



UNIVERSITI
MALAYSIA
KELANTAN

RUJ. KAMI : UMK.A04.800-2/1/8 (28)
TARIKH : 24 SEPTEMBER 2020

CONFIRMATION LETTER

Dear Author,

Nazatul Syima Mohd Nasir

Center for Language Studies and Generic Development, Universiti Malaysia Kelantan.

Warm Greetings!

It's a great pleasure to inform you that, after the peer review process, your article entitled, "**WRITING AND FEEDBACK**" has been accepted and confirmed to be published as one of the chapters in a book, "ISU-ISU SEMASA DALAM BIDANG SAINS SOSIAL" by Penerbit UMK. The book will tentatively be published at the end of this year.

Thank you for your submission.

Warm Regards,

Dr. Amaal Fadhlini Mohamed
Chief Editor
ISU-ISU SEMASA DALAM BIDANG SAINS SOSIAL
Universiti Malaysia Kelantan

WRITING AND FEEDBACK

Nazatul Syima Mohd Nasir

Center for Language Studies and Generic Development

Corresponding email: syima.mn@umk.edu.my

Reasons for Providing Teachers' Feedback

In the teaching of writing in a second language, one important aspect from the side of the teacher that cannot be ignored is giving feedback to the written text produced by students. According to Straub (2001), good instructor feedback involves local setting, to be worked out as per the requests of specific conditions. Students also rely on teachers to be given feedback on their writing. According to a study conducted by Zhao (2010), the findings suggested that the learners used more teacher feedback than peer feedback in their drafts and it also triggered more revisions from the side of the students. This is also supported by a study conducted by Richardson (2001), almost half of the participants in the study share the conviction that instructors' critiques demonstrates right method, and amendments in this manner turns into a push to make writing right. According to Sommers, as cited in Straub (2001), effective composed analysis involves moving students back onto the disorder of revisions and , realizing how to communicate with others. Celce-Murcia (2001) concludes that written feedback gives learners a sense of their progress and indicates where they need to focus their attention for improvement. According to Ferris (1997), written feedback and revision are valuable pedagogical tools. It is clear that providing written responses on students' writing is important not only for improvement of the students' writing but also a written interaction between teachers and students. Language teachers also need to be careful in giving written feedback to students' writing in the hope that their feedback will be meaningful for students and help them to improve their writing skills thus becoming efficient writers.

Many students actually request and expect teachers to give written feedback to their writing as they depend on their teachers' comments to edit their work and make necessary corrections. According to a research done by Ashwell (2000), when teachers were asked about factors that influenced the error feedback, 68% of them said it was 'student request', and 93% of them said it was their thoughts of students' needs. It is not hard to comprehend why students demand is one significant factor as research has exhibited that students like to have direct input. English as a Second Language (ESL) students overwhelmingly value teacher feedback (Curtis, 1997; Nelson & Carson, 1998; Paulus 1999). Moreover, according to research conducted by Straub (2001), the more he delved into the students' ideas and

created those as partners in the investigation of the subject, the more likely his comments would bring student to envision their writing as part of a larger classroom discussion, and learn something about writing and reading. According to McClay & Peterson (2010), giving input are important practices as these practices are affected by instructors' perspectives on what establishes great composition.

Teachers have many reasons for providing written feedback to students' writing as they think that feedback is beneficial for the students. According to a research conducted by Lee (2003), the teachers in the investigation provided some information about the fundamental reason for giving composed input and some of the main answers were to increase student awareness of errors, to help students improve their writing, to give students encouragement, to help students reflect on their writing, to help students locate their errors, and for students' long-term benefits. This is supported by a research done by Ashwell (2000), as the teachers in the study believe that giving specific sorts of criticism encourages their students to improve the effects of specific bit of writing. The result of this study also showed that comparisons including the control group indicated that giving feedback help students to improve the formal accuracy of their writing more than if they received no feedback. Moreover, according to a research done by McClay & Peterson (2010), that most of involved instructors saw that their input had impacted students' corrections of their composition and numerous instructors communicated a view that the broad measure of time that educators dedicate to composing remarks gave proof of the amount they thought about their students as writers.

Teachers' feedback is essential in a second language process writing class which involves few steps in order to come out with the final product of the writing. The process writing approach involves students writing few drafts and also given feedback usually by the writing teachers, to improve in their next drafts. According to Kroll (2001), as cited in Williams (2001), teachers' feedback on students' drafts is one of the two important components to any writing course with the other being the assignments the students are given. Written feedback given by ESL teachers is meant to help ESL students to improve in their writing to the point that they are able to produce writing product with minimal errors and maximum clarity. Many teachers have started providing written comments on students' initial drafts and offering recommendations for the further development of the final drafts.

Methods of Teachers' Feedback

There are a number of methods and techniques that writing teacher may apply when providing written feedback to their students' writing. Hence, teachers need to use appropriate methods and techniques that are most suitable to the needs and contexts of their students' writing. According to Hyland (1990), teachers should discover methods for amending papers which both urge students to consider what they have done and lead them to improve it. He suggests that teacher could provide "interactive feedback", one that would call in students to act on feedback. Hyland (1990) proposes two interactive feedback styles that will encourage students to return to their work after it has been assessed. One is minimal marking, where active correction is done by the students and the other one is tape commentary, which is meant for more detail, natural and informative remarks while increasing teacher-students rapport. According to Anson (2001), the simplest and most common feedback to error is the simple identification of error such as circles, check marks, and quick glosses. Moreover, many students take criticism of their writing as critics of themselves and their values. Most teachers who grade student's compositions by measuring students' writing against an ideal model of good writing may tend to have too many negative comments. Furthermore, teachers' comments should also encourage and motivate students in positive ways. According to Sperling and Freedman, as cited in Murphy (2000), they found that mismatches occurred in participants' understanding of the meaning of teacher comments. In the interaction they studied, the teacher intended his comments to encourage the student to think critically about her writing and to suggest alternative ideas or language, but the student interpreted the comments as directives to change faults or errors.

Students need to be complimented about what they have done effectively, and need to know that they are improving. Through positive feedbacks and complements given by teacher on their papers, students are more motivated to edit their work and reassess their writing. This is supported by a research done by Ferris (1997), as he stated that Harmer (2004), stated that it is a smart thought to record what we believe is acceptable in the students' work. Nobody acknowledges empty feedback; however consolation is critical at this stage. According Zak & Dragga, as cited in Straub (2001), there were some arguments that teachers should devote their comments exclusively to praise, suggesting that praiseworthy response improves students' attitudes about writing and result in more writing than traditional red-ink comments. According Harmer (2004), giving feedback to students' work and remedying it possibly gets valuable if the students can accomplish something with this input. This may just be the encouragement they receive from an enthusiastic teacher – encouragement that spurs them on. At the point when educators return amended work to their students, they ought to guarantee that the students do not quickly place in the on side, with just a look at the evaluation and parts of the mistakes. Great adjustment strategies incorporate guaranteeing that the students comprehend what the errors are and how they can be amended. Therefore,

compliments and praises about the good aspects of students' writing will lead to positive effects of teachers' written feedback to help improve students' writing. McClay & Peterson (2010) also stated in his research that upgrading students' inspiration and confidence as writers was a fundamental objective in the teachers' comments. The 216 teachers in the study believe that positive motivations are key elements of students' improving in writing.

Some language teachers are not sure on what aspects they need to provide written feedback on their students' writing and what type of errors are to be given more attention to. Richardson (2001) conducted a study to investigate the hypothesis that more salient error feedback would have a significant effect in improving students' overall writing quality. Salience of feedback here refers to how much information the teacher provides in his or her written comments. The result suggests that highly detailed feedback in form may not be worth the teachers' time and effort. Zamel, as cited in Ashwell (2000), recommended teachers to give content feedback on early draft and form feedback on later drafts. However, Ferris (1997) concluded that giving form and content feedback simultaneously does not deleteriously affect student admittedly imperfect text, every thought or impression must be sorted out and passed through a kind of 'instructional filter' as the filter translates a mass of reader response into instructional language designed to help the writes recognize certain rhetorical or linguistic principles, or to inspire insightful revisions.

Detailed and lengthy comments are more helpful for students to make improvement in their writing compared to general comments given by teachers. This is supported by Ferris (1997), as longer remarks and those which were content explicit were related with significant changes more than were shorter, general remarks. Though remarks of all lengths seemed to impact positive changes, corrections would in general improve bit by bit as the remarks got longer. As the comments given are longer and detailed, these teachers' comments become more comprehensive. According to a researcher done by Lee (2003), the result show that the majority of the teachers performed comprehensive marking compared to selective marking and teacher preferred to mark all students' errors. However, the quality of feedback given by teachers is important for students to make improvements. This is supported by a study conducted by Parr & Timperley (2010), as there was a noteworthy relationship shown between the quality score for instructor input and the normal degree of writing scores. The more able a teacher was to provide the type of quality feedback to writing required in the context of assessment for learning, the greater the progress of his or her students in writing.

Furthermore, Johnstone (1990) proposes another teacher response technique which attempts to understand the writer's problems and intentions, a student self-monitoring technique which permits

students more command over the comments they get. Writers are given the option of feedback they want by stating in their paper one or more of three options such as write back/respond, edit, and/or answer a specific question about the piece. Writing feedback is given to students within 24 hours so that writers do not lose ownership of their work. Johnstone's techniques take into account to some extent students' preferences and needs when teachers provide written feedback. There are several advantages of this technique for both students and teachers. First of all, self-checking offers students the chance to add to a discourse concerning the content. Secondly, self-checking likewise urges students to look fundamentally at their composition, and by doing so accept accountability for what they compose.

Students' Reactions to Feedback

In a study conducted by Ferris (1997), it was found out that most of the students involved in the study did not actually reread their paper and attended to teacher comments as they claimed to have. Cohen's study showed that only 47% of them read all the teacher's written comments, 34% most of the comments, and 17% some of the written comments. There are many possibilities which entail the findings mentioned earlier. One of it is probably because students could be confused or did not understand the teacher's comments. Moreover, Ferris (1997), adds that learners remain uncertain about what to do with the teachers' comments and how to incorporate them in their own revision processes. Another possibility is that the comments given by the teacher are simply too long or teachers use remarks that do not encourage students to read and edit their writing. Lynch & Klemans (1978) pointed out that written comments given by second language teachers should be detailed and encouraging, rather than sarcastic. Sommers (1982) agrees that supportive written feedback does not have to be lengthy. Therefore, the students will not take the risk of correcting the errors pointed by the teachers and again receive another sarcastic remark. Sommers (1982) add that students may just feel afraid to take the risk when receiving their essays and therefore retain the errors identified by teachers.

Also, students are likely to have more positive attitudes when they are praised by their teachers on their writing. Researchers have called on teachers to balance their criticism with praise or at least to note something positive on every paper. According Zak & Dragga, as cited in Straub (2001), there were some arguments that teachers should devote their comments exclusively to praise, suggesting that praiseworthy response improves students' attitudes about writing and result in more writing than traditional red-ink comments. Other than that, students are more likely to refer to teachers' comments than others' comments when editing their work and making necessary corrections. This is supported by Zhao (2010), as the priority given to teacher feedback is explained by learners' affective preference for teacher feedback over peer feedback. Also, according to a research done by McClay & Peterson (2010), the participating teachers' comments were directed toward sustaining students' self-confidence as

writers. Teachers in the study were also particularly concerned about the effects of comments on students' confidence and they also have desire to provide encouraging feedback to sustain students' motivation and sense of ownership to their writing.

References

- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method?. *Journal of second language writing*, 9(3), 227-257.
- Anson, C. M. (2000). Response and the social construction of error. *Assessing Writing*, 7(1), 5-21.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). 36 Discourse Analysis and Language Teaching. *The handbook of discourse analysis*, 707.
- Ferris, D. R. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *Tesol Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.
- Harmer, J. (2004). *How to teach writing*. Pearson Education India.
- Hyland, K. (1990). Providing productive feedback.
- Lee, I. (2003). L2 writing teachers' perspectives, practices and problems regarding error feedback. *Assessing Writing*, 8(3), 216-237.
- Lynch, C & Klemans, P. (1978). *Evaluating our Evaluation*. Routledge.
- Johnston, B. (1982). Non-judgmental responses to students' writing. *The English Journal*, 71(4), 50-53.
- Murphy, S. (2001). A sociocultural perspective on teacher response: Is there a student in the room?. *Assessing Writing*, 7(1), 79-90.
- Parr, J. M., & Timperley, H. S. (2010). Feedback to writing, assessment for teaching and learning and student progress. *Assessing writing*, 15(2), 68-85.
- Peterson, S. S., & McClay, J. (2010). Assessing and providing feedback for student writing in Canadian classrooms. *Assessing Writing*, 15(2), 86-99.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge university press.
- Richardson, S. (2001). Students' conditioned response to teachers' response: portfolio proponents, take note!. *Assessing Writing*, 7(2), 117-141.

- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. *College composition and communication*, 33(2), 148-156.
- Straub, R. (2001). Students' reactions to teacher comments: An exploratory study. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 91-119.
- Williams, J. (2001). Undergraduate second language writers in the writing center. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 73-91.
- Zhao, H. (2010). Investigating learners' use and understanding of peer and teacher feedback on writing: A comparative study in a Chinese English writing classroom. *Assessing writing*, 15(1), 3-17.