 2.77 which incline towards the preference for correct written errors. It appears realistic that students may prefer teachers to correct all surface errors at least to the extent it is possible.

Table 2: Students' Responses on Teachers' Feedback Provision Strategies

N	Item	A	B	C	D	E	Mn	SD					
1	The teacher writes positive comments, such as words of praise	107	26.8	94	23.5	34	8.5	103	25.8	62	15.5	3.202	1.465
2	The teacher asks students to share pieces of their good writings	55	13.8	52	13.0	120	30.0	98	24.5	75	18.8	2.785	1.277
3	The teacher gives feedback based on our needs	57	14.2	58	14.5	76	19.0	127	31.8	82	20.5	2.702	1.329
4	The teacher writes the correct answers	52	13.0	45	11.2	68	17.0	125	31.2	110	27.5	2.510	1.345
5	The teacher indicates the place where the error occurs by underlining or circling	73	18.2	72	18.2	44	11.0	123	30.8	88	22.0	2.797	1.435
6	The teacher uses codes to indicate errors	89	22.2	80	20.0	31	7.8	142	35.5	58	14.5	3.000	1.424
7	The teacher puts a mark in the margin to indicate errors	129	32.2	86	21.5	39	9.8	86	21.5	60	15.0	3.345	1.485
8	We use self-assessment after writing	54	13.5	44	11.0	83	20.8	136	34.0	83	20.8	2.625	1.297
9	We evaluate each other's work in pairs or with a whole class	50	12.5	55	13.8	104	26.0	100	25.0	91	22.8	2.685	1.304
10	We use peer correction after writing	46	11.5	55	13.8	94	23.5	106	26.5	99	24.8	2.607	1.304
11	We are provided with good writing models	57	14.2	48	12.0	78	19.5	133	33.2	84	21.0	2.652	1.321
12	The teacher provides feedback to each student individually	97	24.2	87	21.8	34	8.5	122	30.5	60	15.0	3.097	1.445
13	The teacher provides feedback to whole class at once	67	16.8	44	11.0	72	18.0	135	33.8	82	20.5	2.697	1.360
14	My teacher gives us brief orientation of the feedback on how to correct the compositions	65	16.2	47	11.8	95	23.8	116	29.0	77	19.2	2.677	1.381

A=Always B= Very often C=Often D=sometimes E=Never

As shown in item 1 in the above table, 107 (26.5%) respondents reported that the teacher sometimes writes positive comments that would more encourage them. 103 (25.8%) respondents claimed that the teacher always gives positive comments including words of praise. Item 2 shows that (30%) tended to report that their teachers often asks to share the pieces of their good writing which can be used as a model for other students. Therefore, it is worth for the teachers to maximize the experience of sharing sample written compositions among them.

Item 3 was designed to make sure whether the feedback given is based on students' needs. Accordingly, the large number of respondents 127 (31.8%) indicated their teachers sometimes gives them feedback as per their needs whereas 76 (19%) of them replied that their teachers often do so. From the table an equivalent number of respondents 57(14.2%) and 58 (14.5%) responded their teachers always and very often gives feedback based on their needs respectively. However, 82 (20.5%) of them indicated that the teachers never gives feedback based on their needs.

Item 4 was prepared to get insights into the techniques teachers use in feedback provision. In line with this, the greatest number of respondents 125 (31.2%) revealed the teacher sometimes writes the correct answers. On the contrary, greater number of respondents 110 (27.5%) reported the teachers never write the correct answers though it guides students to avoid making more mistakes. It is reasonable, therefore; that teachers have to give correct answer for the whole class or individually as this significantly improves the students' writing performance. When teachers fail to give correct answers for the students' work, they miss the right support and there is a tendency that they continue committing mistakes.

Regarding item 5 123 (30.8%) respondents confirmed that the teachers sometimes indicate the errors by circling or underlining. Besides, a significant number of respondents 73 (18.2%) showed the teachers always do so. Almost the corresponding number of respondents 72 (18.2%) also revealed the teachers very often indicates the place of errors by circling or underlining. Based on the above finding it can be noted that teachers use varieties of feedback provision techniques from which students recognize their own errors. Thus, they get access to correct their mistakes. In contrary to the above technique, item 6 from the same table reported the greater number of students 142 (35.5%) disclosed the teachers sometimes use codes to indicate errors.

Hence, it appears reasonable to wrap up the above finding that the teachers are supposed to write the symbol above the targeted error or mistake. In light of this, Al Shamsi (2013) pointed out that coded feedback is locating the exact location of an error and the type of error is indicated with a code. However, symbols and codes should be clear in order not to confuse the students. To get more insights into the feedback provision strategy item 7 illustrates higher number of respondents 129 (32.2%) have shown the teachers always put a mark in the margin to indicate errors. According

to the table, a maximum number of respondents 86 (21.5%) have responded the teachers very often and sometimes put a mark in the margin to indicate errors. Hence, one can infer from the table that teachers put a mark that suggests the right expressions/words so that students make use them when they write similar tasks.

Item 8 was oriented towards self-assessment after the writing task is completed. 136 (34%) of respondents revealed the teachers sometimes make students to assess their writing on their own and 83 (20.8%) of the respondents affirmed the teachers often use self-assessment. In the contrary, the corresponding number of respondents 83 (20.8%) disclosed the teachers never use self-assessment technique after writing. Scholars recognize this argument and they contend that if teachers do not give opportunities for students to correct their own works, then students are likely to face problems of teacher dependence and lack of creativity (Hyland, 2006).

Apart from self-correction/assessment, item 9 was prepared to make sure whether the teachers make students to evaluate each other's work in pairs or with the whole class. As table 2 indicates, greater number of respondents 104 (26%) replied teachers often give an opportunity for students to evaluate each other's work by taking turns. Apparently, almost an equivalent number of respondents 100 (25%) replied teachers sometimes let students to take the responsibility of evaluating each other's work with teachers' guidance. As opposed to this, a significant number of respondents 91 (22.8%) revealed teachers never engage students in the process of evaluating each other's work. From the finding, it can be understood that evaluating each other's work in pairs/with the whole class is helpful for students to improve the quality of their writing. According to Atay and Kurt (2007), using peer feedback in learning environment offers a number of advantages. There are effects on adopting peer feedback in class as it

provides diversity with teaching compared with the traditional way of giving teacher feedback. In peer feedback session, students do not just listen to teachers' instructions, but work with their peers to do more practices in writing.

Item 11 of the same table shows 133 (33.2%) respondents replied the teachers sometimes provides good writing models for students to practice while 78 (19.5%) of them reported the teachers often do so. From the same table 57 (14.2%) respondents have responded the teachers always provides them good writing models whereas 48 (12%) of them responded the teachers always provide them good writing models. On the other hand, a maximum number of respondents 84 (21%) argued teachers never give any writing models. It can be inferred from the finding that giving writing models are highly important for the students as they take it as instances and also it reduces the level of mistakes the students commit while they engage in writing.

With respect to item 13, majority of respondents 135 (33.8%) reported the teachers usually provide written feedback to the whole class at once. Meanwhile 72 (18%) of the respondents revealed the teachers often provide written feedback to the whole class instead of giving individually. The table further illustrates 67 (16.8%) of the

respondents revealed the teachers always gives feedback for the whole class while 44 (11%) of the respondents disclosed the teachers very often provide feedback for the whole class. Nonetheless, a greater number of respondents argued the teachers never give them feedback for the whole class. From the findings, one can deduce written feedback is highly helpful when it is provided for all students are engaged in writing. Feedback for the whole class can be used in some cases but majority of the students find it important when it is provided at least at pair/group stage.

Item 14 was oriented towards the clarity of the feedback hence, greater number of respondents 116 (29%) replied they get brief orientation on how to correct compositions. Moreover, the table depicts 95 (23.8%) of the respondents replied the teachers often give them a brief orientation about the feedback. Quite a large number of respondents 77 (19.2%) revealed the teachers never gives a brief orientation on how to correct their compositions. Therefore, teachers need to give a clear explanation about the feedback so the students are able to correct the mistakes.

**Table 3:** Students' Responses on the Importance of Teachers' Feedback

No	Items	A		B		C		D		E		Mean	SD
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	No	%		
1	helps me to improve my writing	116	29.0	77	19.2	68	17.0	90	22.5	49	12.2	3.302	1.407
2	helps me to reduce the fear I have in writing	94	23.5	54	13.5	79	19.8	100	25.0	73	18.2	2.990	1.435
3	keeps me more active in the writing process	76	19.0	56	14.0	76	19.0	83	20.8	109	27.2	2.767	1.471
4	increases my confidence in writing	114	28.5	65	16.2	68	17.0	87	21.8	64	16.0	3.210	1.471
5	provides direction of the learning process	166	41.5	105	26.2	51	12.8	53	13.2	25	6.2	3.835	1.269
6	helps me evaluate my progress in writing	148	37.0	109	27.2	25	6.2	81	20.2	37	9.2	3.625	1.392
7	helps me build new knowledge about the topic	162	40.5	67	16.8	54	13.5	69	17.2	48	12.0	3.565	1.458
8	enhances my writing fluency	129	32.2	88	22.0	31	7.8	95	23.8	57	14.2	3.342	1.485

A=Always B= Very often C=Often D=sometimes E=Never

Accordingly, in response to item 1 as can be seen in table 3 above, 116( 29.0%) and

77(19.2%) of them showed their strong agreement and agreement respectively that



their teachers feedback help them improve their writing activities. In contrast, 49(12.2%) of the respondents totally could not agree with the idea that teachers' feedback could do nothing in contributing to their writing competences. However, the majority of the students believe that teachers' feedback enhances their writing improvement.

In relation to item 2, item 3 is to see whether teachers' feedbacks are helpful to reduce the fear they have in writing and keeps them active in the writing process. As disclosed in Table 3, concerning these item 94(23.5%) of the students stated that teachers feedback reduce their fear that they have during writing and make them active to exercise writing. In the same items, 100 (25%) and 54 (13.5%) of the students replied that teachers feedback helps them with the degree of very often and sometimes respectively to the item which tried to identify if they were aware of teachers' feedback provision help them to be fruitful in their writing practice whereas others, 73 (18.2%), were unable to decide and the rest two options (sometimes and never) are replied as 109 (27.2%) and the mean for the response lied in the range of agree showing that most of the students have perceived that they can understand the value of teachers comments and feedback.

Item 4 was intended to find out how often teachers provide feedback develop the confidence of students in their writing. As it was indicated in Table 4.3, the 114 (with 28.5 percent always and 87(21.8%) sometimes) said that the feedback from teachers' side increases their confidence in writing. The mean score is 3.21which is nearly 'very often'. Items 5 and 6

were also designed to draw information how and what to do and whether teachers' feedback helps the students to evaluate their progress in their composition. As shown in Table 3 above, Item 7 was intended to identify whether or not the teachers' feedback helps students to maintain knowledge about the topic and activate them to identify their strengthen and weaknesses in writing. Accordingly, the responses to these items revealed that 162(40.5%) and 69(17.2%) of them respectively reported that talways and sometimes teachers' feedback guide them to identify their strength and weakness; and helps them know more about the topic. In addition, the mean for the item, which is (M = 3.56), lies within the range of <very often> (4).

From this one can deduce that nearly the average number of students have high perspective since their responses mean fall in the range of (4), which stands for <very often> .More than half of the respondents, have shown their agreement to full dependence on the teacher feedback to revise their writing in order to identify and solve their writing problems. Item 9 was intended to elicit information whether teachers' feedback helps students enhance their writing fluency. The responses to this item revealed that 129(32.2%) and 95(23.8%) of them respectively reported that they always and sometimes believe that the feedback they receive from their teachers enhances their writing fluency. Here the majority of the responses with the respective question fall between always and sometimes with mean value 3.34 which is almost between always and sometimes.

Table 4: Teachers' Perception about Feedback Provision on Students' Composition

N	Items	A		B		C		D		E		Mean	SD
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1	Comments and corrections are useful, but too time-consuming for teachers	6	28.6	6	28.6	2	9.5	5	23.8	2	9.5	3.43	1.399
2	Teachers' shouldn't correct all major and minor errors.	1	4.8	6	28.6	1	4.8	6	28.6	7	33.3	2.43	1.363

3	The teacher should mark all errors at first, then focus on repeated ones	3	14.3	3	14.3	-	-	7	33.3	8	38.1	3.67	1.431
4	The teacher should only mark some errors, and make general comments at the end	3	14.3	4	19.0	1	4.8	8	38.1	5	23.8	2.62	1.431
5	The teacher should mark only major errors because it's too time consuming to mark all errors	5	23.8	6	28.6	2	9.5	3	14.3	5	23.8	3.14	1.558
6	Error identification is useful only for high-level students.	9	42.9	3	14.3	-	-	5	23.8	4	19.0	3.38	1.687
7	Comments are useful for students to see why the error exists and how to fix it	8	38.1	3	14.3	-	-	2	9.5	8	38.1	3.05	1.857
8	Teacher correction is important so students can see their errors	11	52.4	-	-	8	38.1	2	9.5	-	-	3.43	0.676

A=Strongly Agree B= Agree C= Neutral D= Disagree E= Strongly Disagree

In Item 1 in Table 4, 6 (28.6%) of the respondents reported that they strongly agree and agree that written corrections and comments consume time whereas 2 (9.5%) of the respondents strongly disagree and neutral about the item. Hence, it can be inferred that Comments and corrections are useful, but too time-consuming. This result is similar to the response gained from the students. Although feedback provision requires lots of time, the benefits are highly significant. Therefore, teachers have to be committed in providing feedback as part of their teaching particularly in composition classes. With reference to whether the teacher has to focus in providing corrections, 6 (28.6%) of respondents revealed they agree with the conception of not providing feedback for every error students make. On the other hand, an equal number of respondents 6 (28.6%) disagreed while 7 (33.3%) of the teacher respondents strongly disagreed with the idea of the teacher to be selective in feedback provision.

From the same table item 3 was prepared whether the teacher should mark all errors at first, and then focus on repeated ones. Owing

to this, 8 (38.1%) of respondents strongly disagreed while 7 (33.3%) of respondents disagree with the item. It is reasonable to note that when the students' written composition is low at the beginning phase of writing, more feedback is needed followed by focusing on the repeated ones when the students' are getting more understanding about writing. Regarding item 5, the maximum number of respondents 6 (28.6%) agree with the time consuming of marking all errors. Accordingly, a maximum number of respondents 9 (42.9%) strongly agree as error identification is useful only for high-level students in terms of performance. In other words, it is enough to show where the error is and they have the skill of making use of the comment for improving their writing. With respect to Item 7, the maximum number of respondents 8 (38.1%) strongly agree and strongly disagree respectively. It is realistic to accept that feedback helps students to get insights into how to fix those errors on their own. Item 8 was designed to what extent teachers' correction is important to enable students to see their errors.

Table 5: The practice of different feedback provision strategies by EFL teachers

N	Items administered	A		B		C		D		E		Min	SD
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
0													

1	I give feedback by crossing out what is incorrect and writing the correct word or structure	-	-	11	52.4	-	-	8	38.1	2	9.5	3.43	.676
2	I give feedback by showing where the error is and giving a clue about how to correct it	3	14.3	6	28.6	2	9.5	7	33.3	3	14.3	2.95	1.359
3	I give feedback by only showing where the error is	-	-	8	38.1	2	9.5	4	19.0	7	33.3	2.52	1.327
4	I pay attention to the fluency than accuracy	1	4.8	2	9.5	3	14.3	6	28.6	9	42.9	2.05	1.203
5	I give holistic comment like organization, content and style	2	9.5	6	28.6	8	38.1	5	23.8	-	-	3.24	0.944
6	I try to carry out a conversation with the students on the paper.	7	33.3	8	38.1	4	19.0	-	-	2	9.5	3.86	1.195
7	I point out and tell to the students for serious errors	1	4.8	15	71.4	-	-	2	9.5	3	14.3	3.43	1.207
8	I comment on general strengths and weaknesses	-	-	6	28.6	7	33.3	1	4.8	7	33.3	2.57	1.248
9	I correct all errors	5	23.8	7	33.3	7	33.3	-	-	2	9.5	3.62	1.161
10	I correct only errors that might interfere with communicating ideas	3	14.3	8	38.1	3	14.3	6	28.6	1	4.8	3.29	1.189

Item 1 from the above table was prepared whether teacher gives feedback by crossing out what is incorrect and writing the correct structure. In this view, majority of respondents 11 (52.4%) revealed they give feedback by crossing out what is incorrect and writes the correct structure very often. Regarding item 3 majority of respondents 8 (38.1%) revealed they give feedback by only showing where the error is found. From the table one can conclude that most of the respondents focus on correcting errors related to accuracy rather than fluency/meaning. The table also summarizes about the overall comments in item 5. According to the response collected from respondents, majority of respondents 8 (38%) reported they often give holistic comment like organization, content and style. It is also understood from the table that the maximum number of respondents 6 (28.6%) very often give holistic comment like organization, content and style. Item 7 focuses on whether the teacher point out and tell to the students for serious errors. Owing to this, the largest number of respondents 15 (71.4%) very often point out and tell to the students for serious errors.

One can understand from the finding that it is good for students if the teachers point out and tell to students for serious errors.

Table 5 summarizes about the comments about students strength and weaknesses about writing composition in item. In relation to this, majority of respondents 7 (33.3%) revealed they often comment on general strengths and weaknesses about students' writing. This result confirms the finding from the students that the teacher might focus on correcting serious errors instead of giving feedback for all errors due to large class size and the maximum time needed to correct them.

## DISCUSSION

The objective of the study was to investigate perceptions and practices of teachers' written feedback provision strategies on the students' written composition of the four selected preparatory school students and teachers. The finding from questionnaire reported that majority of the students strongly believed they expect every comment and error correction from the teacher. However, from the real classroom experience teachers might not

correct every error. The teacher has to leave students with uncorrected written compositions so that the students take the responsibility of correcting errors to the level of their understanding. If teachers correct every error, it may result in students' adoption of negative attitudes toward writing. Moreover, a greater number of the respondents strongly agree that it is more helpful to give clear and direct instruction about the students' errors. It draws students' attention to those aspects of their writing that need remediation and by doing so they learn how to improve their performance.

The main intention of correcting students' error is to enable them learn from their mistakes. Students will avoid similar mistakes because of the previous feedback. The feedback that they receive will lead to writing improvement, which can be defined as a gain in accuracy in both form and content of writing (Ashwell, 2000). As the students' level of writing improved, the feedback should be shifted to the new area of writing. Feedback provision keeps students on track and it is an aid to classroom management and lays a good foundation whereby students would write a composition that meets the purpose. It is therefore, clear from the finding the endeavor of the teacher in correcting and checking students' writing governs every related pitfall. With respect to the students' perceptions about the importance of giving feedback on the students' written work more respondents reported and highly rated that it is very significant.

Thus, different research finding for instance, Keh (1990) contends feedback plays varieties of functions including recognizing, correcting and improving students' performance. Another

important related issue deals with the type of written feedback provided matters largely. In this way most students reported the teachers give detailed and specific comments for students. However, as the finding from the text analysis shows that the feedback teachers provide lacks depth and specificity. Owing to this, teachers need to provide feedback that would guide students to the target direction. As far as the students' preferences about the type of feedback given are concerned, it appears rationale that students may prefer to be given the correct written answers for their errors. But, some teachers might not give the feedback in line with the students' preferences. The more the feedback meets the students' needs and preferences, the better they are engaged in producing good compositions.

Using varieties of feedback provision strategies has a number of benefits. Firstly, it reduces teachers' workload as it eases the task of correcting every error. Secondly, students get access to correct their mistakes when the teacher locates the position of the error. In spite of its significance, the actual practice of coding, the EFL teachers infrequently use circling, writing in the margins or underlining. Thus, it is better if teachers use such techniques after students are well informed how the codes are defined. Writing involves the required steps that could encourage students to produce effective writing. In this regard, teachers make use self-correction for achieving the required quality of writing but it is only usually practiced. Owing to this, teachers have to empower students thereby they can edit and correct their own errors with respect spelling, grammar, vocabulary and other language items before they submit for marking.

Teachers, therefore need to give a clear explanation about the feedback so the students are able to correct the mistakes. In conclusion to this, the students need to incorporate the feedback into their next draft so their writing gets the right shape. Regarding the contribution of teachers' feedback on students' written composition it is possible to justify that the students have awareness about the importance of teachers' feedback. Based on finding, one can understand that the students are in need of feedback to produce effective composition. Feedback has also the potential to reduce the fear they have in writing and keeps them active in the writing process. Furthermore, majority of the participants' revealed feedback enhances the confidence of students so that they develop the skills and capability of producing the composition to the desired quality.

The finding also focuses on the benefits of feedback in giving direction in the learning process. In account of this fact, however, teachers did not make students the required effort in leading them to the learning process. Students have also reported about teachers' feedback in contributing to evaluate their progress in writing. Accordingly, the result tended to indicate students do not evaluate their progress in writing due to the infrequent practice of written feedback. From the data, it is possible to understand that teachers' feedback was found to be significant to help students to identify their strengths and weaknesses on the piece of writing.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings, the following conclusions have been drawn. The students have positive perceptions towards teachers' feedback since it acts as a powerful tool in shaping the writing composition of the students. It is believed that when teachers provide feedback as per the composition difficulty, it is likely for the students to get their writing improved. However, from the data obtained the effort that teachers made in giving feedback to students composition is not to the required level. Hence, it is reasonable for teachers to give clear and direct instructions about the students' error to assist them improve their composition writing.

The finding from the questionnaire and text analysis revealed that teachers' endeavor in giving varieties of feedback strategies is not encouraging. Teachers frequently use direct way of providing feedback on students' texts. Instead of using coding, circling, underling, strategies, they simply indicate that their work is wrong. It could be possible to conclude from the data that feedback provision is a tiresome and time-consuming task. This highly influenced teachers not to give timely feedback. Moreover, it was found to be difficult to get the corrected samples of written composition. This indicates that teachers do not effectively practice feedback provision.

Teachers have the knowledge about the benefit of feedback on students writing composition. Due to the large class size, the nature of composition and the performance of the students on writing composition influenced teachers not to adequately practice feedback provision. So as to alleviate the infrequent practice of teachers on students' written composition, first,

teachers are expected to provide feedback using different strategies in order to address the writing problem of the students. Corrective feedback is most effective when it occurs in response to the actual context. Second, awareness creation should be organized for teachers to fill the gaps on feedback provision. Besides, teachers are responsible to give appropriate and sound feedback on students' written composition than putting their signature to ensure the accomplishment of the task.

### Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest between the authors.

### REFERENCES

- Al Shamsi, S. (2013). *English Language Teachers' Perceptions Regarding Corrective Feedback on Students' Writing* (M.A. Thesis). UAEU, Abu Dhabi.
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9(3), 227-257.
- Carnicelli, T. A. (1980). The writing conference: A one to one conversation. In, Timothy, R. Donovan, Ben, W. McClell & Urbana (Eds.). *Eight Approaches to Teaching Composition* (pp. 101-132). IL: NCTE.
- Drown, R. (2009). Feedback in Learning. In, Eric M. Anderman (Ed). *Psychology of Classroom Learning: An Encyclopedia*. USA: Macmilan reference.
- Edge, J. (1989). *Mistakes and Correction*. London: Longman.
- Elashiri, A. (2013). *The Impact of the Direct Teacher Feedback Strategy on the EFL Secondary Stage Students' Writing performance* (M.A. Thesis). Mansura University, Egypt.
- Grami, M. (2005). The Effect of Teachers Written Feedback on ESL Students Perception. *Annual Review of Education, communication and Language Sciences*, 2, 4-5).
- Hattie, J. & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hedge, T. (1998). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hyland, F. (2001). Providing effective support: investigating feedback to distance language learners. *Open Learning*, 16(3), 233-47.
- Hyland, k. & F. Hyland. (2006). *Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, S. & Karliner, A. (1977). Helping writers to think: The effect of speech rules in individual conferences on the quality of thought in student writing. *College English*, 38, 489-491.
- Jamalinesari, A. (2014). The Effects of Teacher-Written Direct vs. Indirect Feedback on students' Writing. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 116 - 123.
- Keh, C.L. (1990). Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 294 - 304.
- Kelly, W. J. & Lawton, D. L. (1998). *Odyssey: A guide to better writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ko, K. & Hirvela, A. (2010). Perceptions of ESL teachers in North America regarding feedback on college students' writing (Doctoral Dissertation). Ohio State University, USA.

- Lounis, M. (2010). *Students' Response to Teachers' Feedback on Writing: The Case of Third Year L.M.D Students of English*. Algeria: MoHE and Scientific Research.
- Lucy, L.(2001). The Effect of corrections and commentaries on Journal Writing accuracy of students. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 235-245.
- Moser, M & Jasmine, J. (2010). *Using Peer Feedback with High School Students to Improve the Use of Analogies and Symbolism within Creative Writing*. (pp.65-68).
- Murray, D. (1985). *A writer teaches writing* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Purnawarman, P. (2011). *Impacts of Teacher Feedback on ESL/EFL Students' Writing* (Doctoral Dissertation, Ver. State University, USA
- Schwartz, F., & White, K. (2000). *Making sense of it all: Giving and getting online course feedback* (M.A. Thesis). Boston, USA.
- Sharma, R. (2000). *Fundamentals of educational research*. Mcerrut: Inter Publishing House.
- Simmons, J.(1984). The one-to-one method of teaching composition. *College Composition and Communication, 35*(2), 222-230.
- Singh, K. (2006). *Fundamentals of Research Methodology and Statistics*. New Delhi: New Age International.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning, 46*, 327-369.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1983) *Learning purpose and language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University press
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*(1), 79-101.

