Investigating the Practice of Teachers' Written Feedback Provision on Students' Writings

Eskinder Getachew Degaga[1], Mr. Ermias Eromo[2]

[1]Hawassa University, Ethiopia
[2]Wachamo University, Ethiopia
Corresponding Author: Dr. Eskinder Getachew Degaga

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this study was to investigate the practices of teachers' written feedback provision on grade 11 students' writing in the selected secondary and preparatory schools. To attain this purpose, a descriptive survey method with mixed approach was employed. In order to collect appropriate data, students' questionnaires and teachers' interview were used. The data collected from questionnaires were analyzed qualitatively using descriptive survey statistics, frequency and percentage. On the other hand, the data obtained from the interview were analyzed and described qualitatively. In an attempt to investigate the extent of written feedback provision practices, the results revealed that the majority of teachers didn't provide sufficient writing activities that promote their written feedback practices. As the result, they usually provide insufficient amount of feedback even which was delayed, evaluative (judgmental), and comprehensive feedback usually on a single draft.
Key words: multi-draft, selective feedback, evaluative feedback, immediate feedback, surface level aspects, meaning level aspects

I. INTRODUCTION

There is no doubt that providing written feedback is often regarded as one of the important task for foreign language teachers both for its potential for learning and for student motivation. The way that teachers structure the classroom for a writing session and the type of feedback they give undoubtedly determine how their students approach the writing process, consider feedback and revise their writing. "Written feedback therefore, emphasizes a process of writing and rewriting where the text is not seen as self-contained but points forward to other texts the student will write" (Hyland 2003: 177).

The forward suggestion of this study arises from the researcher's personal experience as an English Language teacher at primary and secondary levels and from personal readings of similar studies conducted in different contexts. However, having experienced as the English language teacher for six years in the above preparatory schools, the researcher has noticed that students were not reaching the intended writing assessment goals by the end of the writing activities.

So far, a number of studies have been conducted both in global and local level with the aim of investigating the practice of teachers' written feedback provision and its influence on L2 student writing. Among the international researchers, Razlina& Rohaiza (2014) is the one who conducted the study on "Exploring Teacher Written Feedback and Student Revisions on ESL Students' Writing." This study explores three types of feedback- suggestion, criticism, and praise and which type of feedback from these three encourages student revisions. This study reveals that all types of teacher written feedback encourage student revisions. However, the categorization of the types of written feedback in this study (suggestion, criticism, and praise) is not the same with the current study (direct, indirect, comment, grading). Again in contrary to Razlina and Rohaiza, the current study explored that these types of written feedback didn't encourage students' revision especially criticism and praise if they are treated individually.

Among the local researchers for example, Belachew (2016), who studied about the practice of teachers' written feedback on grade ten students' writings. Gamachis (2013) also studied on feedback provisions on students' writing in basic writing skills classes. The result of his study showed that teacher feedback is preferable than others. The current research is different from this study in that the objectives set, the method designed, the findings investigated, etc.

Thus, this paper took a further consideration on the actual written feedback provided by EFL teachers on EFL students' writing by engaging their mind with minimal marking which enables them to expand their language and ideas.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this study was to investigate the practice of English language teachers' written feedback provision on EFL students' writing with particular reference to grade 11 secondary and preparatory schools in Lemo woreda, Hadiya zone.

Significance of the Study

Educational research findings must solve problems in a given discipline and contribute to the development of the teaching/learning activities at any level of learning. To this effect, this study is intended to offer insights into practice that underlie effective written feedback provision on students' writing. Concerning practice, this research may benefit three groups of people. First, as feedback is a classroom level practice, the beneficiaries could be English language teachers. They could use the ultimate findings of this study by comparing it with their actual practices in writing classes by assessing their approach to writing instruction and identifying their strong and weak sides in order to improve the standard of their teaching. Secondly, instructional material developers in the department of curriculum development at ministry of education (MoE) will be beneficiaries of the findings. They may use the findings to modify and improve the writing section of the units in the textbook development. Lastly, it may also serve as a model for other researchers in the field to examine the findings carefully and conduct further investigations in other academic settings.

Delimitation of the Study

There are six governmental secondary and three preparatory schools in Hadiya zone, Lemo woreda. Among these, the study was confined to three preparatory schools (Lisana, Shurmo and Jewe) which have been opened recently compared to other schools in the woreda. They were selected because the researcher had an experience about the realities taking place in the actual practice; consequently, he could easily associate some of the responses that he got from the respondents in line with his own experience. This study again, strictly limits itself on investigating the practice of English language teachers' written feedback provision on grade 11 students' writing.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The main objective of this study is to investigate the practice of English language teachers' written feedback provision on students' writing in grade 11 of three secondary and preparatory schools in Lemo woreda. In order to deal with the research problem in this study holistically, a non- experimental research design which attempts to describe the data collected about the subjects' practices, phenomena, processes etc., was employed. Furthermore, when the research is designed non-experimentally, the researcher could carry out in-depth investigations on research issues aiming at answering the questions what is happening and how it is happening (Eisnerand and Peshkin, 1990 and Peters, 1999).

In conducting this study, mixed research approach (both quantitative and qualitative) was employed so as to have a profound and thorough understanding of the research question by combining both perspectives. Qualitative research approach involves an interpretive and naturalistic approach to the world and helps the researcher to get a valid data for the study. It also helps to see things in their natural settings, to make sense of, or, interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Moreover, the study used descriptive research method so as to get a valid data.

Participants of the Study

There are seven government secondary and preparatory schools in Lemo woreda, in Hadiya Zone in SNNPRS. Among these, three of them (the schools which were not participated in the study) are secondary schools which comprises only grade nine and ten. The targeted population of the study was grade 11 English language teachers and students of three secondary and preparatory schools. The schools had six English language teachers and 97 students for the specified grade level. There were natural and social classes in each school. Thus, all of the students and teachers from the natural and social classes were participants of the study.

Sampling Size and Sampling Techniques

To select the sample size for this study, purposive and availability sampling techniques were employed. Among seven secondary schools, the three preparatory schools were selected by purposive sampling technique. They were selected because the schools were not in a big city and also recently opened, the situations in these schools were not well researched. Moreover, due to small number of the total population in the schools, teachers for interview and students for questionnaires were selected by availability sampling techniques. According to Kumar (2006:94), descriptive research typically uses larger samples; "it is sometimes suggested that one should

select 10-20 per cent of the accessible population for the sample". Therefore, 10% (nine students' documents) of the total population of the students' documents were selected by simple random sampling technique.

Data Collection Instruments
There were two data gathering instruments for this study. These were questionnaire and interview.
Questionnaires
     The purpose of students' questionnaire was to find out the frequency, the types of teachers' written feedback provision and factors affecting teachers' written feedback practices in a wide proportion with less cost within a short period of time. To achieve this goal, a closed-ended questionnaire with twenty items were prepared more of by the researcher himself and some of the parts by adapting Gamachis (2013) and Belachew (2016) questionnaires that have been used for similar research intents and by reviewing research evidences on teachers' written feedback provision.

Interview
     The major aim of conducting interview was to elicit data with regard to identifying frequently given written feedbacks, the types of feedback given in focus and the challenges of teachers' written feedback provision in EFL classrooms. It was employed in order to help interviewees give critical and descriptive reflections on the issue (Creswell, 2003; Cohen et al., 2005).The data that were going to be drawn from the interviews could further be used to supplement and triangulate information gathered from analyzed documents and survey questionnaire. A semi structured interview was used in the interview. Six teachers were selected to be interviewed by the researcher and the data that were going to be obtained from interviews were tape recorded and written in the form of notes without losing the main points.

Data Collection Procedure
     In order to employ the research instruments and obtain the relevant data which were vital in this study to respond to the research questions under investigations, the following various data elicitation procedures were employed. First, the researcher contacted and discussed with the schools' directors on the issue so as this organs to facilitate every essentials and to create good opportunities for the researcher on the way of gathering data. For example, the directors supported the researcher by facilitating assistant teachers and by creating common meeting conditions to introduce each other and to aware participants about the purpose of the study from the late February, 2018 to the beginning of March, 2018. After these all had been accomplished, the researcher directly proceeded into employing the tools. Firstly, a semi-structured teachers' interview was employed by the researcher in the mid March. Finally, on the basis of the insights that were obtained from interview, the researcher administered questionnaires for students and let them to fill the questionnaires within a week and collected them in the beginning of April. To be sure and complete the study on time, the data collection took place from the late February to the mid of April, 2018.

Methods of Data Analysis
     The data which were gathered through interview and questionnaires, analyzed using mixed data analysis method. The data were coded and classified on the basis of attributes. The qualitative data analysis method involved the following. Among others, thematic analysis, interpretive and inductive analyses were used. On the other hand, the qualitative data gathered through teachers' semi-structured interviews was analyzed thematically. The results obtained from all data sources were comparatively triangulated and analyzed through inductive ways. Finally, the researcher interpreted the results of the investigation to point out the findings, to conclude and to recommend.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS
Teachers' written feedback practices
This part of the questionnaire has 13 major items which are related to the frequency of practices of teachers' written feedback provision. Here below are the interpretations and discussions of results.
Key, 5-always, 4-usually, 3-sometimes, 2-rarely, 1-never
F-frequency, %-percentage

Table 1: Frequency of teachers' written feedback

Items	F& %	Rating Scales					
		5	4	3	2	1	total
1. How often your teacher does give you the following writing activities in the past?	F	61	23	10	3	-	97

A. Paragraphs	%	62.88	23.71	10.31	3.10	-	100
B. Short stories	F	-	16	68	10	3	97
	%	-	16.49	70.1	10.31	3.10	100
C. Essays	F	10	23	61	3	-	97
	%	10.31	23.71	62.88	3.09		100
D. Letters	F	-	2	25	62	8	97
	%	-	2.06	25.77	63.91	8.24	100
E. Others	F	23	10	62	2	-	97
	%	23.71	10.31	63.91	2.06		100
2. How often do you get written feedback from your English language teacher on every writings?	F	10	51	34	2	-	97
	%	10.31	52.6	35	2.06	-	100
3. How often does your teacher provide immediate feedback to your writing activities?	F	-	1	12	40	44	97
	%	-	1.03	12.37	41.23	45.36	100
4. How often does your teacher return a test, an exam or an assignment paper in the next day?	F	-	-	23	70	4	97
	%	-	-	23.71	72.16	4.12	100
5. How often do you receive written feedback only on the final (single) draft of your writing?	F	71	20	6	-	-	97
	%	73.19	20.61	6.18	-	-	100
6. How often do you receive a variety of written feedback throughout the writing process?	F	-	2	14	63	18	97
	%	-	2.06	14.43	64.95	18.56	100
7. How often does your teacher require you to re-write your compositions and submit multiple drafts?	F	-	2	21	69	5	97
	%	-	2.06	21.64	71.13	5.15	100
8. How often does your teacher respond to meaning level issues (content and organization) on the first (earlier) draft?	F	-	1	21	71	5	97
	%	-	1.03	21.64	73.19	5.15	100
9. How often does teacher respond to surface level issues (grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, etc.) on the final (later) draft?	F	68	15	14	-	-	97
	%	70.1	15.46	14.44	-	-	100
10. How often does your teacher provide a grading rubric along with your writing tasks?	F	3	10	23	61	-	97
	%	3.10	10.31	23.71	62.88	-	100
11.To what extent does your teacher provide: A. Descriptive feedback?	F	-	1	34	62	-	97
	%	-	1.03	35.05	63.91	-	100
B. Judgmental (evaluative) feedback?	F	62	34	1	-	-	97
	%	63.91	35.05	1.03	-	-	100
12.How often does your teacher use the following kinds of comparison while providing written feedback? A. Norm-referenced (comparing student performance to that of other students)	F	2	71	14	10	-	97
	%	2.06	73.19	14.41	10.31	-	100
B. criterion-referencing (comparing student performance to a standard)	F	-	1	17	70	9	97
	%	-	1.03	17.52	72.16	9.28	100
13 How often does your teacher provide written feedback on A. a task (work itself) and the process	F	-	3	4	54	40	97
	%	-	3.10	4.12	55.67	41.23	100
B. your personality(Making personal compliments or digs)	F	34	52	11	-	-	97
	%	35.06	53.6	11.34	-	-	100

This section (Table 1) is aimed to draw information about two main issues. The first one is about the extent and type of writing activities being provided by teachers as the type and extent of writing activities exercised in the language classroom play a prominent role in determining the type of feedback provision. In other words, the types of feedback students' receive and teachers provide depend on the types of writing approaches being implemented in the classroom. To identify these, a questionnaire was administered for the students in order to see types of writing being exercised by teachers in writing lessons. The second one is about the extent of teachers' written feedback provision practices as EFL teachers have lion's share in feedback provision, it is important first of all to identify the extent of teachers' written feedback provision practice. Here also 12 items were posed for the students in order to see the frequency of teachers' written feedback. Totally 13 items were asked under this team area.

Item 1 is intended to find out how often teachers provide writing activities in the past. As it is indicated in Table 8, paragraphs, essays, and some other writing activities were given always (62.88%, 10.30% and 27.71%), usually (23.71%, 23.71% and 10.30%), sometimes (10.30%, 62.88% and 63.91%), and rarely (3.09%, 3.09% and 2.06%) respectively. Again short stories and letters were given usually (23.71% and 10.30%), sometimes (70.1 and 63.91%), rarely (10.30% and 25.77), and never (3.09% and 8.24%) respectively. This indicated that even though paragraph writing was frequently given activity, there was a problem in providing adequate types of writings activities. Tamene and Yemenebrehan (2014) study, however, revealed similar results which indicated the insufficiency of practical writing activities for the skill which need extensive exercises. According to review of different scholars' idea, writing activities have great role in determining the effectiveness of written feedback practices. Of course writing activities are one of the obligatory issues in the area of written feedback provision.

Item 2 was intended to elicit information about the extent to which students get written feedback from their English language teacher on every writings. Accordingly, the response to this item revealed that 52.6% usually, 35% some times, 10.3% always and 2.06% rarely. This data implied that except 2.06% teachers, more than half of them usually provided written feedback on students' writing activities.

Regarding immediate feedback from their teachers, students' response to item 3 depicted that 1.03% usually, 12.37% sometimes, 41.23% rarely and 45.3% never receive immediate feedback from their teachers. As can be seen from the data, the majority of the respondents (78.56%) said that they receive immediate feedback rarely or never. Tamene and Yemanebrehan (2014), claims teachers did not provide immediate feedback because of tighten class schedules and time constraints for students' written work. The purpose of giving immediate or only slightly delayed feedback is to help students use it. Feedback needs to come while students are still mindful of the topic, assignment, or performance in question. It needs to come while they still think of the learning goal as a learning goal—that is, something they are still striving for, not something they already did. Therefore, immediate feedback and returning a test or assignment paper the next day is expected from teachers for students to get feedback while they are still mindful of the learning target and while there is still time for them to act on it.

Item 4 is also intended to find out whether teacher returns a test, an exam or an assignment paper just on the next day. As indicated in the above table 21.42% of the respondents said 'sometimes', 22.22% 'rarely' and the rest 56.38% replied that they 'never' receive feedback on the next day for their home take assignments. Responses of teachers to item 4 is the same as that of item 3(four sometimes and one rarely). The result obtained from the two items (3 and 4) depict that students get immediate feedback almost in rare cases for writing compositions. These findings can be seen in relation to previous research (Tamene and Yemanebrehan, 2014) that claims teachers didn't provide immediate feedback because of tighten class schedules and time constraints for students' written work.

Items 5 and 6 were intended to elicit information about writing approaches teachers implement in writing lessons through types of feedback they provide for students written work. In this regard item 1.5 students were also asked how frequently they receive feedback on the final drafts of their written output. As can be seen from the Table 8 above, 73.19% of the respondents said always, 20.61% usually, and 6.18% sometimes. It thus seems to be the case that post-product feedback was most common amongst these students. However, there are some negative traits concerning the timing of post-product feedback. When students receive the feedback at the same time as grade, they are often interested in the grade, but not the feedback, especially if they are dissatisfied with the grade (Leki 1990:62). This means that teachers may have spent valuable time on feedback that the students never even looked at. Frankenberg (1990:101) believes that pre-product feedback is important, in order to work with the writing challenges when the students are actually writing.

On the other hand item 6 also asked the students if they receive feedback on the first draft of their written work. The responses to this item revealed that 2.06% and 14.43% of them respectively reported that they usually and sometimes receive feedback on the first draft of their written work. 64.95% (the majority) and 18.56% of the respondent replied rarely and never respectively. Here the majority of the responses with the total of 83.51% fall between rarely and never. This implies that the students rarely receive feedback on their first

draft. When this result is compared to result obtained from item 5, most of the students claimed that they receive more feedback for the final drafts of their writings.

With regards to the issue of rewriting and submitting in item 7, the participating students were asked about the extent to which their teachers ask them to rewrite their compositions and to submit multiple drafts. Their responses to these items revealed that 2.06% (the minority respondents) and 21.64% of the respondents respectively said that the rewriting and submitting multiple drafts were usually and sometimes required by teachers. However, totally 78.34% (73.19% (the majority respondents) and 5.15% of them respectively) reported that the rewriting and submitting multiple drafts were rarely and never required by the teachers. This indicates that the activities were not often required by the teachers instead they provide written feedback on a single draft. Asiri's (1996) study, however, has revealed similar results.

Items 8 and 9 were intended to find out how frequently the EFL teachers provide written feedback on the aspects of drafts (early and later drafts). In this regard item 1.8 asked the students if teachers frequently respond to meaning level issues (content and organization) on the first draft of students' written work. The responses to this item revealed that 1.03% and 21.64% of them respectively reported that teachers usually and sometimes give written feedback on the first draft of students' written work. But, 73.19% and 5.15% of the respondent replied rarely and never respectively. Here the majority of the responses with the total of 78.34% fall between rarely and never. This indicates that the same as the result of item 6 i.e. lack of written feedback on first draft, here also teachers did not provide meaning level issues on the first draft of students' written work.

On the other hand, in item 9, students were also asked how teachers frequently respond to surface level issues (grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, etc.) on the final draft. Regarding this item, students' response depicted that 70.1% always, 15.46% usually, 14.43% sometimes teachers respond to surface level issues on the later drafts. As can be seen from the above data, the majority of the respondents (70.1%) said that teachers usually provide written feedback on surface level issues on the final (later) draft. These results disagree with some of the former study about ESL teachers' concern with surface level errors over meaning-level issues.

As indicated earlier, in contrary to the current results, researchers (Zamel, 1985; Chenwoeth, 1987) suggest that, in students' first drafts, teachers should respond to meaning-level issues and delay surface-level issues to final drafts. They believe that providing students with feedback on surface level concerns does not contribute to students' improvement in writing. However, Fathman and Whalley (1990), who studied the effects of different types of teacher feedback on students' rewrites, found that students can improve their writing in situations where content and form feedback is given simultaneously. They also found that providing students with feedback that focuses only on grammar does not negatively affect the content of their writing. But according to the result of some researches, the current researcher argues that written feedback could be better if it is given specifically in relation to the stages of each draft i.e. in the first draft meaning level issues and in the final draft the surface level issues.

Zamel argued further that ESL teachers should provide feedback related to content just on early drafts, then at intermediate stages of pupils writing and form-based feedback at the end of the writing process. She said, "We need to establish priorities in our responses to drafts and subsequent revisions and encourage students to address certain concerns before others" (Zamel 1985 in Ferris 2003:22-23). Instructions about grammar and language errors should be limited or even non-existent. The main reason for this is that they are ineffective (Zamel 1982, 1983, 1985 in Ferris 2003).

Item 10 is also intended to find out the frequency of teachers' grading rubrics provisions along with students' writing tasks. Accordingly, a large proportion of the students (86.59%) i.e. 23.71% and 62.88% respectively claimed that their teacher provide grading rubrics sometimes and rarely. However, very small proportion of the students i.e.13.41% (3.10% always and 10.31% usually) reported that teacher often provided rubrics for their writing activities. From this result we can deduce that teachers provide grading criteria along with the compositions of students rarely. However, other research has necessarily showed that for effective written feedback, to make sure the feedback is linked to an assessment that is linked to criteria and specific outcomes (Gibbs & Simpson, 2004). Therefore, it is advised to use rubrics and an established set of criteria. According to Hyland (2004) current theories of language assessment emphasize the importance of assessing student writing with a set of clear criteria created by the teacher. The rubric allows for standardized evaluation according to the specific criteria such as, grammar, organization, or cohesive links. This makes grading papers more transparent for the ESL learner. A rubric or criteria guide helps teachers "apply consistent standards to judge each task performance fairly but also so that they can communicate to the student" (Hyland, 2004, p. 163

Item 11 of table 10 is about identifying the extent to which teachers whether they provided descriptive feedback or judgmental (evaluative) feedback. The data clearly showed that almost all of the students (98.96%) reported that their teachers provided descriptive feedback rarely (63.91%) and sometimes (35.05%). But only a very few of them (1.03%) responded that descriptive feedback was given usually. On the other hand students were asked about judgmental or evaluative feedback. According to their responses, a large proportion of the respondents i.e. 98.96 %(63.91% always and 35.05% usually) reported that their teachers' written feedback was

judgmental except 1.03% said that it was given sometimes. Therefore, it was evident from the data about the provision of written feedback; teachers did not provide descriptive feedback, which aims the students' progress by telling what steps to take in order to move forward and to improve their writing in the future.

According to Susan (2008), descriptive feedback is composed of achievement feedback and improvement feedback. Achievement feedback describes or affirms for a student what was done well and why. Improvement feedback describes for a student what more might be done and what strategies might lead to improvement of the work. Hairston (1982) also argues that adopting evaluative feedback in teaching will not encourage students to practice writing because it does not show them how writing works in real-life situations.

Another item 12 in the above table is intended to gather data about the frequency of criterion and norm referenced comparison in providing written feedback. The data clearly showed that criterion referenced feedback was given 2.06 % always, 73.19% usually, 10% sometimes, and 23.71% rarely. This indicated that criterion referenced feedback was provided usually or there was no problem in providing criterion referenced feedback. On the other hand norm referenced feedback was provided 1.03% usually, 17.52% some times, 72.16% rarely and 9.28% never. Accordingly the vast majority of the respondents i.e. 81.44% reported that norm referenced feedback was not experienced by their teachers. As the result, item 12 clearly depicted that teachers provided criterion referenced feedback which is the primary kind of comparison to use for good feedback.

The last item (item 13) of table 8 was about whether teachers provide written feedback on a task (work itself) and the process or on students' personality (making personal compliments or digs. With regards to these issues, students' response to this item was 3.10% always, 4.12% usually, 55.67% sometimes and 41.23% teachers rarely provide written feedback on their task and its process. However, the vast majority of the respondents i.e. 88.66% (35.06% always and 53.6% usually) claimed that teachers provided written feedback on students' personality. But only 11.44% said that teachers provided written feedback on students' tasks rarely. Thus, the data clearly indicated that the large proportion of teachers did not provide written feedback on students tasks and the process and their relationship which gives students information about how they approached the task, information about the relationship between what they did and the quality of their performance, and information about possible alternative strategies that would also be useful. In relation to this item, Susan (2008) strongly support that Good feedback happens when teachers focus on the work and the process the student used to do it. However, he claimed providing feedback on personality for two reasons. First, it doesn't contain information that can be used for further learning, so it's not formative. Second, and more insidious, feedback about the person can contribute to students believing that intelligence is fixed. This implies that achievement is something beyond the student's control. The belief that intelligence is fixed removes the connection between student effort and achievement. It leads to a kind of academic fatalism.

Furthermore, according to Black and Wiliam (2002), feedback is most effective when it focuses on the task, is specific in its nature as to what the learner has done well and what they need to work on next, and is given while the task is still relevant. It opens the opportunity for mistakes to be viewed as learning opportunities when time is provided for students to take action. Suggestions should act as a form of scaffolding to ensure the student does not receive more help than necessary to complete the task. Finally it is concluded as "it is the nature, rather than the amount, that is critical when giving students feedback" (Black and William, 2002).

The results obtained from interviews data revealed that all most all of the teachers didn't give appropriate written feedback to students writing. This is due to the reason that 50% of teachers confirmed that their educational status was below the standard set by ministry of education of Ethiopia for preparatory level (i.e. for preparatory level, grade 11 and 12, masters degree is mandatory). Moreover, all of the teachers (100%) disclosed that they have not attended any workshops and seminars organized for English Language teachers either at regional or national level. Thus, on the bases of the interview result, it is possible to come up with the conclusion that teachers provided written feedback which enhances students' writing ability.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In an attempt to investigate the extent of written feedback provision practices, the results revealed that the majority of teachers did not provide sufficient writing activities that promote their written feedback practices. As the result, they usually provided insufficient amount of feedback even which was delayed, evaluative (judgmental), and comprehensive feedback usually on a single draft. This study also explored that the large proportion of teachers provided direct written feedback and grading focusing on grammatical and mechanical aspects of students' writings. Moreover, concerning training, all of the teachers disclosed that they had not attended any workshops and seminars organized for English Language teachers at all level (from school to national level).

REFERENCE

[1].   Belachew N. (2016). A Study on Teachers' Written Feedback Provision on Students' Writing.
[2].   Unpublished MA thesis, Hawassa University.
[3].   Black, P. and D. Wiliam (1998). "Assessment and Classroom Learning, Principles, Policy and Practice", Assessment in Education, Vol. 5(1), pp. 1-78.
[4].   Black, et al. (2002). Working Inside the Black Box: Assessment for Learning in the Classroom.
[5].   London: King's College London. Department of Education and Professional Studies.
[6].   Chenwoeth, A.N. (1987). The Need to Teach Writing. ELT Journal, Vol. 41(1), PP 25-29.
[7].   Creswell, J.W. (2003). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications..
[8].   Denzin,N.K and Lincoln,Y.S. (2000). Handbook of Qualitative Research.Thousand Oakd, Calif, Sage Publications.
[9].   Eisnerand,E. and Peshkin, A. (1990). Qualitative Inquiry in Education. The Continuing Debate.
[10].   JSTOR Journal Volume 34/3.
[11].   Fathman, A.K. and Whalley, E. (1990). Teachers Response to Students Writing. Focus on Form versus Content. In Second Languae Writing : Research Insights for the classroom (PP 178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[12].   Ferris, D.R. (2003). Response to Students Writing: Implications to Second Language Students.
[13].   Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
[14].   Frankenberg,A. G. (1990). Providing Student Writers with Pre-text Feedback. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[15].   Gamachis, F.(2013). Investigating the Practice of Written feedback Provision on Hawassa University Writing Courses. Unpublished MA thesis, Hawassa University.
[16].   Gibbs, G. and Simpson, C. (2004). Does Your Assessment Support Your Students' Learning?
[17].   Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, Volume 1/1, PP 1-30.
[18].   Hairston, M. (1982). The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing. College composition and communication, 33(1), 76-88.
[19].   Hyland, K. (2003). Genre-Based Pedagogies: A Social Response to Process. Journal of Second Language Writing, 12, 17-29.
[20].   Hyland, K. (2004). Genre and Second Language Writing. University of Michigan Press. Kumar (2006:94)
[21].   Lee, I. (2008). Understanding Teachers' Written Feedback Practices in Hong Kong Secondary Classrooms, 17, 69–85.
[22].   Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the Margins: Issues in Written Response. In B. Kroll(Ed.).
[23].   Second Language Writing: Insights for the Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[24].   Peter, T. M. (1999). The Effect of Peer and Teacher Feedback on Student Writing. Journal of Second Language Writing, Vol 8, 265-289.
[25].   Razlina R. and Rohaiza J. (2014). Exploring Teacher Written Feedback and Student Revisions on ESL Students' Writing. Vol. 19, Issue 5, 63-70
[26].   Susan M. (2008). How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students. United States of America: ASCD.
[27].   Tamene, A. and Yemanebirhan, K. (2014). The Practice of Feedback in Teaching Writing Skills: Adu Sigimo Hoghschool Grade 10 in Focus. Ethiopian Journal of Education and Science. Volume 10/1, PP 63-85.
[28].   Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The Process of Discovering Meaning. TESOL Quarterly, 16/2, 195-209.
[29].   Zamel, V. (1983). The Composing Processes Of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Studies. TESOL Quarterly, 165-187.
[30].   Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to Student Writing. TESOL Quarterly, 19, 79–102.