

ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHER FEEDBACK ON 10TH GRADE ESL STUDENTS' WRITING PERFORMANCE

Ali Raza Siddique¹

PhD Candidate, Department of Applied Linguistics,
Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan
Email: aalimalik381@gmail.com

Muhammad Ahmad²

PhD Candidate, Department of Applied Linguistics,
Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan
Corresponding Author Email: ahmad453@yandex.com

&

Dr. Muhammad Javed Iqbal³

Lecturer, Center for Languages and Translation Studies,
University of Gujrat, Pakistan
Email: mjaved.iqbal@uog.edu.pk

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the nature of teacher feedback on learner performance in writing skills by selecting 10th grade students and an ESL teacher from a private sector secondary in Faisalabad (Pakistan). Teacher marked the essays (written by students) and provided feedback in written form that was analyzed following direct and indirect categories model. The teacher was observed to provide both types (i.e. direct and indirect) of feedback. However, the percentage of direct feedback (51.11%) was observed slightly more than the indirect feedback (48.89%). Crossing with correction, deletion and addition (sub-categories of direct feedback) were used as a marking pattern. Whereas the location of errors and marginal commentary (sub-categories of indirect feedback), were observed being inappropriately used. These results lead to conclude that the feedback (provided by the teacher in the study) is not effective for the students. The study, therefore, suggested the teacher to utilize indirect feedback strategies to facilitate the improvement in ESL student writing.

Keywords: feedback categories; feedback strategies; learner performance; teacher feedback; writing skills

1. INTRODUCTION

Feedback is a response of the teacher on learner performance. It plays a key role in any learning process and is particularly important in independent settings (White, 2003). It is one of the most significant aspects of formative assessment. Which (formative assessment) is a source of providing information to the teacher and student regarding the way students perform learning goals in a classroom (Brookhart, 2008). Hurd (2006) specifically mentioned feedback as the most important role of the tutor which, not only provides a response on learner performance, but also (see White, 2003), serves as a means of providing support, encouragement and motivation to continue the learning process. In fact, feedback is seen as a writing instructional tool to assist the students to revise and improve the errors. In this relation, written feedback is regarded as completely informational i.e. a sources of directing responses and making improvements. Additionally, Chandler (2003) stresses that feedback functions to reduce the grammatical errors which alert the students to

avoid mistakes in writing. It is, therefore, inferred that feedback is a tool resolve writing issues. Therefore, it is assumed that the learner performances are the result of teacher feedback. It is also observed that the learners experience teacher feedback on their writing in terms of positive and negative remarks (Marzano, 2006). Finally, the status of student writing is assumed as result of teacher feedback continuum that means the quality of student writing is an indicator of the quality of teacher feedback. This study, therefore, investigates teacher written feedback on the writing performance of the ESL students at a private sector secondary school.

There are two major types of feedback i.e. positive and negative remarks (Brookhart, 2008). Positive feedback was considered as a “positive reinforcement”, and negative feedback was considered as “punishment.” Both reinforcement and punishment affect learning; thus, feedback was theorized to be effective. These types in terms of good and bad are discussed in the presence of feedback strategies i.e. timing, amount, mode, and audience (Brookhart, 2008). Making a meaning requires using and controlling one’s own thought processes. This is called self-regulation. Butler and Winne’s (1995) review showed that both external feedback (such as teacher feedback) and internal feedback (such as students’ self-evaluation) affect student knowledge and beliefs.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Recently, a different theoretical background on language learning i.e. constructivism (Mory, 2004; Price, Handley, Millar & O’Donovan, 2010) has been ascertained that signifies the role of learners in the production of knowledge. This view opposed the learning through feedback using behaviourist approach. It stressed that feedback had a limited role and remained unsuccessful to consider learners’ agency. In contrast, Butler and Winne (1995) emphasized on the influence of external feedback on learners’ observed performance. To treat this problem, the psychologists have used a methodology that establishes a relationship between stimulus and response. The cognitive mechanisms are actually behind this correlation. In this regard, treatments and behaviours are correlated to study the problem. This philosophy is also pursued in this study to examine the treatment as feedback what teachers give on the learner writing performance.

2.1. PAST STUDIES CONCERNING FACTORS INVOLVED IN FEEDBACK

There are several factors i.e. content, time and traits of the provider (see Molloy & Boud, 2014) which facilitate to improve the learner writing through quality feedback. Sadler (1989) found three features through which the students can experience benefits of the teacher feedback i.e. students require to know the actual goal of the performance, students need to engage themselves for comparing the performance goal with the actual performance and students also need to make a difference using strategy between actual performance and the desired performance. There are problems of the learners e.g. they are mostly observed to remain unsuccessful to comprehend the learning/performance objectives. Another problem, at the part of educators, was noted i.e. they did not have enough time to discuss the strategies to make an improvements in student writing (Hattie, Biggs & Purdie, 1996). This problem was also highlighted by Sadler (1989) who was of the view if the educators did not provide the required information regarding the gap noted between the actual performance and the reference performance, the construct at the moment was known “dangling data” (p. 121).

Secondly, timing is another factor of feedback which is kept in mind by the teachers (Molloy & Boud, 2014). Feedback is provided immediately (Ende, Pomerantz & Erickson, 1995; Hattie &

Timperley, 2007) or lately (see Clariana, Wagner & Murphy, 2000). The last factor is related with qualities of the feedback provider (Molloy & Boud, 2014) which keeps significant value of the feedback content. Thus, expertise of the provider has greater impact on learner feedback. A significant experimental mega research conducted by Hattie (1999 in Hattie & Timperley, 2007) on factors that affect learning achievements more than 500 scenarios. The researcher found that 12 (out of 196 studies) were reported on the effects of feedback. The influence of feedback's size was recorded (0.79). The study concluded that feedback was one of the top five factors which affected learning achievement.

2.2. PAST STUDIES ON FEEDBACK CLASSIFICATION

Many researches were experimented on teacher feedback which introduced clear parameters in the form of results to know effectiveness of the feedback provided by the teachers on the performance of the students. In this way, there are different levels of learners (i.e. school level students, college level students and university level students) whose writings were investigated with respect to teacher feedback. Another way to study was considered at different performances of the learners in the form of reading, listening (i.e. presentation), speaking and writing. The review of the study topic was also pursued with respect to different types of teacher feedback (both oral and written). These kinds of feedback i.e. oral and written were given directly and indirectly. This study is mainly focusing on teachers' written feedback on students' writing performances.

Panhoon and Wongwanich (2014) conducted a research to highlight the problems of teacher feedback on primary school students. Similarly, Ruiz-Primo and Li (2013) studied teachers' written feedback on students' written performances at elementary schools. Another study was observed by Peterson and Portier (2012) in which the researchers examined the influence of teacher feedback on students' writing performance through teacher feedback and formal peer review. Moving ahead, the researchers such as Matsumura, Patthey-Chavez, Valdés & Garnier (2002), Peterson, Childs and Kennedy (2004), and Searle and Dillon (1980) investigated teachers' written feedback at grades 3-8. Similarly, Stern and Solomon (2006) conducted a research on post-secondary classes, to investigate teachers' comments in the form of grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors. In addition to it, another study conducted on grade 3 teachers by Matsumura et al. (2002) who treated the students 4 times with written feedback on their writing errors, content and style. Another similar study was conducted in grade 8 classroom in which the learners were instructed to revise their drafts as per teacher and peer feedback (Peterson, 2003).

With another perspective of teacher feedback, several studies were reported to mainly focus on the learner language skills in the form of reading, listening (i.e. presentation), speaking and writing. Research by Searle and Dillon (1980), Matsumura et al. (2002), Peterson (2003), Peterson et al. (2004), Stern and Solomon (2006), Marzano (2006), Peterson and Portier (2012), Ruiz-Primo and Li (2013), and Panhoon and Wongwanich (2014) investigated teacher feedback on students' written performances. Similarly, a small number of studies on oral feedback were reviewed as per positive and negative effects on students' written performances. Firstly, Lyster and Ranta (1997) stated that negative feedback is considered when immediate feedback is provided to correct the mistakes orally. In contrast, this negative feedback is argued that social persuasion affects self-efficacy beliefs by providing individuals with positive verbal feedback that can override mild self-doubts (Bandura, 1977, 1991; Bless, 2017). Another study by Corkett, Hatt and Benvides (2011) studied self-efficacy beliefs between teacher and students and literary ability of the students. They

also studied verbal persuasion as a teacher feedback that can decrease or increase the self-efficacy of the students.

Past studies (see Butler, Godbole & Marsh, 2013; Chanock, 2000; McGarrell & Verbeem, 2007; Ruiz-Primo & Li, 2013) were reviewed to study further the types of teacher feedback. First of all, Butler et al. (2013) studied the effectiveness of the various types of feedback and also sought out the differences between explanation and correct answer feedback. Secondly, Ruiz-Primo and Li (2013) specifically focused on teachers' written feedback on the students' written performance and teacher feedback practices. In contrast to the previous studies, McGarrell and Verbeem (2007) examined feedback provided by the teacher in English language was not helpful activity for the students because this kind of feedback mainly focused on the corrections at sentence-level than organizational and content of the writing. Thus, it can be inferred that in an L2 classroom the teacher feedback in English as source of communication is not fruitful.

On the other hand, Hennessy and Forrester (2014) focused on an audio feedback and also studied its practices in the classrooms. Research by Cann (2014) and McFarlane and Wakeman (2011) opposed the effectiveness of audio feedback. The researchers found certain technological issues, i.e. longer mp3 files were impossible to send through email. This is why; they highlighted the difficulties related with technology. On the other hand, these technological problems can be controlled. In this regard, the following studies such as Weld (2014), Voelkel and Mello (2014), and Munro and Hollingworth (2014) interestingly highlighted the effectiveness of audio feedback provided by the teachers on students' written feedback. According to Brookhart (2008), teacher feedback is given to students in the form of oral, written and mixed feedback. The oral, written and mixed feedbacks were considered suitable in different ways such as direct and indirect. After having studied all the previous studies, the current study reaches to decide investigating teachers' written feedback on the students' written performances.

2.3. PAST STUDIES AND THEIR EXPERIMENTAL FINDINGS

Several researches were reported which provided numerical results and their interpretations for both oral and written feedback studies. The results of the following studies based on oral feedback were noted e.g. Hennessy and Forrester (2014) derived results from their study that audio feedback, as an oral one, is more efficient over written feedback. Secondly, Cann (2014), and McFarlane and Wakeman (2011) found that technological difficulties were the barriers towards the effective feedback.

A number of studies (see Panhoon & Wongwanich, 2014; Ruiz-Primo & Li, 2013; Peterson & Portier, 2012; Marzano, 2006; Chanock, 2000) on teachers' written feedback on the students' writing performance were also reviewed. First of all, Panhoon and Wongwanich (2014) conducted a research in which teachers' written feedback on an individual student's writing performances in grade 6 (i.e. mathematics and science). The study reported the findings that the feedback received by the teachers on their instruction was not a source of improvements for the teacher performance and student achievement. On the basis of these results, all teachers were assessed and it was established that teachers were having low teaching ability. Secondly, Ruiz-Primo and Li (2013) reported that "teachers' feedback as messages were 61% grades and just 33% the written comments" (p. 171). These findings were consistent with other studies that indicated written feedback practice as poorly implemented by most of the teachers. In order to have a different variety of teacher feedback in comparison with peer feedback, Peterson and Portier (2012) investigated the

students' content and writing received 90% of the feedback from their teacher and peers. To study the effectiveness of teachers' written feedback, Marzano (2006) focused on feedback and considered it as a development tool which improved and helped learners to increase and maintain their learning by 26%. Moreover, the feedback in the form of assessment provided by the teacher was interpreted as the criteria of learning achievement of the learners that was determined 32%. Lastly, Chanock's (2000) study resulted that "almost half of the students did not understand this comment in the way their tutors intended it" (p. 95), on the other hand, more than 80% instructors were of the view that they had efficiently elaborated the dissimilarities between analysis and description of the students' content.

2.4. PAST STUDIES AND THEIR CONCLUSIONS

Review of the previous studies highlighted the ultimate conclusions which were considered as a parameter to have comparison with the results of the current study. For example, Ruiz-Primo and Li (2013) concluded that "there are many unknowns about teachers' feedback practices" (p. 173), particularly at the elementary and secondary levels. Secondly, Chanock (2000) concluded on the basis of the results that "almost half of the students did not understand this comment in the way their tutors intended it" (p. 95). Next, Marzano (2006), summed up that feedback shown in development lines helped students control their learning and increased achievement by 26 percentiles. Feedback of teachers' interpretation of assessment results according to the determined criteria increased learning achievement by 32 percentiles.

In Hennessy and Forrester (2014) students believed that audio feedback was clear, effective, less technical, and more nuanced in comparison to written feedback. Further, Peterson (2003) showed that students made substantive revisions in their writing when their peers questioned the plausibility of events, characters and other features of the writing. In the end, Panhoon and Wongwanich (2014) concluded that all teachers assessed themselves as having low ability of teaching. Moreover, there is no feedback for students addressed in the lesson plans. Teachers needed to improve their performance on teaching and assessment individually. All information from the analysis was used to design a feedback system which could be used to enhance its effectiveness in the classrooms for teaching and learning.

2.5. MODEL BASED STUDIES

A number of research models based on feedback have been reviewed from previous research e.g. model based on the types of feedback i.e. positive and negative was proposed by Brookhart (2008). Another classification on feedback contains the types i.e. feedback about the task, processing of the task, self-regulation, and the self as a person (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Butler and Winne's (1995) shared external and internal feedback. Mack (2009) categorized feedback into comments, questions, or error corrections that were written on students' assignments. Lastly, the types of feedback such as direct, indirect and without codes have been proposed by Ferris (2002). The current study, after reviewing all of these typologies of feedback, has selected the classification as proposed by Ferris (2002) because of its suitability to this study.

To know more about feedback, there are mainly two different ways of giving feedback i.e. written feedback and oral feedback. To provide better feedback on writing, Brookhart (2008) suggests giving feedback on the separate sheet. On the other hand, oral feedback is categorized in two ways: firstly, feedback is given to the whole class at once; feedback is given to every individual

student in further two different ways: the first one is giving feedback to go at the desk of the student and the remaining class is working, whereas, for giving feedback, every student is invited at teacher's desk and is provided feedback orally (Brookhart, 2008). The present study adopts the way to give written feedback on students' writing performance at the desk.

2.6. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this experimental research is to examine Pakistani teachers' written feedback on the writing performance of the Pakistani learners. To know the value of the feedback given by the teachers, the assessment of the students' content has been studied. The ultimate purpose of the study is to describe teachers' written feedback to improve learners' writing performance. In this regard, following research questions have been raised:

- What kinds of the teacher's written feedback result to improve the students' writing performance?
- How is the teacher's written feedback given on the writing performance of the students?

2.7. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Since the number of participants is limited (i.e. one teacher and 16 students), the results of this study are not generalizable.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. FRAMEWORK AND CONTEXTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

This study is experimental in nature in which the researchers studied teachers' written feedback on the writing performance of the students by following a research model developed by Ferris (2002). He categorized feedback into three types such as direct, indirect and without codes. Such categories have been considered for having analysis of teachers' written feedback on writing performance of the students in this study. The marking of teacher has been categorized into direct, indirect and without codes feedback. Direct feedback deals with the teacher's marking in the form of corrected errors, correct substitution and deleted problems; indirect feedback comprises marking codes (i.e. marking errors with codes: P, vt, s/p, so on.); without codes feedback refers to locate errors with circles and underlines. The categories (see Table 1) of Ferris (2002) have been employed for data analysis. The detail of the classification has been given below.

Table 1 Features of Direct and Indirect Feedback

Sr. No.	Kinds of teacher written feedback	Definition	Examples of the feedback
Direct Feedback	Cross with correction	providing the correction (i.e. showing the correct form by crossing)	I gees to school daily (go)
	Deletion	correcting form by crossing	The red color is the beautiful.
	Addition	correcting by adding a missing	He is (a) person.

	word	
Indirect Feedback	Error Location	Indicating the error without showing the correct form I <u>watch</u> TV yesterday.
	Error Code	Using codes to indicate the errors I <u>watch</u> TV yesterday. .vt
	Error Symbol	Using symbols to indicate the errors I <u>watch</u> TV yesterday. △
	Verbal Clue	Using language to provide a clue I <u>watch</u> TV yesterday. <i>Verb form? Correct?</i>
	Marginal Commentary	Using comments in the marginal I <u>watch</u> TV yesterday. <i>Pay attention to the tense and form of verb!</i>
	End Commentary	Using general comments at the end I <u>watch</u> TV yesterday. <i>See your grammar book and correct the errors I encircled, underlined and crossed.</i>

16 students (out of 25 in total) studying in grade-10 in a private sector higher secondary school located in the urban area of Faisalabad (Pakistan) were the subjects in this study. They (students) were asked to write an essay of 150-200 words on "my last day at school" in 30 minutes. The teacher, who has been teaching English to the subjects in this study for the last for months, also participated in the study to mark the students' essays and provided feedback on them that (feedback) was then analyzed following feedback categories (Table 1).

4. RESULTS

The patterns of the teacher feedback were noted with respect to direct and indirect feedback. The direct feedback of the teacher as marking categories was recorded as three different categories such as cross with correction, deletion and addition or inserting a missing word. The indirect feedback of the teacher, as marking patterns, was recorded as three different categories such as error location, error symbol and marginal commentary. Overall, the mutual results of the study have been presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Results of Teacher Written Direct and Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing

Types of feedback	Integrative Observations	Summative Percentage
Direct Feedback	154	48.89%
Indirect Feedback	161	51.11%
Total	315	100.00%

Statistical analysis of the teacher's written feedback as marking patterns revealed that the teacher used both direct and indirect feedback on the writing performance of the students. The teacher's marking as a direct feedback on students' errors was noted 48.89% only. The numerical results of the direct feedback have been given in Table 2.

Table 2 Results of Teacher Written Direct Feedback on Students' Writing

Types of feedback	Sub-categories	Observations	Percentage	Integrative Observations
Direct Feedback	Cross with correction	108	34.29%	154
	Deletion	1	0.32%	
	Addition	45	14.29%	

The direct feedback (as shown in Table 2) of the teacher in written form was given on the writing performance of the students by 34.29% cross with correction, 0.32% deletion, and 14.29% addition or inserting a missing word in a sentence. More about direct feedback, 34.29% cross with correction was considered as a direct error which was treated by the teacher to circle, underline and cross the word and rewrote the right one in near the students' writing error; 0.32% deletion was also a direct error that was treated by the teacher to delete, omit or cross the error without giving substitution on the students' writing; and 14.6% addition as teacher's marking on students' writing was done by adding a new or required word in students' writing. In case of indirect feedback, the numerical results of teacher written indirect feedback have been given in Table 3.

Table 3 Results of Teacher's Written Indirect Feedback on Students' Writing

Types of feedback	Sub-categories	Observations	Percentage	Integrative Observations
Indirect Feedback	Error Location	155	49.21%	161
	Marginal	6	1.90%	
	Commentary			

On the other hand, indirect feedback of the teacher on the writing performance of the students was noted 51.11%. The indirect feedback was given by the teacher on writing of the students through 49.21% error location and 1.90% marginal commentary. To know more about indirect feedback, 49.21% error location as teacher's marking was given on students' writing. In which the teacher just highlighted the errors without providing corrected words. The second category was a marginal commentary 1.90% as teacher's marking was given on students' writing by writing improvement notes on the tense, verb forms and the structural organization. In case of the indirect feedback, the teacher marked students' writing without standard codes as discussed in the model (see methodology). After having seen the statistical results of the both direct and indirect teacher written feedback, the overall numerical results of this study have been summed up and presented below in Table 4.

Table 4 Mutual Numerical Results of both Direct and Indirect Written Feedback of Teacher

Types of feedback	Sub-categories	Observations	Percentage	Integrative Observations	Summative Percentage
Direct Feedback	Cross with correction	108	34.29%	154	48.89%
	Deletion	1	0.32%		
	Addition	45	14.29%		
Indirect Feedback	Error Location	155	49.21%	161	51.11%
	Marginal	6	1.90%		
	Commentary				
Total		315	100.00%	318	100.00%

In order to compare the statistical results of this study, results of the past researches were considered. Ferris (2003) findings indicated that the teacher should give indirect feedback to enable the learners cognitively to solve the problems related with their writing. Ferris was of the view that through indirect feedback the students attempt to self-edit in accordance with the feedback they receive. The findings of the present study were compared with Ferris' (2004) findings that the teacher of a private secondary school engages students with more indirect feedback in cognitive-solving problem than direct feedback provided by the teacher. The results of the present study are in line with Ferris' (2003) and Chandler's (2003) findings of indirect feedback given by the teachers.

In case of direct feedback, the teacher provided feedback directly focusing on grammatical errors such as –s, -es, ed, -ly, -full and etc. on the present and past form of verb, tenses, punctuation, preposition, adverb, articles and so on. This is one the easiest and speedy way to improve students' writing errors through the different categories: cross errors, deletion and adding or inserting a missing word in a sentence. The findings of direct feedback given by the teacher is 48.87% and these results are in contradiction with the results of Chandler's (2003) study which claims 93% direct feedback is given to students' writing performance. The finding of the present study is contradicted with the findings of Robb, Ross & Shortreed (1986). Robb and his colleagues pointed out that the students performed well when they received less explicit error feedback. The present study summarizes that the teacher, at a private higher secondary school, gives both direct feedback and indirect feedback to improve students' errors on immediate basis. More precisely, indirect feedback is igniting students more to think about their errors.

5. DISCUSSION

In discussion section, the study selects some excerpts for analysis. This study has analyzed the teacher's written feedback on writing performance of the students using proposed typologies of feedback i.e. direct and indirect (Ferris, 2003). The results interestingly highlighted the teacher's marking patterns as observed by the researcher. Overall, it is stated that this study has found both direct and indirect feedback in written form at the part of teacher on writing performance of the students. Seeing statistical results, indirect feedback in written form has been more adopted by the Pakistani private secondary school teacher than direct feedback. Indirect feedback is more appealing to improve the learners' errors at cognitive level because it indirectly leads the students to cognitive problem-solving. In order to depict the excerpts selected from students' writing, the examples of the concerning sub-categories have been given below in Table 5.

Table 5 Features of Direct and Indirect Feedback

Sr. No.	Kinds of teacher written feedback	Definition	Examples of the feedback
Direct Feedback	Cross with correction	providing the correction (i.e. showing the correct form by crossing)	He perform performed welcome dance.
	Deletion	correcting form by crossing	One of the 10 th class sing is a very beautiful song.
	Addition	correcting by adding a missing word	The name of hotel (was) Royalton. ↑
Indirect Feedback	Error Location	Indicating the error without showing the correct form	I remember <u>is</u> my last day at school is 3 rd March 2019.
	Marginal Commentary	Using comments in the marginal	I am was very sad. <i>Use past tense!</i>

In the excerpts (see Table 5) of direct feedback, the teacher traced the different types of errors such as cross with correction, deletion and addition or inserting a missing word. Firstly, the teacher located the grammatical error by crossing the whole word “perform” and provided correct form “performed”. Secondly, the teacher deleted grammatical errors by crossing the word as mentioned in Table 5. Lastly, the teacher added or inserted the lexical or grammatical item in the sentence. In case of indirect feedback, the teacher provided feedback in the form of error location and marginal commentary. In excerpt (shown in Table 5), the teacher just underlined or encircled the word error “is”. In marginal commentary, the teacher crossed the word “am”, provided the correct form “was” and also dropped a marginal comment “Use past tense”.

To relate these findings with the statistical results, the percentages provided for each sub-category of direct and indirect feedback help in decision making about the effectiveness of teacher’s written feedback on the writing performance of the students. The findings in Panhoon and Wongwanich (2014), revealed that the feedback received by the teachers on their instruction was not a source of improvements for both teacher performance and student achievement. These results were in line with the findings of the present study. The alignment of the results is backed by the reason that the number of errors was noted most frequently in writing of the students. The students have been studying the same subject by the same teacher and kept receiving the same types of feedback. The student performance illustrates the weakness of the student writing skills. This sort of writing weakness leads toward the teacher that the teacher was assessed and considered as having low teaching abilities.

The study of Ruiz-Primo and Li (2013) reported that “teachers’ feedback as messages were 61% grades and just 33% the written comments” (p. 171). The findings of the present study are in line with the findings of Ruiz-Primo and Li (2013) that the present study found 1.90% marginal commentary but the quality of the comments observed is not so high. Past research indicated the low quality of comments and written feedback practice was poorly implemented by most of the teachers. Similarly, the same results were reported by Peterson and Portier (2012) and Chanock’s (2000) study resulted that “almost half of the students did not understand this comment in the way their tutors intended it” (p. 95). These findings were compared with the finding of the present study and considered in line with them.

6. CONCLUSION

This study investigated the types of teacher written feedback in the improvement of student writing skill at a private higher secondary school. On the basis of the results, the present study described teacher written feedback in direct and indirect forms (Ferris, 2003). The higher secondary school teacher prefers to give indirect feedback 51.11% than direct feedback 48.89%. The preference indicates the teacher’s intention toward the students that the teacher provokes students’ cognitive level to solve problems but to see the frequent occurrences of grammatical errors in writing performance of the students, the situation guides the ineffectiveness of the written feedback provided by the teacher. A very serious problem of teacher written feedback emerges that the ultimate focus of the feedback was recorded on the language issues but no serious attempt at the part of teacher regarding the quality of the content of the students has been noted through feedback.

This study also examined that how the teacher gave written feedback on the writing performance of the students. To provide feedback, the teacher used the model proposed by Ferris

(2003) to give feedback directly through cross with correction, deletion and adding or inserting a missing word in a sentence. The teacher marked the students' writing by underlining, encircling and crossing the word with or without correct form. This is the easiest way to improve the learner writing skills and this claim is supported by Ferris (2003) and Chandler (2003). The study also suggests the teacher to use direct feedback on student writing with additional comments. This study also recommends oral feedback along with written feedback when the students have same level of errors.

This study also notes that the teacher's preference is more tended toward indirect way of giving feedback on student writing. In this type of feedback, the teacher just underlines, encircles and crosses the word without providing correct form. This technique leads the learners to think about their errors committed in their writing. This is a very productive type of feedback but unfortunately it is not properly used by the teacher at a private higher secondary school. This study suggests the teachers to use indirect feedback, error location and error symbols. On the other side of the wall, another reason is the ignorance of the students regarding their errors. This study suggests students to follow the feedback to improve their learning by overcoming grammatical errors and content specific issues.

REFERENCES

- Bless, M. M. (2017). *Impact of audio feedback technology on writing instruction* (doctoral dissertation). College of Education, Walden University, Minneapolis, Minnesota, U.S.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give to your students effective feedback*. Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Publications.
- Butler, D., & Winne, P. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65(3), 245-281.
- Butler, A. C., Godbole, N., & Marsh, E. J. (2013). Explanation feedback is better than correct answer feedback for promoting transfer of learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(2), 290–298.
- Cann, A. (2014). Engaging student with audio feedback. *Bioscience Education*, 22(1), 31–41.
- Chandler, J. (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 12(3), 267-296.
- Chanock, K. (2000). Comments on essays: Do students understand what tutors write? *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(1), 95–105.
- Clariana, R. B., Wagner, B., & Murphy L. C. R. (2000). Applying a connectionist description of feedback timing. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 48(3), 5-21.
- Corkett, J., Hatt, B., & Benevides, T. (2011). Student and teacher efficacy and the connection to reading and writing. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 34(1), 65–98.

- Ende J., Pomerantz, A., & Erickson, F. (1995). Preceptors' strategies for correcting residents in an ambulatory care medicine setting: A qualitative analysis. *Academic Medicine*, 70(3), 224-229.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language writing classes*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hattie, J., Biggs, J., & Purdie, N. (1996). Effects of learning skills intervention on student learning: A meta-analysis. *Review of Research in Education*, 66 (2), 99–136.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hennessy, C., & Forrester, G. (2014). Developing a framework for effective audio feedback: A case study. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 777–789.
- Hurd, S. (2006). Towards a better understanding of the dynamic role of the distance language learner: Learner perceptions of personality, motivation, roles, and approaches. *Distance Education*, 27(3), 303–329.
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37-66.
- Mack, L. (2009). Issues and dilemmas: What conditions are necessary for effective teacher written feedback for ESL learners? *Polyglossia*, 16, 33-39.
- Marzano, R. J. (2006). *Classroom assessment & grading that work*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) Publications.
- Matsumura, L. C., Patthey-Chavez, G. G., Valdés, R., & Garnier, H. (2002). Teacher feedback, writing assignment quality, and third-grade students' revision in lower-and higher-achieving urban schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103(1), 3-25.
- McFarlane, K., & Wakeman, C. (2011). Using audio feedback for summative purposes. *Innovative Practice in Higher Education*, 1(1), 1–20.
- McGarrell, H., & Verbeem, J. (2007). Motivating revision of drafts through formative feedback. *ELT Journal*, 61(3), 228-236.
- Molloy, E. K., & Boud, D. (2014). Feedback models for learning, teaching and performance. In J.M. Spector, D. Merrill, J. Elen & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology* (pp. 413-424). New York: Springer.
- Mory, E. H. (2004). Feedback research revisited. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of Research*

- on Educational Communications and Technology* (pp. 745-783). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Munro, W., & Hollingworth, L. (2014). Audio feedback to physiotherapy students for viva voce: How effective is the living voice? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(7), 865–878.
- Panhoon, S., & Wongwanich, S. (2014). An analysis of teacher feedback for improving teaching quality in primary schools. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4124-4130.
- Peterson, S. S. (2003). Peer response and students' revisions of their narrative writing. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 3(3), 239-272.
- Peterson, S. S., Childs, R., & Kennedy, K. (2004). Written feedback and scoring of sixth-grade girls' and boys' narrative and persuasive writing. *Assessing Writing*, 9(2), 160-180.
- Peterson, S. S., & Portier, C. (2012). Grade one peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Education*, 42(3), 237-257.
- Price, M., Handley, K., Millar, J., & O'Donovan, B. (2010). Feedback: All that effort, but what is the effect? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 35(3), 277–289.
- Robb, T., Ross, S., & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 83-93.
- Ruiz-Primo, M. A., & Li, M. (2013). Analyzing teachers' feedback practices in response to students' work in science classrooms. *Applied Measurement in Education*, 26(3), 163–175.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18(2), 119-144.
- Searle, D., & Dillon, D. (1980). The message of marking: Teacher written responses to student writing at intermediate grade levels. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 14(3), 233-242.
- Stern, L. A., & Solomon, A. (2006). Effective faculty feedback: The road less traveled. *Assessing Writing*, 11(1), 22-41.
- Voelkel, S., & Mello, L. V. (2014). Audio feedback—Better feedback? *Bioscience Education*, 22(1), 16–30.
- Weld, C. (2014). Listen to this: Utilizing audio recordings to improve instructor feedback on writing in mathematics. *Problems, Resources, and Issues in Mathematics Undergraduate Studies*, 24(6), 513–528.
- White, C. (2003). *Language learning in distance education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.