

MEKELLE UNIVERSITY



**INSTITUTE OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES (IPS)
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT
(GRADUATE PROGRAMME)**

English Language Teachers' Feedback Practices on Written Work at Agazi
Comprehensive Secondary School

BIRZAF TEKLESILASSIE

FEBRUARY, 2025

English Language Teachers' Feedback Practices on Written Work at Agazi
Comprehensive Secondary School

Birzaf Teklessilassie

A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Curriculum and Teachers' Professional
Development

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of
M.Ed. in Curriculum and Teachers' Professional Development

Mekelle University

Mekelle, Ethiopia

Feb. 2025

MEKELLE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF PEDAGOGICAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM AND TEACHERS' PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

This is to certify that this thesis prepared by Birizaf Teklesilassie entitled “Teachers’ practices feedback on EFL writing at Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School” and submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in CTPD (Curriculum and Teachers Professional Development) complies with the regulations of the university and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the Examining Committee:

Advisor	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____
Examiner	Signature	Date
_____	_____	_____

Declaration

I, the under signed declare that this thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any other University.

Name: Birzaf Teklesilassie

Signature: _____

Place: Department of Curriculum and Teachers Professional Development, Institute of Pedagogical Sciences, Mekelle University

Date of Submission: February, 2025

Acknowledgements

Above all, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Mengesha Eyasu (Ass. Professor), my principal advisor, who supported and inspire me by providing insightful academic and scholarly suggestions, comments and valuable feedback which have become vital for the successful accomplishment of this MA thesis.

My heartfelt thanks also go to Aman Mehari (MA), my co-advisor, who provided me with critical comments. Thus, he has also contributed a lot to the successful completion of this thesis in collaboration with my principal advisor.

Finally, I am greatly indebted to the EFL teachers and sample grade 11 students of Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School for their collaboration during the data collection.

Table of Contents

Content	Page
List of Tables	viii
Abstract.....	ix
Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3. Objectives of the Study	3
1.3.1. General Objective.....	3
1.3.2. Specific Objectives.....	3
1.4. Significance of the Study	3
1.5. Delimitation of the Study.....	4
1.6. Definition of Operational Terms	4
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature	5
2.1. Introduction.....	5
2.2. Written Error Correction and Feedback.....	5
2.3. Students' Preferences for Corrective Feedback.....	6
2.5. Impact of Teacher Feedback on Students' Writing.....	8
2.6. The Role of Teachers in Providing Effective Feedback for EFL Students	9
2.7. Controversial Issues on the Effectiveness of Feedback	10
2.8. Types of Corrective Feedback.....	11
2.8.1. Direct Corrective Feedback	11
2.8.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback.....	12
2.8.3. Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback.....	13
2.8.4. Focused Corrective Feedback.....	13
2.8.5. Unfocused Corrective Feedback.....	13
2.8.6. Electronic Corrective Feedback.....	14

2.9.	Content Vs. Form	14
2.10.	Participants in the Correction Process.....	14
2.10.1.	Teacher Correction.....	15
2.10.2.	Peer Correction	15
2.10.3.	Self-Correction.....	16
Chapter Three: Research Methodology		17
3.1.	Research Design.....	17
3.3.	Data Sources.....	17
3.4.	Sample size and Sampling Techniques	17
3.5.1.	Questionnaire	18
3.5.2.	Interview.....	18
3.5.3.	Document Analysis.....	19
3.6.	Data Collecting Procedure	19
3.7.	Method of Data Analysis.....	19
3.8.	Pilot Study.....	20
Chapter Four: Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion.....		21
4.1.	Data Analysis.....	21
4.1.1.	Presentation and Analysis of the Student Questionnaire	21
4.1.1.1.	What students want their teachers to do when Returning their paper and what teachers do.....	22
4.1.1.2.	Participants in The Provision of Feedback	24
4.1.1.3.	Ways of Indicating Errors in Students' Essays	26
4.1.1.4.	Kinds of Errors to be Corrected	27
4.1.1.5.	What Students Do When They Receive Their Essays Back.....	29
4.1.1.6.	Presentation and Analysis of Data from Teachers' Interview	31
4.1.2.	Presentation and Analysis of Data from Documents	34
4.1.3.		

4.2. Discussion	34
Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations	38
5.1. Summary	38
5.2. Conclusions	39
5.3. Recommendations	40
References.....	41
Appendices.....	47
Appendix 1	
Appendix 2	
Appendix 3	

List of Tables

Table 1. Students' preferences between focused and unfocused feedback	21
Table 2. Students' preferences for features of language to be corrected.....	22
Table 3. Students' preferences for the frequency of participants in feedback provision and ways of feedback provision.....	24
Table 4. Students' preference and teachers' practices on how to indicate errors in their Essays..	26
Table 5. Students' preferences for kinds of errors to be corrected.....	27
Table 6.How Frequently Students Exercise Some Strategies When They Receive Their Papers Back	29

Abstract

The main objective of this study is to assess the teachers' practices for feedback on EFL writing at Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School. A descriptive survey design with mixed methodology was employed to conduct the study. The participants of this study were 60 grade 11 students selected using random sampling technique and all the four EFL teachers teaching English in grade 11 selected using purposive sampling technique. Questionnaire, interview and document analysis were used to collect the data. The findings of the study depicted that EFL teachers provide direct and unfocused feedback focusing on all aspects of students' writings, gave attention to major, repeated and meaning interfering errors, students' preferred corrective feedback for grammar and mechanics, indirect and focused feedback to their written errors, and teacher correction with comments for their written errors. Besides the students showed negative preference towards self-correction and peer-correction. Some variations between teachers' practices and students' preferences were found: while teachers provide direct and unfocused feedback, students preferred indirect and focused ones. In addition, teachers encouraged self-correction, but students did not appreciate that. Based on the findings it was recommended that the EFL teachers and students should forward the process of feedback provision more effective.

Key words: *error; corrective feedback; EFL writing; Types of feedback; students' preferences; teachers' practices.*

Chapter One: Introduction

1.1. Background of the Study

Giving corrective feedback to EFL students is a fundamental task for EFL teachers. Researches revealed that one of the most challenging tasks which make teaching writing difficult is giving corrective feedback because errors are common in EFL students' writings and it demands the teachers to treat them effectively (Bitchener, 2008). Similarly, Ferris (2002) asserts it is inevitable that EFL students make errors in almost all of their writing works. This implies that errors are evident in EFL writing classes.

Because of its importance, much attention has been given to written corrective feedback in the last twenty years (Hyland, 2020). The practice of providing feedback has been widespread among EFL teachers for various reasons. Lee (2008) explains that many teachers believe that their written comments will help student writers improve their writing.

Although researches reveal that feedback plays a key role in second language writing pedagogy and influences both teachers and learners greatly, a great deal of the researches on different aspects of feedback have presented a conflicting results and opinions. Teachers often find themselves in dilemma in deciding whether they need to focus on form or content in the student writers' compositions (Zacharias, 2007). Touchie (1986) also asserts that teachers should not correct all students' errors since it could be disruptive in their learning process and discourage them from communicating.

Ferris (1999) claims that many L2 learners and teachers highly value teacher corrective feedback; however, the effectiveness of written feedback to help students develop their writing remained controversial. The best way to respond to student writing has been the most challenging subject in recent years and controversies have been occurred frequently (Wang, 2015). Several studies have investigated the effects of various types of teacher feedback in students' writing skills, but little research has explored teachers' feedback and error correction. This controversy led to the focus that EFL teachers should consistently reflect up on their long lasting beliefs concerning their own feedback practices. Much has been said about written feedback so far; however, little has been discovered through researches about teachers' practices and

perceptions towards their feedback. Previous researches done by Henderickson, (2015) investigated teachers' preferences for and the effectiveness of corrective feedback in second language acquisition, but as Panova, (2002) investigated, nothing was found about the differences between teachers' and students' preferences for error correction. Also to the researchers' knowledge no studies have been conducted in our context to investigate this. Therefore, this research becomes different from the others in that it attempts to figure out the discrepancies of teachers' feedback on EFL writing.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Although giving corrective feedback on students' written work is crucial, there was mismatch between teacher feedback practices and students preferences. So, it is from the researcher's experience to see the limited English language teachers' effective practice on written corrective feedback in EFL classes. According to Katayama (2007) discrepancies in the learning style of students will affect the learning environment by either supporting or suppressing their intentional cognition and active involvement.

Since written corrective feedback has an essential role in developing the writing skill of second language learners, teachers consider providing feedback for students as their professional responsibility (Hyland and Hyland, 2001). Little attempt was made on teachers' perceptions and actual feedback of them (Ellis, 2009). Researchers conducted in the UAE revealed some results regarding perceptions about feedback giving. For example, Hammoudi (2007) investigated high school students' perceptions about teachers' feedback on their writing.

Therefore, the present study would become comprehensive investigation that included English language teachers' practices to ensure that the most effective and efficient methods of written corrective feedback in EFL writing classes in the Ethiopian context. Consequently, this research intended to answer the following basic research questions:

1. What were the major types of feedbacks that EFL teachers provide to students on their writing tasks?
2. What types of errors the EFL Students prefer to be corrected in their essays?
3. What were EFL students' preferences for paper marking techniques?
4. How do the students utilize the feedback they receive?
5. Are there any variations between the teachers' practices and the students' preferences regarding to feedback on EFL writing?

1.3. Objectives of the Study

1.3.1. General Objective

The general objective of this study was to assess English Language Teachers' Practices for Feedback on EFL Writing Classes.

1.3.2. Specific Objectives

The following were the specific objectives of this study:

- To find out the major types of feedbacks that EFL teachers provide to students on their writing tasks.
- To point out the type of errors that the EFL Students prefer to get feedback for in their writing.
- To identify the EFL students' preferences for paper marking techniques.
- To reveal the way EFL students utilize the feedback they receive.
- To check if there are any variations between the teachers' practices and the students' preferences regarding to feedback for EFL writing.

1.4. Significance of the Study

This study attempted to investigate the practices of EFL teachers in giving feedback to their students' writing tasks and the students' preferences on the types of feedback given by their teachers. Quality provision of feedback to EFL students' writing helps the students to improve their writing. Thus, this study is believed to bring the following benefits:

1. It informs EFL teachers about the effect of their feedback giving system on their students' work and it enables them to use appropriate feedback giving mechanism according to the context.
2. It helps EFL students to get their written works corrected based on their preference and this, in turn, will help them to internalize the correction and uptake the things to be improved.
3. It also will help the Tigray Education Bureau and the Adigrat woreda education office to take a measure in training teachers to be effective feedback providers and fill their gaps.
4. Finally this research may serve as a starting point for other researchers who want to conduct research in the area of corrective feedback.

1.5. Delimitation of the Study

This study was delimited to the current practices of EFL teachers in providing feedback to their students' writing tasks and the students' preference towards the types of feedbacks in Adigrat town Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School.

Besides, including all the grade levels and sections (9-12) at Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School would have been better. However, this study was delimited to only grade 11 students of the school. Therefore, the research will focus only on assessing the English language teachers' practices of feedback on EFL writing in the year under discussion. Feedbacks on other skills were not the focus of this study. This study tried to compare the teachers' practices and the students' preferences of feedback on EFL writing.

1.6. Definition of Operational Terms

- **EFL writing:** in this research, EFL Writing is used to represent all the activities and tasks done during a writing lesson in English as foreign language classes.
- **EFL teachers:** the researcher, by EFL teachers, means that the teachers who have taken the necessary training in teaching English as foreign language and who are involved in teaching English to English as foreign language.
- **Corrective feedback:** corrective feedback is used to refer to the responses of EFL teachers to the writing tasks of their students with the aim of helping the students correct their mistakes and enabling them become better writers.
- **Teachers' practices:** in this study teachers' practices is used to refer to all the actions that teachers make to give feedback to students writing in EFL classes.
- **Students' preferences:** this, in this study, refers to the way the EFL students want their written work to be corrected and the way they want their teachers to react to their writing tasks
- **Types of Feedback:** in this research, types of feedback is used to refer to the different ways that EFL teachers approach their students' writing aiming at correcting the errors that appear in the writing.

Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature

2.1.Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review some relevant literature to the present study. It presents a review of related scholarly experience concerning the teachers' practices and students' preference for feedback on EFL written work. The main topics incorporated in this review of related literature section are, written error correction and feedback, students' preferences for corrective feedback, teacher stances and feedback practices, impact of teacher feedback on students' writing, role of teachers in providing effective feedback for EFL students, controversial issues on the effectiveness of feedback, types of corrective feedback, content vs. form and participants in the correction process.

2.2. Written Error Correction and Feedback

The importance of written corrective feedback emerged together with the introduction of learner-centered method of teaching (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). As Sara (2015) referring to Touchie (1986) reviewed in her research that language learning involves committing errors. Treatment of these errors has also been a great concern for years. Ferris (2002) believes that expecting error free writing from students is unrealistic and it is essential to correct the errors that students make in their writing.

With regard to students' capability of identifying their errors, Hendrickson (1978) argued that students are unable to discover their errors by themselves and they need an expert to help them identify their errors. Despite the importance of teacher support to discover errors, Zacharias (2007) asserted that teacher feedback was taken for granted by students due to the fact that they believe it is no surprise for them to see the teacher detecting errors as far as he is superior in linguistic competence. Truscott (1996) also indicated that students were unwilling to adopt corrections from their teachers and change their intuitions.

In spite of the suggested defects in students' uptake, many scholars consider errors as signs of learning and improvement and they strongly assert that correcting the errors is essential for developing learners' language abilities and helping them direct their learning (Zhu, 2010; Alavi & Kaivanpanah, 2007; Hyland, 2003). Since feedback reveals learners the degree of lack of

learning, it has a great influence on students' achievement by giving opportunities for students to discriminate between accepted and unaccepted forms of language (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004).

However, Chaudron (1988) warns that overcorrection of errors, especially at the early stage of learning is counterproductive. Explaining the importance of feedback for EFL teachers and students, Coffin et al. (2003) briefs that it helps teachers to improve their pedagogical approach based on the feedback they receive from their students and students can improve their writing skills from the feedback they receive from their teachers. Regarding to the transparency of error correction, Fernandez (1995) argues that students should be conscious of the error being corrected as it helps them analyze the cause of the errors.

2.3. Students' Preferences for Corrective Feedback

Students' have preferences about how their errors in their written works should be corrected. According to Hyland and Hyland (2006), students who have come from cultures where teachers are highly considered as directives expect, accept and value teacher correction. They expect the teacher to notice and correct the error and failing to do these will make students feel resentful. "Preferences may be affected by students' context, which scholars define as a frame which encloses feedback and offers resources for its proper interpretation.

The researches on EFL students' preferences to teacher feedback demonstrate that learners keep in mind and appreciate encouraging comments and expect constructive criticism instead of clichéd remarks (Ferris, 1995). When explaining the effect of feedback, Leki (1991) and Schachter (1991) assert that corrective feedback is not as discouraging for EFL learners as for the native speakers of the language. Ferris (2003) claims the mismatch between students' beliefs and teacher's practice in giving corrective feedback has negative effect. With regard to students' preferences for specific comments, research results show that students tend to prefer direct feedback (Chandler, 2003). A research conducted by Lim (1990) on the attitude, opinions and expectation of Singapore secondary school students to error and feedback reveals that students had positive attitude towards peer correction though they admitted that the primary actor in giving corrective feedback is the teacher. In addition, her findings show that students want their grammar errors to be corrected first followed by vocabulary, spelling, organization of ideas and punctuation errors respectively.

In addition, Leki (1991) consolidates Lim (1990)'s findings she confirmed through her findings shows that EFL students highly valued grammar as the most important aspect of language followed by spelling, vocabulary and punctuation. She also confirmed that none of the students wanted indirect feedback; rather they showed interest in direct feedback followed by metalinguistic clues to help them in correcting the error. Sheen (2011) concludes that "The learning context may determine how students respond to the corrective feedback they receive" (p 44). In addition, Storch and Wigglesworth (2010) confirmed that the effectiveness of corrective feedback depends on the type of errors made and the learners' level of proficiency.

Since correcting all the errors increases students' anxiety, both teachers and students should develop a reasonable approach to handle error correction problem appropriately in order to adapt to their preferences in their learning and teaching (Zhu, 2010).

2.4. Teacher Stances and Feedback Practices

In order for a corrective feedback to be effective, the type and way of feedback the EFL teachers provide should match to the students' needs and preferences. It has been long ago since it started to be recognized that teachers approach texts with a number of purposes in mind and that these may vary with context (Bates, Lane & Lange, 1993).

Several studies have shown that feedback is not simply disembodied reference to student texts but an interactive part of the whole context of learning, helping to create a productive interpersonal relationship between the teacher and students (Hyland, 1998; Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Hyland & Hyland, 2001). For instance, Hyland(1999, 2000a) and Hyland and Hyland(2006b) observed a close relationship between written and oral feedback and instruction, finding that the points made through explicit teaching were picked up and reinforced by written feedback and then recycled in both peer and student-teacher oral interactions. One way of establishing this link has been to encourage students to revise paper based on feedback and incorporate both final versions and drafts in a portfolio(song & August, 2002; Hamp-Lyons, 2006).

Another aspect of the teacher-learner relationship now beginning to receive attention is how teachers select appropriate language and style in their feedback to construct the kinds of relationships which can facilitate a student's writing development (Hyland & Hyland, 2001). Essentially, teachers have to weigh their choice of comments to accomplish informational,

pedagogic, and interpersonal goals simultaneously while taking account of student reactions because negative feedback may have a determinant effect on writer confidence while premature and gratuitous praise can confuse students and discourage revisions (Ferris, 1995). Teachers also seek to mitigate the full force of their criticism and suggestions, however, while mitigation may foster a cooperative pedagogical environment, its indirect approach also carries the very real danger that students may miss the point of the comment or misinterpret the feedback (Hyland, 2001).

2.5. Impact of Teacher Feedback on Students' Writing

Despite the positive attitude of EFL students towards teacher corrective feedback, its contribution to students' development is still disputable. Many studies suggest how students react to teacher corrective feedback. For example, Ferris (1995) and Conrad & Goldstein (1999) suggest that students may either misunderstand or ignore teacher commentaries. In addition, Hyland (1998) asserts that students may sometimes understand the comments but fail to bring appropriate pattern or language structure when revising it. Accordingly they prefer to delete the part to avoid the issue.

In addition, the controversy continues on whether student revisions to feedback improve their writing or not. Researches so far couldn't reach a conclusion on this issue since the feedback and revision take place within a complex of contextual factors which can influence the extent and success of the revision after feedback (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999; Goldstein, 2006). Nevertheless, 'research into feedback has largely been non-contextual and non-social, focused largely on texts and conducted within a linear model of teacher respond and student revise' (Goldstein, 2001).

It has also been mentioned that teacher factors such as attitudes towards particular students or the content of their texts, and student factors like reactions to teacher feedback and their investment in the course can have impact on feedback and revision (Goldstein, 2004). These factors have not been systematically incorporated into most feedback research designs, however, and little is known about potential impact on feedback and student revision.

Attempts have also been made by researchers to find out the most effective kinds of comments. Ferris & Hodgcock (2005) explain that marginal comments have more immediacy while text-specific comments are most likely to encourage students to revise their EFL writing. In addition,

end comments are helpful to provide summarized problems and help text development. Findings of Conrad & Goldstein (1999) from three case studies reveal that deciding to phrase comments as imperatives, declarative or questions has less effect than the type of problem detected in the EFL writing of the students to improve their revision. A finding supported by Ferris (2001) suggested that facts and details dealing comments were revised by 50% while argument and organization dealing comments were revised 10% times. A concern on teacher comment to organization has also been a concern for researchers. Accordingly, the researchers reflected their fear that too much comment on style can make students that they are losing their own style and following the teachers. Therefore, EFL teachers are expected to be cautious of it.

2.6. The Role of Teachers in Providing Effective Feedback for EFL Students

According to Barkaoui (2007) cited in Srichanyachon (2012), teachers need to motivate students, model effective revision strategies, raise students' awareness about the importance of (re)seeing their texts from the teacher's perspective, encourage students to reflect on and self-assess their own writing, and use appropriate tasks and activities for teaching and assessment. "As far as students are concerned, feedback can serve as guidance for eventual writing development" (Hyland, 2003). Based on this teachers are supposed to give chance for their students to self-assess their writings by providing indirect feedback on students' grammatical errors. Research finding by Chandler (2003) reveals that formal accuracy of student writing improved significantly if the participants were required to correct their errors if they were not.

Ellis (1994, cited in Tribble, 1996) claimed that marking mechanical errors is not enough since it can be frustrating to students. Therefore, corrective feedback should be combined with plenty of classroom discussions and peer cooperation. Ellis (1994), open questions result in more meaning negotiation and more complex results. Accordingly, Ellis suggested that teachers should focus on feedback that involves students' as help seekers. Findings of Rae and Cochrane (2008) on a study about the student perspective of written assessment feedback discovered that students required the assessment item and assessment criteria to be clearly stated and presented before they proceed to doing their assessment. They also required clear direction on how to use the corrective feedback they receive from their teachers. Therefore, teachers are expected to provide specific guidance to help EFL students improve their ability to revise their assessments based on the corrective feedback they receive.

2.7. Controversial Issues on the Effectiveness of Feedback

The debate on whether feedback should be given to students, the type of feedback that EFL teachers should give and who should give the corrective feedback has been evident for many years. Two scholars are of great figures in the two continuum of written corrective feedback. Truscott leads the opponents of written corrective feedback while the proponents of written corrective feedback are led by Ferris (2002). Both groups have tried their best to justify their stands. Proponents of written corrective feedback believe that it is considered to be the most essential instrument of an EFL teacher to respond to students' writing. Supporting this idea, Hyland (2003) defines feedback as the central part of the learning process in general and of writing in particular. Hence written corrective feedback provides important information to extend writing skills and develop understanding (Hyland, 2003). On the other hand, Truscott (2006) tries to justify the uselessness of written corrective feedback by saying that it is time consuming for teachers and useless for the students. Truscott said students develop avoidance behavior because of written corrective feedback. Truscott (2006) continues to justify this saying that students tend to write short passages to avoid committing many mistakes. Sheppard (1992)'s experimental research findings support Truscott's argument. According to Sheppard's findings, the group which received holistic correction notes performed better than those who received corrective feedback. In addition to this, Sheppard (1992) added, students of corrective feedback regressed over time. Moreover, Truscott & Hsu (2008)'s research findings reveal that corrective feedback is not only ineffective but also harmful and damaging.

Based on this, it is evident that EFL teacher's knowledge of their students' needs is a significant factor (Shine, 2008). Depending on the literature conducted on written corrective feedback, many researchers (Brown, 2007; Ferris, 2002; Lee, 2003; & Shine, 2008) indicated that there are several issues that teachers have to make decisions about while giving feedback to EFL students' writings. According to these researchers, EFL teachers have to decide if they: correct the errors or not, give the location of errors or not, and in case they decide to correct, will they correct directly or indirectly. In addition, Brown (2007) assured that EFL teachers consider written corrective feedback a need to help students learn.

2.8. Types of Corrective Feedback

As Al Mohammedi (2016) reviewed, there are different kinds of written corrective feedback forms that cause different levels of development in different writing areas. Ferris (2002) claims that errors occur because of lack of proficiency in the target language and EFL students cannot write like native speakers. Consequently, Ferris (2002) also adds, language learning takes longer time and students need corrective feedback to improve their writing.

It is important to discuss the different types of feedback and their respective situations under which they are chosen. Accordingly, Ellis (2009) suggests a clear classification of how teachers can correct linguistic errors in students' assignments. The types of feedback he explains are direct corrective feedback, indirect corrective feedback, metalinguistic corrective feedback, electronic corrective feedback and reformulation.

The choice of any type of feedback by teachers is expected to be justifiable based on its benefit under a particular situation. Studies such as (Bitchener & Knoch, 2008; Bitchener, 2002) recommend teachers to use direct feedback while Bitchener(2012) and Ferris(2004) recommend EFL teachers to use indirect feedback. Still other studies like (Bitchener, 2012 & Ellis et al, 2008) encourage teachers to use focused feedback and (Sheen, 2007 & Bitchener 2012) recommended unfocused feedback. The different types of feedback are discussed in detail below.

2.8.1. Direct Corrective Feedback

According to Ferris (2003), direct corrective feedback is the kind of feedback when the teacher indicates the error and provides the correct form. Ellis (2009) also describes direct corrective feedback as a feedback that is done by either crossing the wrong or unnecessary word out, inserting a missing word or writing the right form above or close to the wrong form. A consensus of opinions among (Nunan, 1995; Brown, 2000; Ur, 2006) also describes another way of providing direct corrective feedback-to formulate the awkward sentences, but keeping the original meaning that was intended by the writer.

Some merits and demerits as well as appropriate circumstances for using direct feedback have also been mentioned by different scholars. It is believed that direct corrective feedback is the best technique to apply if students are unable to self-correct their own errors. For example, Ferris & Roberts (2001) consolidate this idea by suggesting that direct corrective feedback is worth over

the indirect one with students of low proficiency level and unable to identify their errors. In addition, the benefit of direct feedback has been supported by findings some researches. For instance, Carroll and Swain (1993) confirmed through experimental research on 100 Spanish students divided into four groups that the group which received direct corrective feedback outperformed those who received indirect feedback, recast and no feedback. Similarly, Nassaji and Swain (2000) admitted that direct feedback is more effective than the indirect one. Despite the advantages, Elli (2009) claims that direct corrective feedback may not contribute to long-term learning as it requires minimal treatment by learners themselves. As per the researchers' experience, students get motivated if they are given support to identify their errors. It makes them happy for having corrected their own errors.

2.8.2. Indirect Corrective Feedback

While direct corrective feedback is termed as explicit feedback, indirect corrective feedback is termed as implicit feedback, which means that teachers indicate the error by underlining, circling or providing some correction codes or give the number of errors on the margin with the intension of self-correction (Ferris, 2003). Lalande (1982) indicated that indirect feedback can take two forms- either locating the error or just indicating the error without telling the learner its exact location.

Similar to direct feedback, scholars explain some benefits and limitations of indirect corrective feedback. For instance, Lalande (1982) asserted that indirect feedback provides learners with the competence of problem solving and guided learning which, in turn, fosters learners to ponder on their own errors. In addition, Hammerly (1991) argued indirect corrective feedback helps students experience the intellectual process of discovering the right forms and structures and using them correctly. Another benefit of indirect feedback is it saves teachers' time compared to direct feedback (Hammerly, 1991). A study conducted by Haswell (1983) reveals that students are able to correct sixty to seventy percent of their errors by themselves after unquestionable errors like punctuation, spelling, capitalization and grammar are underlined by the teachers. Similarly, Ferris et al (2000) revealed in their research finding that students were able to correct eighty percent of their errors that had been indicated by their teachers cited in Al Mohammadi (2016). This type of feedback is criticized by Ferris & Hedgcock (2005) that students with low FL proficiency levels may not have enough linguistic knowledge to correct their errors even if

they are pointed out. It is evident from the literature that students are less likely to correct their errors if the linguistic element they are learning is new and they cannot identify their own error.

2.8.3. Metalinguistic Corrective Feedback

According to Sara (2015), metalinguistic feedback is given by providing a hint about the error, like its nature or an explanation of the grammar. The first case-telling the learner the nature of the error-, as Sara (2015) explains, matches the goal of using a correction code, although it is not exactly the same. Error codes are abbreviations used to label the nature of the error, such as grammar, vocabulary or spelling, among others. Then, students have to elaborate their own correction. Similarly, metalinguistic information can be given in the form of explanations on the grammar related to the errors made. Sara (2015) reminds us that this type is less frequent as it requires more time than using correction codes.

2.8.4. Focused Corrective Feedback

Focused feedback is the form that refers to the correction of a limited number of errors that are thoroughly tackled in the classroom or chosen by the teacher to meet his students' needs (Ellis et al., 2006 cited in Al Mohammedi, 2016). Research evidences showed that focused feedback is helpful to improve students' writing skill. For instance, Cohen (1987) confirmed in his research with 117 EFL students that the students preferred focused grammatical feedback to overall comments. In addition, Lee (2003) conducted a study on teacher's beliefs and practices in providing corrective feedback and the findings revealed that EFL teachers preferred providing focused feedback despite they tend to correct many errors in practice.

Despite many findings to advocate focused feedback, Ferris (2010) rejected the idea of correcting one or two errors by saying that students commit many errors in their writings that need immediate treatment by the teacher. Ferris believes that it is beneficial for students' development to correct several errors at once. Sara (2015) also reviewed that focused feedback lacks tackling a great variety of errors.

2.8.5. Unfocused Corrective Feedback

According to Lee (2004) unfocused corrective feedback is a comprehensive feedback that attempts to respond to all errors committed by EFL students. Although it has an advantage, unfocused feedback may not be as powerful in the acquisition of specific features as focused

feedback in the short term (Ellis, 2009). Similarly, Ferris (2002) argued that unfocused feedback is time consuming and creates a burden on teachers on one hand and discourages students when they see their writing is covered with red on the other hand. In contrast to Ellis, findings by Lee (2004) confirmed that teachers and students preferred unfocused feedback. Most research findings support the benefit of focused feedback, and not unfocused feedback. For example, Ellis et al (2006) asserted that L2 students have limited capacity to cover a wide range of errors which may cause a cognitive overload.

2.8.6. Electronic Corrective Feedback

According to Sara (2015), this type of feedback consists of selecting the error and providing the learner and the teacher with useful and appropriate online links with examples of correct usage. Ellis (2009) provides some advantages of electronic feedback. Accordingly, it promotes students' independence as they are in charge to choose the corrections which they consider best apply in the text. However, this type of corrective feedback is difficult to apply in the researcher's context.

2.9. Content Vs. Form

With regard to whether EFL teachers should focus on content or form when providing feedback, there has been a continuous debate. Scholars fall into two stands. Teachers also have different preferences to give feedback to their students (Al Mohammedi, 2016). While some researcher's recommended corrective feedback on content rather than form (Ellis, 2005); others suggest teachers' feedback to focus on form rather than content (Long, 1991). Research conducted by Ellis (2005) reveals that written corrective feedback is an important instrument that strongly relates to form. On the other hand, Long (1991) attempted to falsify this by saying L2 instructions should mainly focus on meaning.

2.10. Participants in the Correction Process

The debate on the provision of feedback, three participants in correction process are discussed below.

2.10.1. Teacher Correction

According to Sengupta (1998), teachers have more expertise knowledge than students on FL and many students want their papers to be corrected by their teachers. Despite Truscott's (1999) argument for correction-free approach, most researchers consider teacher correction a central practice in EFL and ESL contexts. The researchers Hyland and Hyland (2006) & Zhang (1985) have also proved teacher's correction effective. According to Zhang's (1985) findings, teacher correction was more effective for improving grammar errors than peer and self-correction.

In addition, Hyland and Hyland (2006:83) describe feedback as "A key element of the scaffolding provided by the teacher to build learner confidence and the literacy resources to participate in target communities". To support effective written feedback, teachers should keep in mind that positive feedback is considered 'positive reinforcement' whereas negative feedback is considered 'punishment' (Bookhart, 2010: 11). Thus teachers should be polite and mitigate their written feedback.

2.10.2. Peer Correction

Mendoca & Johnson (1994) reveal that peer feedback is seen as a way of giving more control and autonomy to students since it involves them actively in the feedback process as opposed to a passive reliance on teacher's feedback to fix up their writing.

On the other hand, studies have questioned EFL students' ability to offer useful feedback to each other and queried the extent to which students are prepared to use their peers' comments in their revisions. For instance, Mendoca & Johnson's (1994) study found out that students were very selective about using peer comments in their revisions. Furthermore, Connor & Asenavage (1994) confirmed through their findings that peer feedback made only marginal difference to student writing, finding that only 5% of revisions could be directly linked to peer comments compared to 35% related to teacher comments.

Further researches have also been done on ways to improve peer correction. Suggestions for this indicated that careful preparation and training are essential for successful peer response Stanley (1992). Stanley (1992) also found that a group of university EFL students trained in peer evaluation offered more feedback and couched it more tactfully than an untrained control group and that student writers were more likely to use the feedback in their revisions. Researches also

show that training is also likely to benefit student reviewers themselves as they are then in a better position to view their own texts from a reader's perspective (Hyland, 2003; Ferris, 2004).

2.10.3. Self-Correction

Another alternative for providing feedback to students' writing is self-correction. Researches indicate that students can correct their own errors by themselves. Many researchers propose self-correction as the most effective strategy of feedback (Pishghadam et al., 2011; Ibarrola, 2009). Pishghadam et al. (2011) cited in Sara (2015) point out that once learners are capable of self-correcting, they already know the right form or at least they have it as an option in mind. Self-correction is defined by Wanchid (2013: 158) as "a strategy according to which students read, analyze, correct, and evaluate their own writing by using guided questions or checklists, both form-focused and meaning focused".

Some of the advantages to self-correction, according to Yang (2010), are the increased independence of students from the teacher, the students' retention of their own mistakes, their awareness of their own learning process (including strengths and weaknesses) and the time-saving factor. Moreover, this approach to feedback helps students concentrate better on their own errors and diminish dependence on the teacher, fostering thus students' autonomy and self-determination (Ancker, 2000). Apart from this independency from the teacher, Pishghadam et al. (2011: 958) include that learners are "given an opportunity to consider and activate their linguistic competence, so that they can be active participants".

Chapter Three: Research Methodology

3.1. Research Design

The research design used in this research was descriptive survey because it helps to describe the attitude, belief, cognition, preference, practice and awareness of a particular group towards some discipline or field of knowledge (Best and Kahn, 1999). In addition, Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2017) claimed that survey inquiry gathers data at a particular point with the intention of describing the entire nature of existing conditions in generalizability.

3.2. Research Method

A mixed method was employed to answer the research questions because this method is the quantitative and qualitative methods separately used under the analysis part (Creswell, 2012). Therefore, the quantitative method was used to analyze and interpret the close-ended questions of the students' questionnaire whereas the qualitative method was used to analyze and interpret data from the teachers' interview and document analysis qualitatively and quantitatively.

3.3. Data Sources

To answer the five research questions, both primary and secondary sources of data were used. The primary data was collected using questionnaire and interview from the sample students and teachers of Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School while the secondary data was collected using documentary analysis from sample essay work which was given for the sample students. Sample student writings which were marked by the EFL teachers in the school were analyzed and interpreted.

3.4. Sample size and Sampling Techniques

The target population of this study was English teachers and grade 11 students of Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School. In this study, in the sample, grade 11 students were taken randomly with the assumption that they can provide relevant data for the problem to be studied and to avoid discrimination. The researcher selected 3 sections using simple random sampling method. There were 180 students in the 3 grade 11 sections of Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School and to select 60 of the total population as sample subjects, the researcher used simple

random sampling method. This means the researcher applied lottery method to select the sample among the population. There were 4 English teachers in the school who teach grade 11 and all of them were taken comprehensively with the assumption that it was the best options among the teachers in the school who could give relevant data for the research. This was because their size was manageable and they were the ones who actually taught writing and gave feedback to the tasks done by students. Hence the total sample size of the study included 60 students and 4 English teachers in the school who teach grade 11.

3.5. Instruments of Data Collection

The data gathering tools used in this research was questionnaire, semi-structured interview and document analysis. The researcher assumed that employing multiple data collection instruments would help to combine the strength and to complement the inadequacies in any of the data gathering tools.

3.5.1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire was used as a major instrument to gather data from student respondents. The researcher adapted close-ended questions from Rula L. Diab (2005) and Sara orts (2015). The close-ended questions were prepared in order to reduce students' confusion while filling out the questionnaire. It is also believed that questionnaire is a popular means of collecting different types of data in research and it is an appropriate instrument to obtain information about conditions, practices and problems for relatively large sample studies (Best and Khan, 1996).

Furthermore, because questionnaire allows respondents to have enough time to read and give well thought out responses in written form without the intervention of the interviewer, it is suitable in the case of big enquires and it is economical in terms of time and energy (Kothari, 2004).

3.5.2. Interview

In addition to questionnaire, the required data was gathered through semi-structured interview with EFL teachers who have been teaching grade 11 students. This technique helps the researcher to get the teachers' practices in providing corrective feedback to students. As Burns (1999) cited in Cherie (2003) claimed, semi-structured interviews is important because it can help the researchers to get themes and topics which may not have been anticipated while

designing the interview. The interview questions were intended to achieve the desired objectives of the study; and the items were designed in line with the literature review.

3.5.3. Document Analysis

The researcher took what some EFL teachers sample marked corrected some students' writing assignments in order to cross check what the teachers claim to practice and what they have actually done with the students' work.

3.6. Data Collecting Procedure

In order to conduct the research in the particular comprehensive secondary school, the researcher first visited the school and asked the school principal for permission. Then the school principal arranged things for the researcher to meet the students and EFL teachers. Following this, agreement was made for a convenient schedule with teachers and students to fill questionnaire and sit for interview. After this, items of both questionnaire and interview were developed and pilot tested. Finally, the questionnaires were distributed among the student respondents and interview was made with the EFL teachers according to the predetermined schedule. Sample documents of EFL teachers' feedback for their students were also accessed following to the interview with the teachers.

3.7. Method of Data Analysis

The data that was gathered through questionnaire, interview and document analysis were analyzed in both quantitative and qualitative ways. The quantitative data which were collected through questionnaire were analyzed using frequency, percentage and mean scores so that appropriate descriptive statistics could be generated and reliability of the obtained numerical data would be ensured. The mean value interpretation for each item was: 4.5 and above= strongly agree; 3.5-4.49= agree; 2.5-3.49= neither agree nor disagree (neutral); 1.5-2.49= disagree; 1.4 and below= strongly disagree. On the other hand, data gather through semi-structured interview and document analysis was analyzed qualitatively in order to generate findings that transform row data from the teachers that were interviewed and obtained from document in to new knowledge in inductive way.

3.8. Pilot Study

To assure the validity of the instruments, much effort was made to develop the instruments by incorporating all the comments of the Advisor, TEFL graduate teachers of the school. The reliability of the students' questionnaire was checked through Pilot study. Questionnaire was distributed to 9 grade 11 students who didn't select as sample for the study.

The data that was gathered through questionnaire, observation, interview, and document analysis were analyzed in both quantitative and qualitative ways. The quantitative data which were collected through questionnaire were analyzed using frequency and percentage. On the other hand, data gathered through semi-structured interview, observation and document analysis were analyzed qualitatively.

Chapter Four: Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion

As it was already explained in chapter three, data was collected through questionnaire, interview and document analysis. In this chapter, the collected data was analyzed. So, in order to conduct the research successfully, the results of the questionnaire that was filled by the students was analyzed and triangulated with the data got through interview with English teachers and the document analysis. This chapter is therefore all about findings and discussions.

4.1. Data Analysis

In this part, the closed ended items of the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively, and the interview and document review was analyzed qualitatively.

4.1.1. Presentation and Analysis of the Student Questionnaire

This part of the data analysis presents only the quantitative data gathered through questionnaire and its analysis using the SPSS Version 20.

4.1.1.1. Focused or Unfocused feedback

Table 1 Students' preferences between focused and unfocused feedback

I want my teacher to correct all the errors in my paper at once	N 21	% 35
I want my teacher to correct one type of error at a time	N 39	% 65

Table 1 provided data about EFL students' Preferences for focused or unfocused feedback. They were asked whether they prefer focused or unfocused feedback and more than half of the students 39 (65%) confirmed that they prefer the corrective feedback to be focused. That means they wanted their teachers to focus on one type of error at a time and another type at another time. However, 21(35%) preferred unfocused feedback. Therefore, it can be concluded that the students preferred focused feedback to their writing errors.

4.1.1.2. What students want their teachers to do when Returning their paper and what teachers do

Table 2 Students' preferences for features of language to be corrected

No.	Item	5		4		3		2		1		Mean
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1.	point out errors in grammar (verb tense, subject/verb agreement, article use..etc	30	50	15	25	6	10	5	8.3	4	6.7	4.04
2.	point out errors in spelling	30	50	11	18.3	9	16	4	6.7	6	10	3.91
3.	point out errors in punctuation	20	3.3	27	45	4	6.7	3	5	6	10	3.87
4.	make comments on the organization of the paper	5	8.3	3	5	25	41.7	11	18.3	16	26.7	2.5
5.	make comments on the writing style	2	3.3	1	1.7	20	33.3	26	43.3	11	18.3	2.28
	Grand mean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.32

Key: 5= strongly agree; 4= agree; 3= nether agree nor disagree; 2= disagree; 1= strongly disagree

As it shown in the above (Table 2), presents data about students' preferences towards aspects of language to be corrected. The student respondents were asked to indicate their preferences about the features of language they want to be corrected. Accordingly, the first item of Table 2 reveals that more than half of the respondents (50%) strongly agreed with the idea that their EFL teacher points out errors in grammar. However, 15(25%), 6(10%), 5(8.3%) and 4(6.7%) of the respondents agreed remained indifferent, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value for this item is 4.04 which indicate that the response of the student respondents lies on the "agree" column. This means that students want their teacher to point out errors in grammar.

Similarly, the second item of the Table 2 shows that while the majority of the respondents (50%) strongly agreed with the practice of providing feedback on spelling, 18.3%, 16%, 6.7% and 10% of the respondents agreed, abstained, disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value for this item is 3.91, similar to the first item, and it indicates the students prefer spelling correction with an aggregate result that indicates agreement. The mean value for this item shows a positive preference of learners towards correcting spelling errors.

Furthermore, as it can be seen from Table 2, presents data about correcting punctuation errors in its fourth item. The responses revealed that from the total respondents 20(3.3%) strongly agreed that they prefer correction on punctuation of their writing. Meanwhile, the majority of the respondents (45%) agreed with the idea of correcting punctuation errors. On the other hand, the remaining 6.7%, 5% and 10% of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value of the item (3.87) shows that the students' response is positive with regard to correction on punctuation errors.

Likewise, the student respondents were asked to indicate their preference towards corrective feedback on organization of paper in item five of Table 2. Accordingly, a few of them (8.3%) strongly agreed that they wanted feedback on organizational aspect of their writing. another small number (5%) of the respondents also agreed with the item. The fifth item of Table 2 also shows that a significant number of the respondents (41.7%) neither agreed nor disagreed with the idea of correction on organization of a paper. On the other hand the remaining 18.3% and 26.7% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the feedback given by EFL teachers on organization of their writing. The mean value for this item is 2.5, which indicates that the students remained indifferent for feedback on organization.

Moreover, the sixth item of Table 2 presents data about feedback on style(the way students express their ideas) and the result reveals that only 2(3.3%) and 1(1.7%) of the student respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they prefer their teachers to give them corrective feedback on their writing style. On the other hand, a great deal of the respondents (33.3%) neither agreed nor agreed with the idea of correcting the style of their writing. more than half of the respondents 26(43.3%) and 11(18.3%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value for this item (2.28) indicates that the student respondents' response towards correction on writing style is negative as the response rate falls on the "disagree" column.

Overall, Table 2 as a whole reveals that students showed a positive preference for correction on grammar errors, punctuation errors, spelling errors and correction on every aspect of their writing. On the other hand, they showed negative preference to correction on the style and organization. The grand mean for the table is calculated 3.32 and it shows that the student respondents tended to neither agree nor disagree regarding to correction for the different items of language.

4.1.1.3. Participants in The Provision of Feedback

Table 3 Students' preferences for the frequency of participants in feedback provision and ways of feedback provision

Item	5		4		3		2		1		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Teacher correction(teacher corrects all errors)	7	11.7	9	15	20	33.3	14	23.3	10	16.7	1.24
Teacher correction with comments	25	41.7	10	16.7	20	33.3	2	3.3	3	5	3.87
Error identification (the teacher indicates the place where the error occurs by underlying or circling it	27	45	24	40	4	6.7	2	3.3	3	5	4.17
Peer correction (Students evaluate each other's work in pairs or with a whole class)	12	20	10	16.7	3	5	15	25	20	33.3	2.65
Self-correction (Students evaluate their own work)	2	3.3	7	11.7	12	20	17	28.3	22	36.7	2.17
Grand mean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.82

(5) Usually (4) often (3) sometimes (2) occasionally (1) Never.

Table 3 presents data about how frequently the students want the given participants take part in the provision of feedback to their writing. Accordingly, the first item of the table displays students wanted their teacher to correct all their errors “sometimes” with the mean value of 1.24. The detailed response for the first item of Table 3 shows 7(11.7%) and 9(15%) of the

respondents claimed that they usually and often prefer teacher correction for all errors that exist in their writing respectively. while another 20(3.3) of the respondents confirmed that they sometimes prefer it. The remaining 24(23.3%) and 10(16.7%) of the respondents confirmed they rarely and never prefer teacher correction for all errors that exist in their writing respectively. The mean value (1.24) refers that the student respondents admitted they prefer teacher correction for all errors of their writing to happen sometimes.

The second item of Table 3 is about students' preference for teacher correction with comments. To this, 25 (41.7%) of the respondents wanted it to happen usually and 10 (16.7%) wanted it to be given to them often. Another 20 (33.3%) opted sometimes and 3.3% and 5 % of them preferred occasionally and never respectively. The mean value for this item (3.87) reveals students wanted teacher correction with comments "often". This show the students have positive response towards teacher correction with comments. Therefore, the students' response towards teacher commentary without correction tended to be negative. This means the students do not want their teacher to give them comments without correction.

Another item (the fourth item) of the table presents data about error identification without error correction. The student respondents were asked to express how often they want their teacher to identify errors by either underlining or circling it and not exactly tell them what the error is or what the correct form should be. To this, the majority, 27(45%) and 24(40%), confirmed that they want it usually and often respectively. A small number of respondents (6.7%, 3.3% and 5%) wanted it to happen sometimes, occasionally and never respectively. The mean value for this item is 3.89 which indicate that the students wanted error identification without comments often. Therefore, students' response for error identification without correction tended to be positive.

The fifth item of Table 3 is about peer correction. It asks students to rate how often they want peer correction. Accordingly, 12(20%) and 10(16.7%) of them confirmed that they usually and often want it respectively. While 3(5%) of the respondents confirmed that they wanted it to occasionally happen sometimes, the remaining 25% and 33.3% of the respondents preferred it to happen occasionally and never respectively. The 2.65 mean value means that students occasionally prefer peer-correction for their writings. Furthermore, the sixth item of the table presents data about how often students want self-correction to their writing tasks and the results show that only 2(3.3%) and 7(11.7%) of the respondents preferred it usually and often respectively. However, the majority of the respondents (20%, 28.3% and 36.7%) of the

respondents wanted self-correction to be practiced sometimes, occasionally and never respectively. The mean value (2.17%) would mean grade 11 students of Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School do not appreciate self-correction and they want it to happen occasionally. This means that the students' response tended to be negative towards self-correction to their errors in their writing.

To sum up, the grand mean value for the above table, Table 3 is 2.82 and it shows that students' response towards the participants in correcting their written errors and the way the correction is made tended to be average. With regard to the responses, the student respondents rated teacher correction with comments, error identification by the teacher and teacher-student conferencing positively because the mean values for these items are greater than three. Commentary feedback, peer correction and self- correction were rated low by the student respondents.

4.1.1.4. Ways of Indicating Errors in Students' Essays

Table 4. Students' preference and teachers' practices on how to indicate errors in their Essays

Item	Students' preferences		Teachers' practices	
	N	%	N	%
By crossing out what is incorrect and writing the correct word or structure	12	20	48	80
By showing where the error is and giving a clue about how to correct it	32	53.3	28	46.7
By ignoring the errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation...etc. and only paying attention to the ideas expressed	40	66.7	20	33.3

Table 4 above present data about students' preferences for the different ways of providing feedback and their witness about how their teachers provide them feedback. The questions asked were, "How do you want your English teacher to provide you feedback on your writing?" and "How does your English teacher provide you feedback on your writing?" Hence, the students' responses for their preferences and the actual practice of the teachers in providing feedback are presented side by side. Accordingly, while only 12(20%) of the student respondents preferred corrective feedback by crossing out the errors and writing the correct form directly, 48(80%) of

them witnessed that their English teachers provide them feedback by crossing out what is incorrect and writing the correct word or structure. On the other hand, the second alternative of the table reveals that 32(53.3%) of the students preferred feedback by showing where the error is and giving a clue about how to correct it and 46.7% of them revealed that their teachers provide them feedback by doing so.

The last item in Table 4 asks students whether they want corrective feedback that ignores errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation etc. and focuses on the ideas expressed only and whether their EFL teachers do so when providing feedback to their writing. To this alternative, 40(66.7%) of the respondents confirmed that they prefer it and only 20(33.3%) of them witnessed that their EFL teachers use this kind of strategy while providing feedback to their writing.

In general, the above table reveals data about the students' preferences for different ways of receiving corrective feedback and their witness about how their teachers provide them feedback. According to the students' responses, the students highly wanted their EFL teachers to indicate them where the error is and give them cues while they witnessed that their teachers tended to give feedback by crossing out the error and providing the correct form.

4.1.1.5. Kinds of Errors to be Corrected

Table 5. Students' preferences for kinds of errors to be corrected

Item	5		4		3		2		1		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Correct all errors, major and minor	5	8.3	8	13.3	11	18.3	16	26.7	20	3.3	2.37
Correct all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor one	22	36.7	17	28.3	13	21.7	5	8.3	3	5	3.84
Correct only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are	15	25	11	18.3	7	11.7	15	25	12	20	3.04
Correct all repeated errors whether major or minor	24	40	19	31.7	7	11.7	6	10	4	6.7	3.89
Grand mean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.29

Key: (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree.

Another part of the student questioner has elicited responses on the kinds of errors of to be corrected in EFL students' writing. Accordingly Table 5 above presents about it. The students were asked the question, "If there are many errors in your essay, what do you want your English teacher to do with them?" Then the students' rated each kind of error correction based on their preferences. Based on this, the first item of Table 6 shows that 5(8.3%) and 8(13.3%) of the student respondents claimed the strongly agree and agree with their English teacher to correct all errors, major and minor. In addition, 11(18.3%) of them opted neither agree nor disagree with the item. Different from these, the remaining 16(26.7%) and 20(33.3%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the item that claims teacher correction for all major and minor errors that occurred on students' writing. The mean value for this item was calculated to be 2.37 and it shows that students tendency towards teacher correction for all major and minor errors is negative.

In addition, the 2nd item in Table 5 deals with correcting errors the teacher thinks major, but not the minor ones. The students' response for this item reveals that they have positive tendency towards the item with a mean value of 3.84. In other words, most of the respondents, 22(36.7%) and 17(28.3%), strongly agreed and agreed respectively that they prefer teacher correction of major errors, not minor ones. 13(21.7%) of the student respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the item. Contrary to this, only 5(8.3%) and 3(5%) of the respondents disagreed and strongly disagreed with the fact that the teacher corrects all the major errors. The conclusion for this item is that students have positive preference for teacher correction of all errors that he thinks are major by ignoring the minor ones.

Moreover, the third item of Table 5 presents data about the students' preferences for teacher correction of a few of the major errors no matter how many there are. Accordingly, 15(25%) and 11(18.3%) of the student respondents strongly agreed, agreed respectively. On the other hand, 7(11.7%) of the respondents claimed that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the item. The item in the table also reveals that the majority of the respondents, 15(25%) and 12(20%) of the respondents disagreed and agreed with the item respectively. The mean value for this item is 3.04 and it shows that the student respondents' response about correcting a few of the major errors regardless of their frequency tended to be negative.

Furthermore, the fourth item of Table 5 presents students' response for the kind of teacher correction by focusing on the repeated errors whether they are minor or major. Then the response by the students show that a great deal, 24(40%) and 19(31.7%), of them strongly agreed and agreed with the item. While 7(11.7%) of the respondents neither agreed nor disagreed, the remaining 6(10%) and 4(6.7%) of them disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively. The mean value (3.87) shows that students have an average tendency towards correcting the repeated errors regardless of being major or minor.

To conclude, the mean score for the whole table was calculated 3.29 which means the students showed an average tendency towards the different types of error correction. The overall student respondents' response shows that the students preferred correction for errors that the teacher considers major, all repeated errors whether major or minor and errors that interfere with communicating ideas. On the other hand, the least favored ways of correcting errors by the students were correcting all errors major or minor with a mean value of 2.37.

4.1.1.6. What Students Do When They Receive Their Essays Back

Table 6.How Frequently Students Exercise Some Strategies When They Receive Their Papers Back

Item	4		3		2		1		Mean
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Asking for teacher explanation	25	41.7	19	31.7	10	16.7	6	10	3.05
Referring back to previous compositions	6	10	4	6.7	26	43.3	24	40	1.87
Consult a dictionary/grammar book	15	25	30	5	5	8.3	10	16.7	2.84
Rewriting by only incorporating teacher's comments	25	41.7	20	33.3	10	16.7	5	8.3	3.05
Grand mean	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.71

Key: (4) frequently (3) sometimes (2) rarely (1) never

Mean value interpretation: 3.5 and above= frequently; 2.5-3.49= sometimes; 1.5-2.49= rarely; 1.4 and below= never

Finally, Table 6 presents how often students utilize the given strategies to revise their papers when they get them back.

In addition, Table 6 reveals that 25(41.7%) and 19(31.7%) of the total 60 student respondents as assert that they frequently and sometimes ask for teacher explanation respectively. The remaining 10(16.7%) and 6(10%) of them responded to item 3 of Table 6 that they rarely and never ask for teacher explanation. The mean value (3.05) indicates that the students sometimes consult for teacher explanation. This shows that asking for teacher explanation is among the strategies that student use when receiving their papers back. On the other hand, very small number of the respondents (10% and 6.7%) confirmed they refer back to previous compositions to check and modify the comments given in their composition. Meanwhile, a great deal of the respondents (43.3% and 40%) of the respondents indicated that they rarely and never refer back to previous comments. The mean value for item 3 of Table 6 is 1.87 and it reveals that the students are not accustomed to referring to previous compositions to improve their current writings once they received their papers from their teachers.

The fifth item of Table 6 also displays that more than two third of the respondents (25% and 5%) claimed the frequently and sometimes consult a dictionary and grammar books after they receive their papers back from their EFL teachers. The remaining 5(8.3%) and 10(16.7%) of them admitted that they rarely and never consult dictionary and grammar books respectively. The students' response also showed that they sometimes consult a dictionary to revise their essays following a comment with 2.84 mean values.

The final item of the table 6 deals with the practice of students in rewriting their essays by only incorporating the teachers' comments. The students response for this shows 25(41.7%) and 20(33.3%) of the respondents confirmed that they frequently and sometimes do that respectively. The remaining 16.7% and 8.3% of the respondents rarely and never do it. The mean value 3.09 indicates a positive practice of students in revising their essays by only incorporating the teachers' comments.

In general, the data that the table provides reveals that the students' response regarding what they do when they receive their papers showed a positive inclination with a mean value of 2.71. The detailed presentation of the data by Table 6 reveals asking for teachers' explanation, consulting a dictionary, identifying points to be explained and rewriting the essay by only incorporating the teachers' corrections were given the highest preference by the students. Meanwhile, referring

back to previous compositions and writing points by type earned the least preference by the students.

4.1.2. Presentation and Analysis of Data from Teachers' Interview

Following to the data collected through questionnaire from students, the researcher conducted interview with the EFL teachers in Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School. This section presents the data obtained through interview and analysis has been done side-by-side to the presentation.

Q1. When you give feedback to your students, do you correct all the students' writing errors on the paper at once or you focus on specific errors? Why?

Teacher 1: "Yes, I frequently correct my students' errors because escaping some errors and correcting the others is that the students consider the other part as correct one. This leads to repeat the errors in their later writings."

Teacher 2: "Usually, I do not focus on a specific error. I correct to all errors I find due to leave any part of the students' error is an error itself."

Teacher 3: "I simply correct one group of errors like grammar at a time and ignore the others although I know because this helps students to control a particular aspect of language at a time and the others at other time. "

Teacher 4: "I give correction for every error I find."

Results from the interview indicated that most of the EFL teachers interested in providing unfocused feedback to their students. Only 1(25%) of the respondents stated that she provided focused feedback to her students. Therefore it is possible to conclude that the EFL teachers in the particular school are tending towards providing unfocused feedback to their students' writing.

Q2. Which aspect of the students' writing do you usually focus when providing corrective feedback to your students? Grammar, punctuation, spelling, organization, style or ideas only? Why?

Teacher 1: "I frequently give corrective feedback to all aspects of students' writing errors because I strongly support that all of these items are essential in making students better writers."

Teacher 2: “Most of the time, I provide feedback on organization and the ideas expressed because I want my students to be fluent, not accurate.”

Teacher 3: “I usually provide corrective feedback on grammar and mechanics only because my intention is students to develop their own ideas and style.”

Teacher 4: “As an EFL teacher I strongly believe that I am responsible for providing corrective feedback on the form and content.”

According to the teachers’ response to the second question in the interview can be concluded that only 1(25%) of the interviewees confirmed that they provide feedback on grammar and mechanics part only, the other threes (75%) admitted that they provide corrective feedback to all aspects of their students writing. This shows that the teacher respondents gave equal value to form and content when giving corrective feedback to their students’ writing.

Q3. Do you grant your students some autonomy by making them figure out their writing errors by underling or circling their errors? Or do you provide them with a correction codes list to work on their own? Do you think indirect feedback will benefit to better their writing skills?

With regard to how teachers provide feedback, the interview conducted with the teachers revealed that, most of the teachers (75%) stated that they provided feedback directly and crossing out the erroneous one because some of the students Only one teacher (25%) from the interviewees confirmed that he always tries to provide correction codes to the students’ so that they can revise it by themselves. Therefore, their response tended to be direct although there is indirect ways of providing corrective feedback by one teacher.

Q4. In the process of providing corrective feedback to your students’ writing, do you provide the feedback by yourself? Or do you let the students’ correct their own errors by themselves? Do you encourage students’ to read their peer’s writings and provide corrective feedback? Why?

Teacher 1: “Yes, I encourage my students, but they do not want to look for their own errors by themselves and by their friends to correct their errors in their writing. So, I correct their errors by myself.”

Teacher 2: “I always correct my students’ errors by myself because the students don’t want correct their own errors by themselves. If they can correct their errors by themselves, why could they make the errors in the beginning?”

Teacher 3: “I aware the students to correct their own errors by themselves by providing hints such as what kind of error it is, underlining it or circling it. I don’t encourage peer correction because it is destructive. The students end up mocking each other. I also provide corrective feedback directly by myself. ”

Teacher 4: “I try to encourage my students but they are not voluntary. So, I use teacher correction most often in my writing class”

To summarize, the result of the teachers’ interview showed that all of the teachers confirmed that they usually give corrective feedback by themselves. They valued teacher correction highly because most of the time the students are reluctant to receive corrective feedback from their peers. Therefore, the EFL teachers in the school highly use teacher correction.

Q5. What kind of errors do you prefer to correct when you see your students’ writings? Do you correct all major and minor errors, the major ones only, the repeated ones or those that interfere with communicating ideas?

When teachers respond to the above question during the interview, almost all of the teachers confirmed that they usually correct errors that are major and repeated in the students’ texts. They also focused that errors that affect the message were intolerable for them. The respondents also claimed that minor errors should be left for the students. From this, it can be concluded that the EFL teachers of the school correct major, repeated and meaning affecting errors when they read their students’ writings.

Q6. When you provide corrective feedback to your students’ writing, do you simply provide the correct form? Or do you provide comments? Or the combination of the two?

Responding to what teachers were asked whether they simply provide the correction or provide comments, most of the teachers pointed out that they simply provide the feedback and nothing else because it is difficult to do both as it is time consuming, but one teacher said, “I admit that I provide the correct form and give comments to my students.” In general, the interviewees’

response to the above item revealed that the EFL teachers of the school usually provided direct feedback without comments, but they sometimes provided comments to their students' writings.

4.1.3. Presentation and Analysis of Data from Documents

In addition to the data collected through questionnaire and interview, the students' writings were also taken to make the data more valid and reliable. Hence, looking at the actual students' papers that were corrected by the EFL teachers was found crucial. Therefore samples of 16 papers were taken from the sample students and they were analyzed as follows. Two papers marked by each teacher were taken. This was done to make the analysis valid as they were going to be used for triangulating purpose.

More than half of the papers (56.25%) were found to be corrected using direct way of providing corrective feedback. Similarly, the focus of the correction on the papers was on form rather than ideas. The teachers simply crossed out the incorrect pattern and they provided their own correct form. For spelling errors, the teacher simply added some letters by splitting the words or deleting and replacing. None of the teachers who corrected the papers provided any feedback on the organization and on the ideas. They did not give any comment either.

In general, the secondary data about feedback provision indicated that the EFL teachers in the school provided feedback mostly focusing on form rather than ideas and organization. They also tended to provide direct and unfocussed feedback as the documents revealed.

4.2. Discussion

Discussions have been made from the findings of the study and literature review considering the research questions and objectives of the study.

Regarding the major types of feedback EFL teachers provide to students' writing tasks, the findings of the data gathered using questionnaire for the students' indicated that the EFL teachers in the school give direct and unfocussed feedback. Similarly, all the interviewed teachers admitted that they usually prefer to give direct feedback to their students. The document analysis also revealed that most of the papers were corrected using direct way of feedback provision. Nassaji and Swain (2000) also suggested that direct feedback is more effective than the indirect one. However, Ferris et al (2000) revealed in their research finding that students were able to correct eighty percent of their errors that had been indicated by their teachers.

In general, as it was explained by Al Mohammedi (2016), the choice of any type of feedback by teachers is expected to be justifiable based on its benefit under a particular situation. Therefore, it seems to be important to compare this finding with the students' preferences and reach a conclusion. Analysis of the students' preferences follows.

The findings of the study further revealed that when students were asked the types of errors EFL students prefer to get feedback for in their writing, almost all of the students wanted grammar errors, punctuation errors and spelling errors to be corrected. Only, a few of the student respondents preferred organization, and make comments on the writing style. It seems evident that the students were highly interested in correction of grammar errors, punctuation errors and spelling errors to be corrected.

Supporting this idea, Leki (1991) confirmed that EFL students highly valued grammar as the most important aspect of language followed by spelling, and punctuation. However, the result stood against Semke (1980)'s claim which pointed out that feedback on content was more useful than that of on form.

As the result indicated in the students' response for whether they wanted direct teacher correction, peer correction, self-correction, preferred different clues by their teacher to help them self-correct their errors, or not, the findings revealed that EFL students highly preferred feedback by indicating where the error was and giving clue about what type of error it was. About 53.3% of them confirmed this. The least preferred way of providing feedback by the students was indicating the error and not doing anything.

In addition, the students' questionnaire revealed that students prefer teacher-correction for their error correction, but they showed negative preference towards peer and self-correction. The students also preferred teacher correction with comments. Similarly, all of the teachers confirmed that students do not want self and peer correction. To sum up, although most of the EFL teachers in the school believed and practiced teacher, peer and self-correction, the students showed a negative preference towards them.

Regarding this, (Hyland and Hyland, 2006; Zhang, 1985) which proved teacher's correction is effective. In addition, Zhang's (1985) findings revealed that teacher correction was more effective for improving grammar errors than peer and self-correction. On the other hand the negative preference of students towards peer and self-correction mismatches with the positive

contribution of these two feedbacks indicated by Yang (2010) that suggested self-correction increased independence of students from the teacher. He also considers the students' retention of their own mistakes, their awareness of their own learning process (including strengths and weaknesses) and the time-saving factor as other advantages. Pishghadam et al. (2011: 958) findings about the advantages of self-correction also included that learners are "given an opportunity to consider and activate their linguistic competence, so that they can be active participants". We can, therefore, conclude that students prefer teacher correction and they showed no preference to self and peer correction.

With regard to how students' utilize the feedback they receive the different mechanisms that the EFL students used to utilize the comments they receive, the questionnaire data from students came up with a finding that students gave equal frequency to "Asking for teacher explanation" and "Rewriting by only incorporating comments from the teacher" with a mean value 3.05 for each. The second most frequent mechanism of utilizing feedback preferred by the students was "asking for teacher explanation". Consulting a dictionary or other grammar books also got average preference by the students with the mean value of 2.84. The least frequent ways of utilizing feedback indicated by the students was referring back to previous compositions. This means the most frequent mechanisms students use to utilize the comments and corrections for their writings were: "rewriting by only incorporating comments from the teacher" and "asking for teacher explanation".

A variation was discovered between teachers' practices and students' preferences. On the data gathered from students' through questionnaire and the data from teachers' interview followed by document analysis, the results of the data gathering tools indicated that students preferred teacher correction with comments and showed negative preference towards self-correction and peer correction. On the other hand, most of the teachers claimed that they give corrective feedback without comments and they encourage self-correction the interview results also indicated that the EFL teachers confirmed their students do not want self-correction and peer correction.

In addition, the data obtained through questionnaire, interview and document analysis showed that students prefer focused and indirect feedback; however, teachers provide direct and unfocused feedback. The students showed interest to corrective feedback by identifying the errors and giving clues about the type of the error.

On the other hand the findings revealed similarities between teachers' practices and students' preferences for corrective feedback on writing. The EFL teachers admitted that they provide corrective feedback for major, repeated and meaning affecting errors on their students' writings. Similarly the students confirmed they prefer these errors to be corrected.

The students' preferences for corrective feedback on grammar, spelling and punctuation matches with the findings by Leki (1991) and Lim (1990) which confirmed that EFL students highly valued grammar as the most important aspect of language followed by spelling, vocabulary and punctuation. However, students' preference to indirect feedback mismatches with the results from Chandler (2003) which confirmed that students tended to prefer direct feedback. In addition, the findings of this research revealed students' negative preference to peer correction; nevertheless, Lim (1990) claimed that students showed positive preference towards peer correction. These two results mismatch with each other.

On the other hand, results of document analysis proved the student questionnaire's result true. While the students witnessed that they preferred feedback on grammar, spelling and punctuation; the EFL teachers claimed that they mostly prefer providing feedback on grammar, mechanics organization and ideas and they usually practice doing though students do not like organization and ideas' correction. However, the actual way of providing feedback to students' errors that was observed through document analysis shows that most of the teachers focused on correcting grammar, spelling and punctuation. Ferris (2003) claims the mismatch between students' beliefs and teacher's practice in giving corrective feedback has negative effect. Schulz (1996) also claims that teachers can adapt their way of providing corrective feedback to the students' preferences by learning about the students' attitudes and preferences for corrective feedback. Therefore, it could be true that the EFL teachers had adapted their way of providing feedback in a way that matches students' preference.

Chapter Five: Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1. Summary

The main purpose of this study was to describe teachers' practices of feedback for EFL writing at Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School of grade 11 classes in Adigrat town. The study tried to answer the five basic research questions. such as the major types of feedbacks that EFL teachers provide to students on their writing tasks, the errors do the EFL Students prefer corrective feedback for in their essays, the EFL students' preferences for paper marking techniques, the students utilize the feedback they receive and the variations between the teachers' practices and the students' preferences regarding to feedback on EFL writing.

In this study, 60 participants were chosen from grade 11 students using simple random sampling technique and all the four EFL teachers were also taken assuming the comprehensive sampling technique. To collect the data, both primary and secondary sources of data were used. In order to answer the five basic research questions, three types of data gathering tools were employed such as questionnaire, interview and document analysis. The questionnaire contains close-ended questions was adapting from Rula L. Diab (2005) and Sara orts (2015). Then the questionnaire which was prepared for the students was given to EFL teachers to guarantee for their validity. The questionnaire critically evaluated in terms of language clarity, logical flow of ideas and its comprehensiveness to measure the desired objectives. Based on the feedback given modifications were made towards grammatical errors of certain questions before their administration. After that the questionnaire was translated in to the students' mother tongue (Tigrigna) because all the students are Tigrigna speakers and some of them may not understand English. This helped the respondents to avoid language barriers and ambiguity of ideas. Then it was pilot tested and modified for the purpose of increase reliability before it was administrated to the student respondents. In addition, semi-structured interview was employed to gather data from the four EFL teachers of Agazi Comprehensive Secondary School. The teachers were interviewed about their experience on the major types of feedbacks that EFL teachers provide to students on their writing tasks, the type of errors that the EFL Students prefer to get feedback in their writing, the EFL students' preferences for paper marking techniques, the way EFL students utilize the feedback they receive and the variations between the teachers' practices and the students' preferences regarding to feedback for EFL writing.

Furthermore, document analysis was used as a third data gathering tool and it was employed to gather data from secondary sources. Sample papers that had been given corrective feedback for were taken and the way the EFL teachers provided the corrective feedback was analyzed.

The data collected through questionnaire were tabulated along with frequency, percentage and mean value descriptions using SPSS version 20. In addition, data gathered through interview and document analysis were presented under two headings; analysis of interview data and analysis of data from documents. Finally, the findings obtained from the data gathering tools were explained and discussed under discussion session. The findings also revealed that there are similarities and mismatches between teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on EFL writing. The similarities indicated that EFL students and teachers usually prefer and practice corrective feedback for errors that are frequent, meaning affecting, and major ones. In addition, both the teachers and students showed positive practice and preference for corrective feedback on grammar and mechanics. While teachers provide direct and unfocused feedback, the students' preferred indirect and focused feedback. Another variation was that students preferred corrective feedback for grammar and mechanics; however, teachers gave equal attention to both form and content.

5.2. Conclusions

From what has been analyzed and discussed the following conclusions were drawn.

- The common ways that the teachers used were direct and focused teachers feedback although there are many ways of providing feedback to students' writing that most EFL teachers use very limited number. This shows that EFL teachers in school may not either have sufficient knowledge about the different types of corrective feedback or they are not committed enough to practice as many of them as possible.
- While students prefer feedback on grammar, punctuation and spelling, EFL teachers gave equal value to grammar, punctuation, spelling and organization when they gave feedback for EFL students' writing.
- Students preferred indirect and focused feedback to their writing; however, the EFL teachers tended to practice direct and unfocused feedback. This shows variation between teachers' practices and students' preferences for corrective feedback on EFL writing. On the other hand, students' preference for corrective feedback on major, repeated and

meaning interfering errors matched with teachers' practices to correct such kinds of errors.

- Students preferred teacher-correction with comments while teachers usually tended to focus on teacher correction and self-correction. Students showed negative preference towards self-correction and peer correction because of misconception on the students' side.
- The students preferred error correction by identifying where the error is and giving clue about the type of the error. Finally, the results also revealed that students are not committed enough to revise their papers once their teachers returned to them.

5.3. Recommendations

Based on the drawn conclusion, the following recommendations have been made.

- EFL teachers should make open discussion with their students. This helps to create conducive environment in which the students and teachers can work cooperatively to correct students' errors on their writing.
- In order to students can work hard to find out the right correction for the error, teachers should exert their ultimate effort to indicate the error and provide clue.
- The teachers should update their knowledge of feedback provision because they seemed to lack knowledge of the different ways of providing corrective feedback to their students' writing.
- EFL students should give special attention to their papers when their teachers return to them and make necessary improvements by adding their own improvements and modifications instead of including teacher's comments only.
- First and foremost, EFL teachers should exert effort to make students' attitude positive towards peer-correction and self-correction by avoiding the habit of teasing and mocking among students for errors that their friends made. Peer correction and self-correction give students more opportunities to correct their errors more than teacher correction.

References

- Alavis, S., KaivanPanah, S. (2007). Feedback Expectancy and EFL Learners' Achievement in English. *Journal of Theory and practice in Education*, 3 181-196.
- Best, J.W. & Khan, J.V. (2015). *Research in Education*. (7thed). New Delhi: Practice Hall of India PLC.
- Barkaoui, K. (2007) Revision in Second Language Writing: What Teachers Need to Know. *TES Canada Journal*, 25(1): 81-92.
- Bates, L., J. Lane & E. Lange (2011). *Writing clearly: Responding to ESL composition*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Berg, E. (2012). The effects of trained peer response on ESL students' revision types and writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8.3, 215–241.
- Bitchener, J. (2008). Evidence in support of written corrective feedback. *Journal of second language writing*, 17(2), 102-118.
- Brown, H., D. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, H.D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching (4th Ed.)*. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Bruffee, K. (1984a). Collaborative learning and the 'conversation of mankind'. *College English* 46.7, 635–652.
- Chandler, J. (2003) The Efficacy of Various Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 12: 267-296.
- Chaudron, C. (2015). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaudron, C. (2010). The effects of feedback on students' composition revisions. *RELC Journal* 15.2, 1–15.
- Coffin, C., Curry, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lillis, T., & Swann, J. (2003). *Teaching academic writing: A toolkit for higher education*. London: Routledge.

- Cohen, A. D. & Cavalcanti, M. C. (2008). Feedback on compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second Language Writing* (pp. 155-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Cohen, A. D. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. L. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-69). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2017). *Research Method in Education*. (8th edition). London, Cambridge University Press.
- Conrad, S.M. & Goldstein, L. (1999). Student Revision after Teacher Written Comments: Text, Contexts and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 8.2, 147-180.
- Cotterall, S. & R. Cohen (2003). Scaffolding for second language writers. Producing an academic essay. *ELT Journal* 57.2, 158-66.
- Curtis, A. (2001). Hong Kong student teachers' responses to peer group process writing. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching* 11, 129-143.
- Dulay, H.C. & Burt, M.K. (1974). Natural Sequences in Child Second Language Acquisition. *Language Learning*, 24, 37-53.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The studies in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2009). *A typology of written corrective feedback*. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97- 107.
- Fernández, S. L. (1995). Errores e interlingua en el aprendizaje del español como lengua extranjera. *Didáctica*, 7, 203-216.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student Reactions to Teacher Responses in Multi-draft Composition Classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly* 29.1, 33-53.
- Ferris, D. (1999). *The Case for grammar Correction in L2 Writing classes*. A Response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 8-1, 1-10.
- Ferris, D. (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. An Arbor, MI: The university of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 315-339.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence.

- Ferris, D. R. and Roberts, B. (2001) Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How explicit does it need to be? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10: 161-184.
- Ferris, D. R., Pezone, S., Tade, C. R., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher commentary on student writing : Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 155-82.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (2006). Feedback in portfolio based writing courses. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (eds.), 000–000.
- Haswell, R. H. (1983). Minimal marking. *College English*, 45(6), 600-604.
- Hendrickson, J. (2015). Correcting Errors in the L2 Classroom: Students' and Teachers' Perceptions. kerwin A. livingstone.
- Hendrickson, J.M. (1980). The treatment of Error in Written work. *Modern Language Journal*, 64, 216-221.
- Hendricks, J.m. (1984). The Treatment of Error in written work. In S. McKay(ed.) *composition in a Second Language (pp145-159)*. Rowley, MA; Newbury house.
- Horwitz, D. (1986). Process not Product: Less than Meets the Eye. *TESOL Quarterly* 20.141144
- Hu, G. (2005). Using peer review with Chinese ESL student writers. *Language Teaching Research*, 9, 321-342.
- Huntley, H.S. (1992). Feedback strategies in intermediate and advanced second language composition. A Discussion of the Effect of Error correction, peer review, and student- teacher conferences on student writing and performance. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 355 809)
- Hyland, F. and Hyland, K. (2020). *English Language Teaching Educational Journal*. Vol.3, No.2, Pp.95-107.
- Hyland, F. (2003). *Focusing on form: Student Engagement with Teacher Feedback*. System, 31: 17-230.
- Hyland, F. & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the Pill: Praise and Criticism in Written Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. 10(3), 185-212
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7, 255-286.
- Hyland, K. & F. Hyland (2006b). *Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing an interpreting teacher written*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Hyland, K. & F. Hyland. (2006c). *Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Katayama, A. (2007). Japanese EFL students, preferences towards correction of classroom oral errors. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9, 289-305.)
- 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, 305-313.
- Lalande, J. F. (1982) Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment. *Modern Language Journal*, 66(1): 140-149.
- Lee, I. (2004). *Error correction in L2 secondary writing classroom*. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 285-312.
- Lee, I. (2002). Helping Students Develop Coherence in Error Correction in Writing. *English Teaching Forum*, 40(3), 32-39.
- Lee, I. (2008 a). Student Reactions to Teachers' Feedback in two Hong Kong classrooms. *Journal of Second Language writing*, 17(3), 144-164.
- Leki, I. (1991) The Preferences of ESL Students for Error Correction in College Level Writing Classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24(3): 203-218
- Liu, J. and Hansen, J. (2005). *Peer response in second language writing classrooms*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Long, M. & P. Porter (1985). *Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition*. *TESOL Quarterly* 19.2, 305-325.
- Long, M. H. (1991). *Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology*. In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in Cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Min, H. T. (2005). *Training students to become successful peer reviewers*. *System*, 33, 293-308.
- Mendoca, C. & K. Johnson (1994). *Peer review negotiations: Revision activities in ESL writing instruction*. *TESOL Quarterly* 28.4, 745-768.
- Nunan, D. (1995). *Language Teaching Methodology: A text book for teachers*. London, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Oladejo, J. A. (1993). Error correction in ESL: Learners' preferences. *TESL Canada Journal*, 10,

71-89.

- Pica, J., Lincoln-Porter, F., Panions, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). *Language Learners' Interaction: How Does it Address the input, output, and feedback needs of L2 learners. TESOL Quarterly, 30, 59-69*
- Polio, C., C. Fleck & N. Leder (1998). 'If I only had more time': ESL learners' changes in linguistic accuracy on essay revisions. *Journal of Second Language Writing 7.1, 43-68.*
- Raula, L.D. (2005). *EFL university students' preferences for error correction and teacher feedback on writing. TESL Reporter 38, 1(2005), pp 27-51*
- Riazi, A. (1997). *Acquiring disciplinary literacy: A socio cognitive analysis of text production and learning among Iranian graduate students of education. Journal of Second Language Writing 6.2, 105-137.*
- Sadler, D. (1983). *Evaluation and Improvement of academic. Learning. Journal of Higher Education, 54(1): 60-67*
- Saito, H. (1994). *Teachers' practices and students' preferences for feedback on second language writing: A case study of adult ESL learners. TESL Canada Journal, 11, 46-70.*
- Sara, O. (2015). *EFL students' attitude and preferences towards written corrective feedback. University Jaume I.*
- Schmidt, R. (1990). *The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11, 129-158.*
- Schmidt, R. (1994). *Deconstructing consciousness in search of useful definitions for applied linguistics. Consciousness in second language learning, 11, 237-326.*
- Schulz, R. A. (2001). *Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA Columbia. The Modern Language Journal, 85, 244-258.*
- Semke, H. (1980). *The comparative effects of four methods of treating free-writing assignments on the second language skills and attitudes of students in college level first year German. (Doctoral dissertation), University of Minnesota.*
- Sheen, Y.
- Shine, E. A. (2008). *Written feedback in a freshman writing course in the UAE: Instructors' and students' perspectives on giving, getting and using feedback. (Doctoral dissertation), Massey University, Palmerstone North, New Zealand.*
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal, 23, 103-*

- Singh, Y. K. (2006). *Fundamentals of Research Methodology and Statistics*. India (New Delhi): New Age International Publishers.
- Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1.3, 217–233.
- Tribble, C. (1996). *Writing*. Oxford.
- Touchie, H. (1986). Second Language Learning Errors: their types, causes and treatment. *JALT Journal*, 8(1), 75-80.
- Truscott, J., & Hsu, A. Y. P. (2008). Error correction, revision, and learning. *Journal of second language writing*, 17(4), 292-305.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes. *Learning* 46.2, 327-369.
- Ur, P. (2006). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, T. & Jiang, L. (2015). *Studies on Written Corrective Feedback: Theoretical Perspectives Empirical Evidence, and Future Directions*. *English Language Teaching* vol. 8, No. 1; 2015.
- Widdowson, H.G (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37, 556–569
- Zacharias, T. (2007). *Teacher and student attitudes towards feedback*. *RELC Journal*, 38, 38-52.
- Zamel, V.(1985). *Responding to Student Writing*.*TESOL Quarterly* 19.1, 77-101
- Zhu, H. (2010). An Analysis of College students' Attitudes towards Error correction in EFL context. *English Language Teaching* 3, 127-130.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Questionnaire for Students

Mekelle University

College of Institute of Pedagogical Sciences

Department of Curriculum and Teachers Professional Development

Dear Students

First of all, I would like to say thank you for your willingness to fill this questionnaire sacrificing your time. The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data that will be used for a study on “Teachers’ Practices and Students’ Preferences for Feedback on EFL Writing.” Therefore, you are kindly requested to fill in the questionnaire based on the given instructions. Your responses are used only for the research purpose and are kept confidential.

Thank you in advance!!!

Instruction: for each of the following items, please indicate based on the questions in each numbers.

1. What do you want your English teacher to do when responding to your essays?
Read each statement a-e and then decide if you: (5) strongly agree, (3) agree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree. Please write the number of your response in the space provided.
 - a. Point out errors in *grammar* (verb tenses, subject/verb agreement, article use...etc.) _____
 - b. point out errors in *spelling* _____
 - c. point out errors in *punctuation* _____
 - d. make comments on the *organization of the paper* _____
 - e. make comments on the *writing style* (the way you express your thoughts and arguments) _____
2. when your teacher gives you corrective feedback:
 - a. I want him to correct all my errors at once
 - b. I want him to focus on one type of error at a time

3. There are different ways to provide feedback on student writing. Please put an "x" mark under the column of your agreement that best describes your preference of feedback based on the rating scales given. (5) Usually (4) often (3) sometimes (2) occasionally (1) Never.

R.NO.	Item	1	2	3	4	5
a.	Teacher correction(teacher corrects all errors)					
b.	Teacher correction with comments					
c.	Error identification (the teacher indicates the place where the error occurs by underlying or circling it					
d.	Students evaluate each other's work in pairs or with a whole class					
e.	Students evaluate their own work					

4. How do you want your English teacher to indicate an error in your written work?
1. By crossing out what is incorrect and writing the correct word or structure
 2. By showing where the error is and giving a clue about how to correct it
 3. By ignoring the errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation...etc. and only paying attention to the ideas expressed
 4. specify if others: _____
5. How does your English teacher currently indicate errors in your written work?
1. By crossing out what is incorrect and writing the correct word or structure
 2. By showing where the error is and giving a clue about how to correct it
 3. By ignoring the errors in grammar, spelling, punctuation...etc. and only paying attention to the ideas expressed
6. If there are many errors in a paper, what do you want your English teacher to do? Read each statement and then decide if you: (5) strongly agree, (4) agree, (3) neither agree nor disagree, (2) disagree, or (1) strongly disagree. Please write the number of your response in the space provided.
1. Correct all errors, major and minor _____

2. Correct all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones _____
 3. Correct only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are _____
 4. Correct all repeated errors whether major or minor _____
7. What do you usually do when you get your paper back? Rate the frequency of doing these things according to these rating scales. (4) Frequently (3) sometimes (2) rarely (1) never. Put the number of your agreement in the blank space.
1. Referring back to previous compositions _____
 2. Consult a dictionary/grammar book _____
 3. Rewriting by only incorporating teacher's comments _____
 4. Revising and expanding _____
 5. Not doing anything _____

Appendix 1: ፅሕፍታዊ መሕተት ንተምሃሮ ዝተዳለወ

ዩኒቨርሲቲ መቐለ

ትካል ፔዳጎጂያዊ ሳይንስ ኮሌጅ

መምህራን ምምዕባል ሞያን ስርዓተ ትምህርትን ክፍሊ ትምህርቲ

ዝኸበርኩም ተምሃሮ፡-

ካብ ኩሉ አቀዲመ ኩቡር ጊዜኩም ሰዊኢኩም ነዚ ፅሕፍታዊ መሕተት ክትመልኡ ፍቓደኛታት ስለዘከንኩም ከመስግን እፈቱ። እዚ ፅሕፍታዊ መሕተት ”ተግባር አዋህባ ግብረ-መልሲ መምህራንን ምርጫ ተምሃሮን ኣብ ቋንቋ እንግሊዝኛ ፅሕፈት ትምህርቲ “ብዝተባህሰ ርእሲ ንዝካየድ መፅናዕቲ ዝውዕል ሓበሬታ ንምእካብ ዓላሙ ዝተዳለወ እዩ። ዝኸን ይኹን እትህብዎ መልሲ ምስጥራውነቱ ዝተሓለወ ኮይኑ ነምፅናዕቲ ጥራሕ ዝውዕል ምዃኑ ከረጋግጹልኩም እፈቱ። ንሕድሕድ ሕቶ ብጥንቃቄ ብምንባብ ብመሰረት ዝቐረበልኩም መምርሒ መልስኹም ክተቅምጡ እለበወኩም።

ፆታ ----- ዕድሜ -----

- 1. ብቋንቋ እንግሊዝኛ ድርሰት እንትፅሕፉ መምህርኩም እንታይ ዓይነት ግብረ-መልሲ ክህብኩም ትደልዩ? ሕድሕድ ሕቶ ብጥንቃቄ ምስ ኣንባብኩም በዚ ዝስዕብ መንገዲ መልስኩም አቀምጡ። 5 = ኣዝዩ እስማዕምልሉ፣ 4=እስማመዕሉ 3=እስማዕመዕወይዘይስማዕማዕአይክእልን 2= አይስማዕማዕ 1=ፈጻሚ አይማዕማዕን። በጃኩም መልስኹም ብቁፅራብ ምፅሓፍ አቐምጡ።

ሀ. ሰዋሰው ተንክፍ ሕቶታት ፈልዩ ከውፅአለይ (ግስ፣ በዓል ቤትን መእሰር ዓንቀፅን ዘይምስምዕማዕ፣ ጠቆምቲ መስተአምራት ዝምልከት ጌጋ ወዘተ) -----

ለ. አፀሓሕፋ ቃላት ዝምልከት ጌጋ ፈልዩ ከመልክተኒ -----

ሐ. አጠቓቕማ ስርዓተ ነጥቢጌጋ ፈልዩ ከመልክተኒ-----

መ. አዋድዳ መዋቕር ዝምልከት ጌጋ ፈልዩ ከመልክተኒ-----

ረ. ኣብ አፀሓሕፋ ዘይቤ አመልኪቱ ሓበሬታ ክህበኒ -----

- 2. መምህራይ መስተካከሊ ግብረ መልሲ እንትህበኒ- (ሓዲኡመልሲአክብብወይአክብቢ)

ሀ. ኩሎም ጌጋታታይ ብሓደ ግዘ ክስተኻኸለለይ እደሊ

ለ. ኣብ ሓደ እዋን ሓደ ዓይነት ጌጋ ጥራሕ ክስተኻኸለለይ እደሊ

3. ንናይ ተምሃሮ ፅሕፈት ግብረ መልሲ መውሃቢ ብዙሓት መንገዲታት አለዉ። ናትካ /ኪምርጫ ደረጃ ዝሕብር መልሲ በዚዝስዕብ ደረጃ መልስ/ሲ.

5 = ኩሉግዞ 4 = እናሻዕ 3 = ሓደሓደግዞ 2 = ሓልሓሊፉ 1=ብፍፅም :: ኣብቲ እትስማዕምዕሉቦታናይ x ምልክትአቐምጡ።

ተቁ	ግብረ መልሲመ ውሃቢመንገዲ	መዐቀኒ				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	ብመምህር ዝውሃብ ግብረመልሲ (መምህር ኩሉ ግዜ ሕቶታት የስተኸኸል)					
2	ሪኢቶ ሓዊሱ ብመምህር ዝውሃብ ግብረ መልሲ					
3	ጌጋ ዝተፈጠረሉ ቦታ ብምሕባር (መምህር እቲ ጌጋ ዝተፈፀመሉ ቦታ ብምስማር ወይ ብምክባብ ይሕብር)					
4	ዓርሰ ምስትኸኸል (ተምሃሮ ባዕልቶም ጌጋኦም ከስተኸኸሉ ምግባር)					
5	ብመሓዛ ዝግበር ምስትኸኸል (እርማት) (ተምሃሮ ብፅምዲ ከይኖም ናይ መሓዝቶም ፅሕፈት ይግምግሙ)					

4. ናይ እንግሊዝኛ መምህርኩም ኣብ እትፅሕፍዎ ፅሑፍ ዘሎ ጌጋ ብኸመይ ከመላኸትኩም ትደልዩ?

- ሀ. እቲ ጌጋ ዝኮነ ብምስራዝ ብትክክለኛ ቃል ወይ መዋቅር ክትኩሉልና
 - ለ. እቲ ጌጋ ዝተፈጠረሉ ቦታ ኣበይ ከም ዝኮነ ብምሕባር ብዛዕባ እቲ ጌጋ ዝኮነ ኣንፈት ክህቡና ሐ. ኣብ ሰዋሰው፣ አፀሓሕፋ ቃላት፣ ስርዓተነጥቢ ወዘተ ዘሎ ጌጋ ንጎኒ ብምግዳፍ ኣብ ሓሳብ ዘተኮረ እርማት ክህቡና
- መ. ካልኣት እንተሃሊዮም ይገለፁ-----

5. ኣብዚ ሕዚ እዋን ናይ እንግሊዝኛ መምህርኩም ኣብ እትፅሕፍዎ ፅሑፍ ዘሎ ጌጋ ብኸመይ የመላኸትኩም?

- ሀ. እቲ ጌጋ ዝኮነ ብምስራዝ ብትክክለኛ ቃል ወይ መዋቅር ይትኩሉልና
- ለ. እቲ ጌጋ ዝተፈጠረሉ ቦታ ኣበይ ከም ዝኮነ ብምሕባር ብዛዕባ እቲ ጌጋ ዝኮነ ኣንፈት ይህቡና
- ሐ. ኣብ ስዋሰው፣ አፀሓሕፋ ቃላት፣ ስርዓተነጥቢ ወዘተ ዘሎ ጌጋ ንጎኒ ብምግዳፍ ኣብ ሓሳብ

ዘተኮረ እርማት ይህቡና

6. ኣብ ዝፀሓፍኩምዎ ድርሰት ብዙሓት ጌጋታት እንተሃሊዩ ምመምህርኩም እንታይ ክገብር ትደልይዎ ?
ሕድሕድ ሓሳብ ኣንብብዎ እሞ በዚ ዝስዕብ መሰረት ደረጃ ስምምዕኩም ‘ x ‘ ብምቅማጥ ኣመልክቱ።
5 = ኣዝዩ እስማዕምልሉ፣ 4= እስማመዕሉ 3= ክስማዕመዕ ወይ ዘይ ክስማዕማዕ ኣይክእልን 2= ኣይስማዕማዕን 1= ፈፂሞ ኣይማዕማዕን።

ሀ. ኩሎም ጌጋታት ኣናእሽተይ ይኩኑ ዓበይቲ ክስተካክለልና -----

ለ. እቲ መምህርቀንዲ ዝብሎም ጌጋታት ክስተካክለልና -----

ሐ. ክንድ ዝሃለዉ ጌጋታት ይሃልዉ ብዘዩግድስ ካብቶም ቀንዲ ጌጋታት ውሑዳት ክስተካክለልና -----

መ. ቀንዲ ወይ ንኡሳን ይኩኑ ብዘይግድስ ብጣዕሚ ዝተደጋገሙ ጌጋታት ክስተካክለልና -----

7. እቲ ዝፀሓፍኩምዎ ወረቀት ተአሪሙ ምስተመለሰልኩም ዝተዋሃበኩም እርማት ኣብ ጥቅሚ ንምውዓል እንታይት ገብሩ? ቀዲሎም ተምሃሮ ቋንቋ ወፃኢ ዝጥቀሙሎም ተግባራት ተጠቂሶም ኣለዉ።ክሳብ ክንደይ ከም ትስማምዑ ብዚ ደረጃ ኣመልክቱ።

4 = ኩሎም፣ 3 = ሓዲሓዲጊዜ፣ 2= ሓልሓልፉ፣ 1= ፈፂሞ

ሀ. ናይ ሕሉፍ ድርሰታተይ ተመሊሶ ይርኢ-----

ለ. መዝገበ ቃላት ወይ ናይ ስዋሰው መፅሓፍቲ ይውከስ-----

ሐ. ናይ መምህር እርማት ጥራሕ ብምጥቃም እንደገና ይፅኑፍ-----

መ. ከሊሰን ኣስፊሐን ይፅኑፍ -----

ረ. ምንም ነገር ኣይሰርሕን -----

Appendix 2: Interview Questions for Teachers'

Mekelle University

College of Institute of Pedagogical Sciences

Department of Curriculum and Teachers Professional Development

1. When you provide corrective feedback to your students' writing, do you simply provide the correct form? Or do you provide comments? Or the combination of the two?
2. When you give feedback to your students, do you correct all the students' writing errors on the paper at once or you focus on specific errors? Why?
3. Which aspect of the students' writing do you usually focus when providing corrective feedback to your students? Grammar, punctuation, spelling, organization, style, or ideas only? Why?
4. What do you do for your students to figure out their writing errors by underling or circling their errors? Why? Or do you provide them with a correction codes list to work on their own?
5. In the process of providing corrective feedback to your students' writing, do you provide the feedback by yourself? Or do you let the students' correct their own errors by themselves or with their peers? And Why?
6. What kind of errors do you prefer to correct when you see your students' writings? Do you correct all major and minor errors, the major ones only, the repeated ones or those that interfere with communicating ideas?

Appendix 3

Air pollution

Air pollution ^A ~~have~~ ^{has} many health problems.
People can ^{be} impacted by different disease.
~~For~~ ^F example cough, short ^{ness} of breath etc.

Air pollution ^A has long term ^A effects on human life. Air pollution ^A mainly ^A affects living things specially in urban areas.

In developing countries, the problem is more ^{ous} serious because of un ^A controlled urbanization

Therefore the government ^A should ~~protected~~ air pollution ^A in every parts of our country.

Coffee Preparation

To prepare ~~coffee~~ my coffee ~~in market~~ in market
I take water and heat for fire
after that I add coffee in material so for
not taste for people in home with
people about guests all in the
home for. Finally father first coffee
drinks. After that mother with my
sister.



Please write your essay clearly.

You should follow all the necessary

steps like:

- Introductory paragraph

- Thesis statement

- well developed bodies

- Concluding paragraph

N.B - please look at carefully for:

- grammar

- punctuation marks etc.

November Nights

November nights are long and chill and full of stars. They are full of fallen leaves skittering in the wind. November nights are good for walking down a country road. Then the world is close about you.