

Chapter Four

Finding and Discussion

This chapter presents the interview result about the teachers' perception on the study of teachers' feedback on students' writing at EED of UMY. All interview results were divided into five categories, those categories are: 1) the roles of teachers' written feedback in students' writing, 2) the components affected by teachers' written feedback, 3) the types of teachers' written feedback applied, 4) the obstacles in providing written feedback, and 5) the strategies to encounter the obstacles. Each category was discussed on the following discussion together with the quotes of the interview and the interpretation of the quotes. Those categories were presented to answer the two research questions in this research. The categories number 1, 2 and 3 were digging up to answer the research question number one which is about the teachers' attitude in delivering teachers' feedback. Meanwhile the categories number 4 and 5 were presented to answer research question number two which was about the teachers' obstacles and strategies to solve the obstacles in providing written feedback to their students.

Research Question 1: Teachers' Attitude toward Their Own Feedback in Students' Writing

The researcher had gathered the data from the participants of this research. There are three categories explained to answer the first research question. Those three categories were served to know about the EED of UMY teachers' attitude toward their own feedback in students' writing. Those three categories are category 1 which discussed about the roles of their feedback in students' writing,

category 2 which related to the components the teachers paid attention to and the last category 3 which discussed about the types of teachers' written feedback that are mostly provided by the EED of UMY's teachers.

The roles of teachers' written feedback in students' writing. In the beginning of the interview, the researcher asked the participants about the roles of teachers' written feedback in students' writing. The data gathered about the roles of teachers' written feedback was used to answer the first research question about teachers' attitude on their written feedback. All participants agreed that teachers' written feedback gave positive roles to students' writing. It shows that teachers of EED of UMY had positive attitude toward teachers' written feedback in term of the positive roles of their written feedback to students' writing.

Finding 1. Teachers' written feedback provided input in students' writing. All the participants stated that teachers' written feedback gave input to the students' writing.

There are various roles of teachers' written feedback, first of all teachers' feedback gave input to their writing. Thus input could be in a form of grammar or flow of idea. ... The role was also to build students' skill in writing" (Participant 1, 2016).

It was supported by the second participant who stated "Written feedback was done to correct the wrong grammar or spelling used in order to let them know and finally make them learn because they get input from my written feedback" (Participant 2, 2016).

Last, the third participant also conveyed the same idea about the role of the teachers' written feedback as an input to students' writing "In my point of view, by teachers' written feedback, students' will receive some input for their writing quality enhancement" (Participant 3, 2016).

Accordingly, Maroof, Yamat and Li (2011) briefly state that teachers' feedback is the major input and resources that can be used by the students in conducting some improvements on their writing by doing revision on the errors made. Rahimi and Sobhani (2015) supported that teachers' written feedback consist some input both positive and negative and those input were beneficial to the students' enhancement in writing. Based on those statements, it could be indicated that teachers' written feedback gave students' input that led them to do some corrections and brought them to the improvement on their writing.

Finding 2. Teachers' written feedback motivated students to perform better in writing. The two of three participants agreed that teachers' written feedback gave their students motivation to write better than previously. It could be seen on the interview result by the statement of the first and second participant:

The first participant argued that the feedback especially positive feedback gave students motivation through the positive comment given by the teachers.

I gave not only negative feedback but also positive feedback in order to encourage and motivate them. For example, they have made a good paragraph, then I will give feedback "Well done, "Good job" or "I like this

paragraph”, something like that. So it gave not only input but also motivation to the students to write (Participant 1, 2016).

The second participant stated that teachers’ written feedback made students’ feel valued. Because the students felt valued, their motivation in writing was increase. The casual language used in teachers’ written feedback encourage the students’ became more open to ask what need to be improved on their writing.

Students feel valued. Imagine that the students are asked to write the whole piece of paper but teacher does not give feedback on their writing. It will make them doubt whether teacher reads their work or not. Different from while the teacher put feedback on students’ writing, it will make the students feel valued. If we do not put any feedback on their writing it will discourage them while we ask them write again later. ... It encourages them to come and ask me. They are more enthusiastic by reading feedback with casual language rather than by giving mark on it (Participant 2, 2016).

Hence, based on the participants’ answered, it could be concluded that the teachers’ written feedback gave students motivation to perform better in writing. It was showed by the students who felt motivated and valued after their teachers gave them written feedback. The three participants’ statement was sustained by Silver and Lee (2007) who state that some types of teachers’ written feedback encourage the students to motivate them to perform better on their next writing. Additionally, teachers’ written feedback not only provided valuable information to the students’ about the quality of their writing but also gave them motivation to

presented a better performance on writing rather than the previous one (Elshirbini & Elashri, 2013).

Finding 3. Teachers' written feedback helped students' to revise and reduce their errors in writing. The three participants agreed that some input given were able to correct and reduce students' error in writing and finally improved students writing. The improvement could be in a form of grammar, spelling and content of students' writing

.... In grammar, they become more aware while writing next time, so teachers' written feedback is used to make correction (Participant 1, 2016)

Sometimes, students did not realize that they make some error on their grammar, spelling and organization. By written feedback, they will know their errors. For example, in writing essay or quiz, sometimes it needed some correction so I gave written feedback, "your writing is ..."
(Participant 2, 2016).

Teachers' written feedback is able to reduce the students' error. While the students' read my feedback, I hope they can understand in what side they make error and then they can make some corrections on it (Participant 3, 2016).

The written notes, request clarifications, and comment on written feedback given by the teachers encouraged students to do revisions and resulted to writing improvement on the students writing (Razali & Jupri, 2014). Furthermore, according to Grami (2005) teachers' written feedback was believed to help

students to improve their accuracy and fluency in writing. Hence, the teachers' written comment, correction and notes on students' writing as a form of feedback were considered to be valuable in helping students to reduce their errors in writing.

The components in which the teachers paid attention to in providing written feedback. During the flow of the interview process, the participants of this research answered some important points regarding some components they focused on while providing written feedback to students' writing. Based on the data result, in providing written feedback, the EED of UMY's teachers paid attention to some components which were grammar, content and organization of idea, spelling, vocabularies, mechanics and punctuation.

The input could be in a form of grammar or flow of idea (Participant 1, 2016).

Sometimes, students do not realize that they do some error on their grammar, spelling and organization. By written feedback, they will know their errors (Participant 2, 2016).

First of all, the very basic one, I will give feedback on mechanics or the punctuation such as full stop, comma, capital letter and lower case, something like that. Second, sometimes it is related to the grammar and sentence structure. The third is the input on the organization of idea (Participant 3, 2016).

Moreover, while the researcher asked about the effect of teachers' written feedback to the students' writing, all participants answered positive indications. All participants agreed that after the students were given written feedback throughout the writing process, students' writing become more systematic. Nevertheless, the first participant was doubt about the effect of her written feedback on students' grammar.

I thought their writing become more systematic, so students also learnt from thus feedback. For example, before the feedback was given, one paragraph had more than one main idea. However, after the feedback was given, the idea delivered on their writing was more systematic. Nevertheless, actually the correction in grammar was still difficult. It was still needed more time to fix the grammar error by written feedback. I could not say the grammar was improving but it can be seen that their writing was better than the first draft. What are going to be delivered became clearer, the paragraph became more systematic and every paragraph had main idea and did not over context (Participant 1, 2016).

There are a lot. Although some of them put aside, most of them learnt. For example, in the beginning of the semester they still used simple sentence only, still did some grammar error, still not to be consistent with the use of tenses. In the middle of the semester, their writing had been shaped. From the content aspect when they were asked to retell at the first semester they just write with 3 or 4 sentences. But after some feedback were given "would you please elaborate more.", their writing was more than 4

sentences and more organize. So from the very beginning of the class, their writing development became better (Participant 2, 2016).

At least, they made it better. For me, reading students' writing for the second time was more comprehensible, although the students did not make change on their writing based on my feedback 100% in their first or second drafts (Participant 3, 2016).

Based on those statements, it could be seen that according to the teachers' perception, teachers' written feedback gave positive effect to the students' writing in terms of making the students' writing become better and more systematic. According to Sträub (1997) as cited in Srichanyachon (2012) affirm that students felt feedback on both global issues (i.e., content, organization, and purpose) and local ones (i.e., sentence structure, word choice, and grammar) were helpful for their writing". Furthermore, in the process writing, teachers' written feedback was able to encourage the students to enhance their writing become more systematic in every draft they did both in grammar and organization of idea (Kafri, 2003).

However, the researcher of this research did not make further examination about the real effect of teachers' feedback on students' writing which might be seen through comparing students' writing. In fact, the researcher just dug up the effect of written feedback based on the teachers' perception only. Here, it was clear that teachers' of EED of UMY had positive perception about the effect of their written feedback. They assumed that written feedback delivered affected positively both in language and content accuracy.

The types of teachers' written feedback. In the next step of interview, the participants were asked about the types of teachers' written feedback that were mostly delivered to their students. There were five types of written feedback that the researcher focused on in this research. Those five types of written feedback were categorized into two categories based on the technique or method of delivering feedback and the components the teachers' focused on in delivering feedback. The types of written feedback which included the components that the teachers focused on in delivering written feedback were form-focused feedback, content-based feedback, and integrated feedback. The types of written feedback which included the techniques of delivering feedback were direct feedback and indirect feedback.

Based on the data gathered, the types of written feedback existed among form-focused feedback, content-based feedback and integrated feedback was integrated feedback. Besides, between direct and indirect feedback, the feedback that was mostly applied was indirect feedback. Moreover, the answer of the participants of this research indicated that there were emerging types of teachers' written feedback applied by EED of UMYs' teachers.

Finding 1. Integrated feedback became the feedback that was mostly applied by the teachers of EED of UMY among the types of feedback included the components focused. The data showed that the feedback that mostly applied among the form-focused feedback, content-based feedback and integrated feedback was integrated feedback. However, all participants indicated that each course had different focuses on the feedback given although both of the

components (grammar and content) were corrected. So, the feedback given was in all components both grammar and content but the focus depended on the appropriateness of each courses studied. The statements of the participants were written below:

For me, there were several drafts while the students wrote, for the first draft I thought the flow of idea was important to be given feedback such as the main idea, coherent and cohesion, so they became my first priority. After it seemed to be better, then I focused on correcting the grammatical error made by the students. The most important thing was what they were going to deliver had already been on their writing. Grammar is the last except I really could not understand what they were going to explain on their writing (Participant 1, 2016).

It depended on whether it was quiz or project / paper. In quiz I will be more focused on the content of their answer and the grammar used. Do they answer the question with the correct answer or not. Second, I also focused on their grammar, spelling and word choice. In paper, because it has more number of the words and more assessment components, so there are many components that I should focus on such as on the organization, grammar, and also the content. From the grammar aspect, I focus not only on the correct or wrong answer but also on the simple, complex and compound sentences used on their writing (Participant 2, 2016)

For writing, all are important, but because they were still in the 2nd semester and I taught the Reading and Writing for Career Development class, mechanic was important for them. Second, how to express their thinking into written expression or the idea was also important and the right word choice or vocabulary was also included. Because *skripsi* was related to their academic research, my focus was not merely on the mechanics because students have been already in the 7th and 8th semester, otherwise, on the sensible idea. Their idea was related to their logical arguments and also the sentences structure and the grammar. It was because good idea without good delivery and understandable language used was failed (Participant 3, 2016).

The participants' statements are in line with Park (2006) who stated that although focusing on one aspect between correcting the grammar or content, both grammar and content need to be corrected. Moreover, teachers are needed to provide feedback both in the grammar accuracy and content quality because both are important in enhancing students' writing. That is why it is essential to apply integrated feedback for the better enrichment of students' writing (Zaman & Azad, 2012). Based on these statements, the participants of this research had positive attitude about the written feedback both in grammar and in content. Beside that, they agreed that although they delivered the integrated written feedback which was the feedback that focused both in grammar and in content, each of the teachers had their own focus either on grammars or content depending on what courses they taught.

Finding 2. In the types of the technique of delivering written feedback, indirect feedback was mostly provided by the teachers of EED of UMY rather than direct feedback. When the participants were asked about how to indicate the error, two of three participants explained that they just indicated the error without providing the correct form of those errors. Those two participants believed that by only indicating the error without providing the correct form, the indirect feedback encourage students to do self-correction and make students became active to learn independently.

... For example, “They should write “The writer explains ...” but they just write “The writer explain ...”, then I did not provide the correct answer on my feedback directly but I wrote “Please check this grammar.” I just indicated the error happened. It is aimed at letting them learn again. Then, for the flow of idea, I usually write “what do you mean is this?” or I write “what are the main idea of this paragraph?” It was done to make the students not only revise their writing but also relearn, not only relearn about the grammar but also relearn about how did actually make a good writing and a good paragraph (Participant 1, 2016).

Because feedback on the paper was not given once and then finish, in the first draft I gave clear explanation. For example “This sentence does not have any verb.”, but I did not give the verb needed on that sentence (Participant 3, 2016).

The researcher also found that the types of indirect feedback applied by the EED of UMY's teachers were coded feedback, un-coded feedback and elicitation feedback

Coded feedback. Other result of the interview process also showed that in delivering indirect feedback, the teachers used coded and un-coded feedback to the students' writing. It was seen by the participant 2 and 3 who stated:

If the errors is in the passive or active sentences then I just give mark "p" for passive and "a" for active, but I do not give the formula of active and passive sentence (Participant 3, 2016).

The statement was in line with the Kaweera and Usaha (2008)'s statement about code feedback that code feedback was an error identification in which the correctin was in a form of codes of error types. The definitions and examples of errors were also provided while a teacher gave coded feedback to the students. The example of coded feedback was:

Siti eat banana every morning.

V

The word "eat" was underlined and be given a code V for verb in order to indicate an error occurred on thus utterance.

Un-coded feedback. While the second participant indicated that the un-coded feedback was also given at EED of UMY.

For example, in the use of verb past tense, in the text narrative they are asked to retell and sometimes they forget about “bring” that should be “brought” or “think” that should be “thought”. Then I just circling the verb (Participant 2, 2016)

Un-coded feedback referred to the error location. In un-coded feedback, the teacher was just locating an error by circling it, underlining it, highlighting it, or putting a checkmark in the margin (Kaweera & usaha, 2008).

Elicitation. Last, the elicitation feedback was also used by the teachers of EED of UMY while delivering feedback. It was based on the interview result of the first and the second participants of this research.

For example, “They should write “The writer explains ...” but they just write “The writer explain ...”, then I do not provide the correct answer on my feedback directly but I will write “Please check this grammar.”. Then, for the flow of idea, I usually write “what do you mean is this?” or I write “what are the main idea of this paragraph?”. (Participant 1, 2016).

For example, in writing essay or quiz, sometimes it needs some correction so I give written feedback, “your writing is (...)”. If there is two sentences with the same subject, I will circle the subject and then I will write “the student who (...)” (Participant 2, 2016).

The two participants indicated that they applied elicitation feedback. Elicitation feedback was when the teacher elicits the correct form directly from the students’ writing by writing questions such as “How to say it in English? Or by writing

down the uncomplete utterance to be completed such as "It's a....". (Saniei, A, 2013).

It showed that the participant had a positive perception on indirect feedback. It could be seen by their answer that they preferred to just indicating the error without providing the right answer in order to let the students learn again from the feedback given and to make them learn about their error made. The two of participants' statements were in line with Srichanyachon (2012) statement who affirmed that indirect feedback encouraged students to do self- correction and to be independent learner who actively learn by themselves through the feedback given. In contrast, the second participant was not only indicating the error but also providing the correct answer.

I also provide the correct answer, but actually it depends. In the first correction, I provide the correct answer. For example, in the use of verb past tense, in the text narrative they are asked to retell and sometimes they forget about "bring" that should be "brought" or "think" that should be "thought". Then I just circle the verb, I put the correct answer and I give some notes there "Come on, improve the use of verb past tense, how to use verb 1 and verb 2." (Participant 2, 2016).

The second participant had different ways of delivering feedback in which she was not only indicating the error but also providing the answer. However, she stated that she just provided the answer for the first answer. The second error with the same answer was only indicated the error without providing the answer.

It was done to make students realize their error then could make the revision on the other same error.

... The students can learn, so when they make correction, they not only change the wrong into right one but also learn from the error (Participant 2, 2016).

The second participant's statement was supported by Ellis (2009) who affirmed that direct feedback was principally helpful for the students who were difficult to do self-correction because it provided the information about their inaccuracies.

Finding 3. The emerging types of written feedback which existed at EED of UMY. In addition the integrated and indirect feedbacks which were mostly used by the teachers of EED of UMY in providing feedback on students' writing, there were also emerging types of written feedback applied by EED of UMY's teachers. There were negative and positive feedback which were mostly mentioned by the three participants of this research while the interview was conducted.

Positive and negative feedback. The answer of two participants on this research pointed out that they applied positive and negative feedback in this research.

I gave not only negative feedback but also positive feedback in order to encourage and motivate them. For example, they have made a good paragraph, then I gave feedback "Well done, "Good job" or "I like this paragraph", something like that (Participant 1, 2016).

I just getting used to not only give negative feedback but also the positive one. When the students have made a good writing, I also should appreciate and say “Your work is excellent.” (Participant 2, 2016).

According to Silver and Lee (2007) positive feedback is the feedback that was not only focus on students’ negative aspect but also focus on appreciating students’ positive aspect in writing. While positive feedback signposted that students’ utterance on their writing was correct (Zaman & Azad, 2012). In comparison, negative feedback is “signals, in one way or another, that the learners’ utterance [or writing] lacks veracity or is linguistically deviant. In other words, it is corrective in intent” (Ellis, 2009, p.3).

Research Question 2: The Teachers’ Obstacles and Strategies to Encounter the Obstacles.

The result of the data gathered was also used to answer the second research question about the obstacles and strategies to solve the obstacles. There were two categories that the researcher made in order to answer this research question. They were category 4 and category 5. Category 4 was about the obstacles faced by EED of UMY’s teachers. Category 5 was about the strategies to encounter the obstacles. The detailed explanations were presented below:

The obstacles in providing written feedback. In the last session of the interview, the researcher asked the participants about their obstacle while providing written feedback to their students’ writing. Based on the interview

result, it could be known that there were two major obstacles faced by the EED of UMY's teachers in providing feedback to students' writing.

Providing meaningful feedback. The first obstacle was how to provide the meaningful feedback to their students. Meaningful here meant providing written feedback that were not too much, understandable and did not discourage students while reading the feedback given so the feedback could be meaningful and helpful for students writing quality enhancement.

... Nevertheless, it is difficult to refrain from giving feedback to the whole errors made by students while seeing the unclear organization of idea and the unsystematic grammar. The point is how to deliver feedback that do not make the students feel discouraged and demotivated to write again later (Participant 1, 2016).

The students' with the very basic knowledge, on their writing will be a lot of correction. Sometimes I worry about making them demotivated with my correction and feedback on their writing (Participant 2, 2016).

I have to formulate the necessary feedback to make students understand what I mean on my feedback and how to not make them confused while reading my comment (Participant 3, 2016).

Those all participants showed about actually it was hard to provide appropriate feedback to students, so the teachers should be really careful in formulating the feedback in order to not make their students confused and feel demotivated while reading their feedback. According to Williams (2003) mostly

the written feedback to students' writing were delivered inconsistently, unclearly and overemphasizes the negative side of students' writing. Gordon argued that that kinds of condition might make the students became in a condition of confusion, frustration and neglect of the comments. Leki (1990) as cited in Williams (2003) there were three possible reactions of students while they received inappropriate teachers' written feedback. "The students may not read the annotations at all, may read them but not understand them, or may understand them but not know how to respond to them" (p.1).

Time consuming. The two participants of the research agreed that providing written feedback was time consuming.

Sometimes I needed to spend more time to give written feedback because there are so many to be read and to be written (Participant 1, 2016).

... , because the limitation of the time, so I just focus on the things that need to be corrected (Participant 2, 2016).

The participants' statement about the time obstacle was supported by Shammari (2011) who state that it took a long time because written feedback should be delivered to each student on their each work. Each student's writing had each own problem, so the teachers should communicate personally with each students' writing. In a class there were many students and the teachers should correct their writing one by one through their written comment and it took much time (Zaman & Azad, 2012).

The strategies to encounter the obstacles. Together with the obstacles the participants said during the interview, they also conveyed their own strategies to solve those problems. There were three major strategies in encounter the two obstacles faced by the EED of UMY's teachers. There were focused on the certain correction to be corrected, made assessment rubric and focused not only in correcting students' error but also appreciating students' good side of writing.

Focusing on the certain error to be corrected. The first strategy applied was focus on the certain error to be corrected. This strategy was done to make the feedback given was not overwhelming both for the teachers and the students. If the feedback given was not overwhelming and did not discourage students in receiving the feedback given, then the feedback could be beneficial and meaningful to the students in doing some enhancement in their writing. Additionally, focusing on the certain error to be corrected was also applied in order to shorten the time.

Sometimes to solve the obstacle I focus on the certain correction only, so I do not give all feedback at once. I never give feedback on grammar and content together in one time because it is overwhelming both for me and for my students. What I do is sometimes I give feedback in turns. And I also apply this method in delivering feedback in order to shorten the time. Beside that I also make the assessment rubric to accelerate the correction, so not all part is commented although I willing to comment all part but I make some focus while giving written (Participant 1, 2016).

Making assessment rubric. The same with the first strategy mentioned, the EED of UMY's teachers also made assessment rubric with the purpose of keeping the feedback delivered was not overwhelming, because the overwhelming feedback delivered could make the students discourage. Moreover, making assessment rubric was also applied in order to shorten the time.

Beside that I also make the assessment rubric to accelerate the correction, so not all part is commented although I am willing to comment all part but I make some focus while giving written feedback. (Participant 1, 2016)

Giving not only negative but also positive feedback. To make the students did not feel discourage, the EED of UMY's teachers focus not only on correcting the students' error but also on appreciating the students good side of their writing by giving appreciation through positive feedback.

I just getting used to not only give negative feedback but also the positive one. ... It took time when I made notes and provide the correct answer for the whole error with the same indication. That was why I just provided the correct answer in the first error happened. (Participant 2, 2016)

The strategies applied by the EED of UMY's teachers were mostly focused on the students' motivation in writing. It was in line with Razali and Jupri (2014) affirm that teachers' highlight on students' written work help the students to be better motivated in doing some adjustments and corrections on their writing if the teacher provide their feedback suitably and pleasantly.

From the explanations, it could be summed up that to encounter the time consuming problem in providing written feedback, the EED of UMY's teachers applied two strategies which were focused on the certain error only to be corrected and made assessment rubric in order to specify the correction. By those two strategies, the feedback delivered could be specific and finally could be shorten the time. However, to encounter another obstacle about how to provide the meaningful feedback, the EED of UMY's teachers applied all the strategies which were focused on the certain error only to be corrected, made assessment rubric in order to specify the correction and gave not only positive but also negative feedback. By those strategies, the feedback given could be meaningful because did not overwhelming and did not discourage students' motivation.