

**JIMMA UNIVERSITY**



**COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE  
EFFECT OF TEACHERS' WRITTEN CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK  
ON EFL STUDENTS' PARAGRAPH WRITING ACCURCY,  
FLUENCY AND STUDENTS ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE  
FEEDBACK:**

**'JIREEN' SECONDARY SCHOOL IN FOCUS**

**BY**

**HINDI JEMAL**

**FEBRUARY 2021**

**JIMMA, ETHIOPIA**

**Effect of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students'  
Paragraph Writing Performance and Students Attitude towards the  
Feedback: 'Jireen' Secondary School in Focus**

**By  
Hindi Jemal**

**Department of English Language and Literature  
College of Social Sciences and Humanities  
Jimma University**

**Advisors**

**Dr. Tewodros Zeleke (Principal Advisor)**

**Dr. Yimam Workneh (Co-advisor)**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Department of English Language and  
Literature in Partial Fulfillment to the Degree of Master of Arts in  
Teaching English as a Foreign Language**

**February 2021  
Jimma, Ethiopia**

## Declaration

I declare that this research “ **Effect of Teachers’ Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students’ Paragraph Writing Accuracy and Fluency and Students’ Attitude Towards the Feedback: ‘Jireen’ Secondary School in Focus** ” is my original work and that all sources which I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of references list.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

### **Conformation and Approval**

_____	_____	_____
<i><b>Principal Advisor’s Name</b></i>	<i><b>Signature</b></i>	<i><b>Date</b></i>

_____	_____	_____
<i><b>Co-advisor’s Name</b></i>	<i><b>Signature</b></i>	<i><b>Date</b></i>

### **Research Evaluators**

_____	_____	_____
<i><b>Examiner’s Name</b></i>	<i><b>Signature</b></i>	<i><b>Date</b></i>

_____	_____	_____
<i><b>Chairperson’s Name</b></i>	<i><b>Signature</b></i>	<i><b>Date</b></i>

## **Acknowledgments**

First of all, I would like to thank my Almighty Allah (SW) for helping me complete this research work. Next, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my major advisor Dr. Tewodros Zeleke and Co. advisor Dr. Yimam Workneh, for their constructive comments, professional guidance, continuous encouragement, suggestion, with quick response within the time frame designed for this work. Without their unreserved effort, this research work could not get its present shape. To speak truly, they were the best advisors who put a big insight to my future life.

My special thanks also go to my beloved husband Kedir Jemal for his financial, technical, moral, psychological and material support.

I also extend my deepest gratitude to my best sisters Hindia Abdella, Kemeria Zakir, and Masho Ligdi for their appreciation and encouragement.

My heartfelt gratitude also goes to 'Jireen' Secondary School director, vice director, English Language teachers and students for their cooperation and sacrifice in providing me with the necessary data for this study.

## **Abstract**

The purpose of the study was to examine the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL grade 12 students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback with reference to 'Jireen' high school. To achieve this objective, quasi experimental and descriptive research design, were used. Pre and post tests were the main instruments used to collect data from the participants and also questionnaire and interview were used in addition to this. Out of twenty sections of grade twelve, two classes were selected by using purposive sampling method. Next to this, the two sections were grouped in to two as control and experimental groups by using the same sampling method. The dependent and independent variables of this study were students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency, students' attitude towards the feedback and teachers' written corrective feedback respectively. To analyze the data, quantitative and qualitative methods (mixed approach) was used. The result of the study revealed that the experimental group students outperformed the control group students. This implies that, teachers' written corrective feedback has positive effect on grade twelve 'Jireen' secondary school students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency. The results from the questionnaire and interview also showed that students have positive attitude towards the feedback. On the basis of the findings, it was recommended that to improve students paragraph writing accuracy and fluency more, EFL teachers have to use mixed teaching method, to keep the balance between accuracy and fluency while teaching their students. Also they have to use mixed approaches. Besides, they should consider learners' attitude towards their feedback as these all can affect their students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency. When these and others added to providing specific, frequent, immediate and clear comments, students' paragraph writing performance would be expected to improve.

## Table of Contents

Contents	Page
.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
List of Tables .....	vi
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	vii
CHAPTER –ONE .....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
<b>1.1 Back- ground of the Study</b> .....	1
<b>1.2 Statement of the Problem</b> .....	4
<b>1.3 Objectives of the Study</b> .....	7
1.3.1 General Objective of the study .....	7
1.3.2 Specific Objectives .....	7
<b>1.4 Research questions and Hypothesis</b> .....	7
1.4.1 Research Questions.....	7
1.4.2 Hypotheses.....	8
<b>1.6 Limitations of the Study</b> .....	8
<b>1.7 Delimitation/ Scope of the Study</b> .....	9
<b>1.8 Definition of Operational Terms</b> .....	9
CHAPTER- TWO .....	11
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE .....	11
<b>2.1 Writing Skill</b> .....	11
<b>2.2. Approaches to Teaching Writing</b> .....	12
2.2.1. Product-oriented approach .....	12
2.2.2 Process-oriented approach.....	14
<b>2.3 Paragraph Writing</b> .....	16
2.3.1 Accuracy and Fluency in Paragraph Writing .....	18
<b>2.4. Definition of feedback</b> .....	26
2.4.1 Different kinds of Feedback on Students writing .....	27
2.4.2 Different Methods of Teachers’ Feedback Provision.....	29
2.4.3The importance of Teachers’ written corrective Feedback.....	30

CHAPTER-THREE.....	35
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....	35
<b>3.1 Research Design</b> .....	35
<b>3.2 Research Variables</b> .....	35
<b>3.3 Sources of Data and Study site</b> .....	36
<b>3.4 Population, Sample and Sampling Procedure.</b> .....	36
<b>3.5 Data Collection Instruments</b> .....	37
3.5.1 Pre-test.....	37
3.5.2 Post-test.....	37
3.5.3 Questionnaire for Students.....	37
3.5.4 Interview for Teachers .....	38
<b>3.6. Material for the Intervention</b> .....	38
3.7 Controlling Mechanisms of Erroneous Result.....	38
3.8 Ethical Consideration .....	39
3.9 Method of Data Analysis.....	40
CHAPTER FOUR .....	40
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	40
4.1 Introduction .....	40
4.2 Participants' Demographic Information .....	41
4.3 Case Processing Summary.....	42
4.4 Results of Pretest and Posttest of Control and Experimental Groups.....	43
4.4.1 Pretest Result of Control and Experimental Groups.....	43
4.4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics of the Pretest .....	43
4.4.1.2 Independent Sample t-test of Pretest .....	44
4.4.2 Posttest Result of Control and Experimental Groups .....	44
4.4.2.1 Descriptive Statistics of Posttest.....	45
4.4.2.2 Independent Sample t-test of Posttest.....	46
4.5 Comparing Both Tests for a Group .....	46
4.5.1 Results of Control Group.....	47
4.5.1.1 Descriptive Statistics .....	47
4.5.1.2 Paired Sample t-test of Control Group .....	48
4.5.2 Results of Experimental Groups.....	48

4.5.2.1 Descriptive Statistics of Experimental Groups.....	49
4.5.2.2 Paired Sample t-test.....	49
4.5 Learners’ Accuracy and Fluency in Paragraph Writing .....	50
4.5.1 Paragraph Writing Accuracy and Fluency before the Intervention .....	50
4.5.2 Paragraph Writing Accuracy and Fluency after the Intervention .....	50
4.5 Results of Students’ Questionnaire .....	52
<b>4.6 Results of Teachers’ Interview</b> .....	53
CHAPTER FIVE .....	55
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	55
<b>5. 2 Summary</b> .....	56
5.3 Conclusions .....	57
5.4 Recommendations .....	58
References .....	59
Appendix- A.....	63
Appendix- B.....	66
Appendix- C.....	67
Appendix- D.....	72
Appendix E .....	75
Appendix F .....	76



List of Tables

<a href="#">Table 3.1 Reliability statistics of test-retest reliability of Pretest and Posttest</a> .....	39
<a href="#">Table 4.1 Demographic information of the sample students</a> .....	42
<a href="#">Table 4.2 Case Processing Summary for Experimental a Control Groups in the pretest and posttest</a> .....	42
<a href="#">Table 4.5 Independent Sample t-test of Pretest</a> .....	44
<a href="#">Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics</a> .....	45
<a href="#">Table 4.7 Independent Sample t-test Posttest</a> .....	46
<a href="#">Table Descriptive statistics of pre and posttests of Control groups</a> .....	47
<a href="#">Table Paired Sample t-test of the pre and posttest of Control Group</a> .....	48
<a href="#">Table Descriptive statistics of experimental group</a> .....	49
<a href="#">Table Paired Sample t-test of Experimental Group</a> .....	49
<a href="#">Table Summary of the two Groups' Result on Accuracy and Fluency in the Pre-test</a> .....	50
<a href="#">Table Summary of the two Groups' Result on Accuracy and Fluency in the Posttest</a> .....	51

## List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

**TWCF:** Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback

**WCF:** Written Corrective Feedback

**EFL:** English as Foreign Language

**FL:** Foreign Language

**ESL:** English as Second Language

**FLT:** Foreign Language Teaching

**TEFL:** Teaching English as Foreign Language

**CG:** Control Group

**EG:** Experimental Group

**N:** Number

**SD:** Standard Deviation

**Min:** Minimum

**Max:** Maximum

# CHAPTER -ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Writing has a recorded history which is above 6000 years. (Lyons, 1968) cited in Ali and Rahnama(2013). Being one of English language skills, writing can be considered as a means for thinking. It is when we write that we can express our feelings, thoughts and ideas. People know more about themselves when they write (Ivanic, 1998). The identity potentially inherent in writing may also play its own role in language learning since it may either restrict or promote the process of language learning. (Gee 1996).

For Boughey (1997), writing cannot be simply acquired naturally; it is usually learnt or culturally transmitted as a set of practices in formal instructional settings or other environments. Boughey further states that writing is the result of the relationship between the writer, the reader, the text and the real life, which are under constant change.

According to O'Malley and Pierce (1996), when learners want to write, they focus on four kinds of knowledge which includes; the knowledge that they have on what they are going to write based on their back ground knowledge, the ability that they have to combine those information together, the other type is the knowledge that they have to make agreement between different types of writing by using different types of punctuation etc. The final point is related to the knowledge the writers should have to use the three above skills according to their order to get the final written text.

From the above expressions, we can understand that writing as one of language skills has almost a long history and serve as a way through which we can reflect what we are. If one is good at writing this can also help him or her to develop language learning skill.

As we can see from the above points, different scholars expressed writing skill in different ways. For instance, for Boughey, writing cannot be acquired naturally without formal learning which is

different from listening and speaking skill. Rather it is acquired through the interaction between the writer, the reader, the text and the real life. On the other hand, O'Malley and Pierce understood writing as the skill which requires four skills from learners to acquire. These four skills are: their knowledge about what they are going to write, the skill to combine those knowledge, the ability to relate the obtained information and lastly the capacity that the writer has to organize the above skills according to their order of importance.

Writing in a second language is challenging, and requires ways to assist learners to develop their writing skill and this has been the main concern for teachers and educational researchers (Polio, 2003). In relation to this, there is also the idea that if errors are not identified and corrected, they can become bad habit and developed in learners writing. One way commonly employed to help students improve their writing (correct their errors in writing) is the provision of feedback. Thus, the help that someone gives to someone else in the process of writing is called *feedback*, and if this feedback is given by teachers it is called teachers' *feedback*. Here the general aim of teachers in giving feedback is to direct and aid students to produce a written work of good quality (Al-Sawalha, 2016; Al-Sawalha & Chow, 2013. Teachers' feedback is one of the most helpful means among the various options available to students to improve their writing ability (Williams & Jasmine, 2003). It is believed that students prefer this feedback most because of the teachers' highest level of proficiency (Hong, 2006; Nugrahenny, 2007) (cited in Sultan H. Alharbi (2016).

Furthermore, in an EFL context in general and in our context of 'Jireen' secondary school in particular where most of the students are low in proficiency, it is the only alternative that feedback from the more proficient teachers is considered to be suitable. Researches by Hyland,( 1998; Liu, 2008) have shown that teachers' feedback can improve the quality of students' writing. For instance, Hyland (1998) conducted a study on six student writers' responses to feedback and the uses of teachers' written feedback for revision in an English proficiency program course. Hyland's results revealed that the students employed the teachers' feedback to make some revisions to increase the quality of their writing.

Providing written corrective feedback for students writing is not enough to improve learners' writing skill as there are also other factors. That is why writing teachers should consider various

important factors before making any effort to give feedback. One such factor is learners' attitudes towards teachers' comments. Writing teachers should take into consideration about their learners' attitudes toward the kinds of the comments teachers give because learners' preferences can affect the usefulness of the provided comments (Amrehin & Nassaji, 2010) and may increase their engagement and motivation (Hamouda, 2011). In addition, writing teachers should not only know what learners perceive to be the most helpful types of comments and the most preferred, but also try to match the two in order to improve learners' motivation, learning, and behavior in class (Ferris, 2003). Hyland (2003) found that the percentage of a teachers' feedback that students incorporated in their revisions varied according to the individual's personal beliefs and preferences toward the teachers' feedback. Therefore, in order to focus the learners' maximum attention on the feedback, it is essential to know their attitude according to which we should match our comment type. There are also some teachers who consider their learners' mistake as crimes and as a result provide negative (discouraging) comments to them. As this also can affect the effectiveness of teachers' feedback, teachers themselves have to change their negative attitude towards their learners' mistakes.

The other point is that, the forms of feedback giving strategies mainly depend on the teachers' use of approaches to delivering the writing lesson. In the product-oriented approach to teaching writing, the feedback strategy used mainly based on teacher-centeredness. One shot correction was made by the teachers. Because of this, teaching and giving feedback have been segregated so that learners have not got chance to improve their writing.

On the other hand, in relation to difficulty of writing, an appropriate approach of teaching writing is a very important issue and process oriented is the appropriate one. In the process oriented approach, writing is viewed as a creative process consisting of a series of stages occurring recursively throughout process and building on one another. It focuses what goes on when learners write and what they can do to help the learners acquire the natural writing process. Writing as a process means that teachers focus more on the process of writing which consist of some stages: pre writing, drafting, revising and editing. Here the importance of giving feedback on students writing is equal with the importance of doing revision and editing the process of writing (Cahyono2002).

As cited in Sultan H. Alharbi (2016), Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) is the best mechanism that used by almost all teachers to provide their students with important guidance which helps their learners in revising their written work. In supporting this, (Ferris, 1997) suggested that teachers written corrective feedback is the most preferred and common form of feedback. So, based on this point it can be considered as an essential instrument to improve students paragraph writing accuracy and fluency.

Accuracy refers to the production of error-free language. It is estimated by considering the percentage of error free clauses (Foster & Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1999; Yuan & Ellis, 2003) and the percentage of correct use of target features (Crookes, 1989; Wigglesworth, 1997). Cited in (Zahed (2017)). On the other hand, fluency refers to the speed of language processing and the general language proficiency in line with keeping coherence using cohesive devices or other strategies. It is estimated by considering the mean length of utterances (Kormos & Dénes, 2004). To this end, to what extent EFL teachers' written corrective feedback affect the students' accuracy and fluency of writing a paragraph needs a deep scrutiny.

## **1.2 Statement of the Problem**

It is believed that second/ foreign language (FL) writing can be expressed through features of complexity, accuracy and fluency (CAF) (Ellis, 2003, 2008; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Freeman, 2009; Skehan, 1998) cited in (Fall & Winter 2017). From this one can understand that for a good performance of paragraph writing, accuracy and fluency are considered as the major requirements. This research also focuses on investigating the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on secondary school EFL students 'paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback. The dependent variables are EFL students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and their attitudes towards the feedback, whereas the independent variable is teachers' written corrective feedback.

Most of the secondary school English language teachers have been heard that their students cannot compose even a single sentence. Alamirew (2005) states not only secondary students but also university students of Ethiopia have great difficulty to organize their ideas in writing. The teaching learning process of writing has been jeopardized because of low level students' writing proficiency (Atkins et al, 1996). Besides, Geremew (1999) says that first year students are

observed getting into demanding effort to express themselves in writing. Most students at secondary school cannot write their paragraphs accurately and fluently.

Though many teachers have failed to give due corrective feedback to students' attempt, few teachers tried to follow up their students' pace of writing a paragraph. In addition to improper teaching or delivering method of writing skills, not giving appropriate feedback to students is the observed problem in our context. Geremew (1999) remarks that assessing students' academic writing properly by following some important principle can play a vital role in improving learners' writing skills. However, how many of English language teachers implement written corrective feedback, direct or indirect ones. Therefore, learners' problems of not writing accurate and fluent paragraph can have relation with the problem of not giving proper feedback.

The problem of writing accurately and fluently also seems to be inseparable and a controversial issue in our context of 'Jiren' Secondary School where there are a large number of students even who cannot write correct sentences by considering accuracy and fluency. It is known that paragraph writing is being practiced by English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners based on the lessons given in the textbook.

Although more of the writing tasks presented in the syllabus require the students to perform writing under process-oriented approach, the students seem to be incapable of realizing this goal. This is why students have problems of paragraph organization, using the correct format, cohesion, coherence, word choice, mechanics, grammar, unity and language use.

Moreover, from her teaching experience at 'Jireen' Secondary School, evaluating or marking students' paragraph writing skills and exchanging information with English language teachers, the researcher has learned that students' paragraph writing skills in general and accuracy and fluency in particular are persistent problems in students' writing. This initiated the researcher to propose a study in this area. In their paragraphs students do not use the correct format, organization, contents related to the topic, word choice, the correct grammar, appropriate connective words. Thus, the connective words used may not signal progression of argument to the reader. Here, there might be absence of transitional signals that leads reader from one paragraph to another within the text. Therefore, the overall text could become disorganized due to the absence of these and other requirements.

In such case, what would be the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and also what would be the attitude of learners towards the feedback are the major concerns of this study. In addition to this from the two groups of students (control and experimental group), which one is better in improving their paragraph writing in relation to accuracy and fluency was the other question which was expected to get answer from the findings of this research. Ferris (1999) and Bitchener et al. (2005) recommend that the corrective feedback on ESL/EFL students writing is effective to improve their writing. In his study, Ferris (1999) claims that it is not possible to dismiss correction in general as it depends on the quality of the correction, if the correction is clear and consistent it will work.

There are also other researchers who have conducted their study under this problem in supporting the effectiveness of teachers' written corrective feedback (Jing, 2010; Grondahl, 2015; Ilmu, 2017). However, all these researchers have failed to give attention to both accuracy and fluency in paragraph writing while studying about the effect of teachers' feedback on students writing. Some of them only focused on accuracy, while others only gave attention to fluency. Accuracy is the basis of fluency while fluency is a further improvement of a person's linguistic competence and a better revelation of his/her writing/communicative competence. The two are so closely related that they are inseparable (YuruShen, 2013). From this one can understand that they are interdependent, for instance, if someone has the ability to write accurately this also helps that person to write fluently and they cannot be seen separately. Again, any paragraph is said to be well performed if it contains both accuracy and fluency. Without one of them/ if one is missed the paragraph loses its quality.

Besides, as far as the knowledge of the researcher is concerned, there is also no locally conducted research investigating the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on students' paragraph writing in relation to accuracy and fluency by using experimental research design. Jing (2010) conducted a comparative study on EFL teachers' preference of using direct and indirect feedback. His survey assured that most EFL teachers in his study prefer one of the indirect feedback strategies which can be done only by underlining the errors. Samuel (2015) conducted a study on EFL teachers' perception and practice of giving corrective feedback on EFL students' writing. The findings of this descriptive survey show that though many teachers have favorable



perceptions, they could not practice due to many personal reasons. However, the present study is experimental in nature, not focuses on writing in general, but focuses on paragraph specifically, not focuses separately only on accuracy or fluency but focuses both on accuracy and fluency and also it is about students' attitude towards teachers' feedback (it mainly focuses on the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback).

## **1.3 Objectives of the Study**

### **1.3.1 General Objective of the study**

The general objective of this study was to investigate the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on grade twelve EFL students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback.

### **1.3.2 Specific Objectives**

The specific objectives of the study were to:

- find out whether there is statistically significant difference between the mean values of experimental and control group students' paragraph writing performance
- inspect the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in paragraph writing before and after the intervention
- identify the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL learners' fluency in paragraph writing before and after the experiment
- identify whether learners recognize the given written corrective feedback positively or not.

## **1.4 Research questions and Hypothesis**

### **1.4.1 Research Questions**

1. Is there any statistically significant difference between the mean values of control and experimental groups' paragraph writing performance?
2. Is there any statistically significant effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in paragraph writing?
3. Is there any statistically significant effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL learners' fluency in paragraph writing?

4. How do EFL learners accept the given written corrective feedback?

### **1.4.2 Hypotheses**

Ho1. There is no any statistically significant difference between the mean values of control and experimental groups' paragraph writing performance before and after intervention.

Ho2: There is no any statistically significant effect of teachers' corrective feedback on EFL learners' accuracy in paragraph writing before and after the intervention.

Ho3:There is no any statistically significant effect of teachers' corrective feedback on EFL learners' fluency in paragraph writing before and after the intervention.

Ho4:EFL learners who are made to participate in the experiment have negative attitude towards teachers' written corrective feedback.

### **1.5 Significance of the Study**

. The study is expected to have significance both for teachers and students of the study area. It will inform the EFL teachers of the school about how to provide constructive feedback for their students' paragraph writing and provides them with information in order to overcome the students' problem of accuracy and fluency in paragraph writing. It may also improve the attitudes of learners towards their teachers' feedback which enables them to accept their teachers' feedback positively which in turn helps them to write effective paragraph. It can also develop the researcher's language teaching skill in general and feedback providing skill in particular. Moreover it will be used as a base for further and related studies.

### **1.6 Limitations of the Study**

Obviously, whatever the degree of the challenges is different, any research has its own limitations. Therefore, while conducting this study, the researcher faced some problems. The first was the problem related to the coming of Corona Virus (Covid - 19) to our country. Following the appearance of this chronic disease, she became so busy on her regular work. This consumes the researchers' time and created a bit difficulty to the researcher to add other instruments such as

observation to run her research work as needed. Another problem was, the researcher found it challenging to get reference materials because of inconsistent internet and light services.

## 1.7 Delimitation of the Study

Writing is of many types, but this study was focused only on paragraph writing in a specific way. Other types of writing were beyond the scope of this study. Accordingly, the study was delimited to the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on grade 12 students' paragraph writing with particular emphasis on accuracy and fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback. The independent variable of this study was teachers' written corrective feedback, whereas the dependent variables are students paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and their attitude towards the feedback. Other variables were not the concern of this research. The rationale behind selecting grade 12 was that the researcher's observation of students' paragraph writing problem while teaching at this grade level. And also since the researcher is going to conduct her research this year, she enforced to use grade 12 students of 2013 academic year. Ofcourse, it would have been better to conduct this research by including other high schools in Jimma town which helps to get enough sample size and generalized information about Jimma town high schools as a whole, however, for the sake of shortage of time, energy and money this study was delimited to EFL students of 'Jireen' High School in 2013. The school is found just at the back gate of Jimma University (The Main Campus) in the area which is locally known as 'Kolo-Ber'

## 1.8 Definition of Operational Terms

**Feedback:** information about someone's work.

**Accuracy:** the ability to avoid error in performance.

**Fluency:** the ability to write a language smoothly, accurately, and easily.

**Mechanics:** is about spelling, punctuation and capitalization

**Organization:** an arrangement of ideas

**Content:** things that are contained in something else (in this case paragraph)

**Diction:** choice and use of words

**Coherence:** is the relationships of ideas and the capability of those ideas to function together for conveying the meaning.

**Unity:** the state of being in agreement (agreement between ideas/ sentences)

## **CHAPTER- TWO**

### **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

In this chapter, concepts of writing skill, paragraph and paragraph writing, accuracy and fluency in writing, with their definition, definition of feedback, its types, different methods of teachers' feedback provision, attitude of learners towards their teachers feedback, importance of teachers' written corrective feedback and how can teachers provide constructive comments to improve their students paragraph writing accuracy and fluency were discussed.

#### **2.1 Writing Skill**

Writing is defined by different scholars in nearly from the same perspectives. For instance, writing is defined as a process of putting ideas into words to the target reader in mind (Byne (1998). Similarly, McDonough and Shaw (1993) consider writing as primarily message. Writing is also a means of exploration and discovery, and today, more than ever, being able to write well is a vital skill. People all over the world communicate, exchange information and conduct business immediately across the environment (Kelly and Lawton, 1998). These are some reasons we want to master the skill of writing and help learner to master it. However, Mastering-writing skill is not as easy as we might think because of its nature and different factors related to it. As Grabe and Kaplan (1996) states, unlike that of speaking and listening, writing is mastered through learning. From this, we can understand that learning to write is subject to formal instruction as opposed to speaking and listening which have more chance than writing out of the formal learning situation. As compared to speaking and listening, writing requires much more care, patience, skill and cooperation in its learning. Hedge (1988), for instance, explains that effective writing requires a number of things. It demands a high degree of organization in the development of ideas, a high degree of accuracy to avoid ambiguity, the use of complex grammatical devices

for focus and emphasis a careful choice of vocabulary etc. It is addressing the problems that scholars are much concerned with the need for much practice in its learning.

## **2.2. Approaches to Teaching Writing**

Different studies show that there are numerous approaches to teaching writing; however, the main approaches to teaching writing are process and product- oriented (Coffin et al, 2003). According to this view, the product approach is the “traditional approach” that puts an emphasis on the accuracy, whereas a process-oriented approach concentrates on fluency.

According to the researcher’s understanding, as the title of this research is directly related to accuracy and fluency (Effect of Teachers’ Written Corrective Feedback on EFL Students’ Paragraph Writing Accuracy and Fluency), studying about these two approaches is very essential for this study. Thus the effectiveness of these approaches to improve students writing is described as follow:

### **2.2.1. Product-Oriented Approach**

A product approach is “a traditional approach in which students are encouraged to mimic a model text, usually is presented and analyzed at an early stage” (Gebrielatos, 2002). Researchers claimed that in product oriented approach, learners are engaged in imitating, copying and transforming models of correct language; therefore, learners are anticipated to master language at sentence level before producing complete paragraph (Nunan, 1991; Williams, 2003; Kroll, 1990). Besides, Harmer (2001p.257) claimes “when concentrating on the product, we are only interested in the aim of the task and in the end product.”

On the other hand, Wen (2013) states that product-focused approach to EFL writing mainly refers to controlled or guided composition. It concentrates on specific features of the written language. Its primary goal is on formal accuracy and correctness, focuses on mastery of previously learned linguistic form of language to the production of original ideas, organization and style. In this

approach, the writer is simply manipulator of previously learned language structures; the teacher has a vital role as an editor or proofreader of the written work.

Moreover, Hedge (1988) explains that product approach includes the skills of “getting the grammar right, having ranges of vocabulary, punctuating meaningfully, using the conventions of layout correct letter, spelling accurately, using a range of sentence structure, linking ideas and information across sentence to develop a topic.

Hyland (2003) added that writing, in this approach, may be looked up on as a logical and well-organized placement of words, clauses, and sentences according to rules of language. According to Hyland, the focus in this approach is control of grammar and vocabulary. Pincas (1984) also states that writing is primarily about linguistic knowledge, with the attention focused on the appropriate use of vocabulary, syntax, and cohesive devices. She explained that the teacher introduces a topic or uses guides provided by a text book, discusses them and may be provoke a little class discussion and then explain how students are going to write a composition based on them. Then, the students would be invited to write before handing their writings to teacher. The teacher grades the composition and makes some comments on the paper & focus on form rather than content. Such approach is thoroughly teacher-centered form rather than content.

For the researcher, the above expression shows that, in product approach, learners’ main concentration is on the end product rather than focusing on steps for arriving at the end product. In addition to this, in the product approach, learners are dependent, that means to write correct sentences or paragraphs they have to depend on a sample sentence/ paragraph which is written correctly by their teachers or others. Thus, this approach enforces them to be passive & imitate others rather than being creative. Here the main focus is on what to write rather than how to write. However, to produce autonomous learners (independent learners), teaching how to write is very important, before going to write.

## 2.2.2 Process-oriented approach

Kroll (2001) concedes this approach as the fact when student writers engage in their writing tasks through a cyclic approach rather than a single-shot approach. For him, students are not expected to produce and submit completed and polished responses to their writing assignments without going through stages of drafting and receiving feedback on their drafts from teachers, followed by revision of their evolving texts. The process approach infuses greater respect for individual writers and for the writing itself (; Coffin et al, 2003 Hyland, 2003); as a result, teachers begin to put increasing emphasis on how the learners write well rather than what they have written (Su& Yang, 2001; cited in Wen, 2013), besides Coffine et al (2003) mentioned process writing was chiefly on how students could express their identities, rather than on writing as something that occurs in a social context.

In addition, process writing is appropriate, especially for EFL learners because its prominent features are emphasize on fluency. As young learners learn to speak fluently, they also need how to write fluently (Cameron, 2001; cited in Linse, 2005 ).

Moreover, Williams (2003) claims that instruction in the process-oriented is top-down, not bottom-up, which means that the focus is on producing entire papers, not on grammar. Perhaps more important, however, is that process instruction aims to modify student behaviors to match those of good writers; it does not concentrate on form or rules. He added that the process approach recognizes that writing is a very personal activity in numerous respects, which means not only that there are many behaviors that are not universal, but also that there is variation within the universals. Therefore invention may take the form of discussion, brainstorming, outlining, and so forth, depending on a given writer's preference and, no doubt, on the writing task at hand.

Wen (2013) also asserts that process approach is a multiple-draft process which consists of prewriting, drafting, revising more than once. As far as the rhetoric composition is concerned, successful writing technique learning skill requires the process approach. It centers on the elements of the paragraph (topic sentences, supporting sentences, concluding sentences, and transitions), and various ways to the development of the paragraph (illustration, exemplification,



comparison, contrast, classification, definition, and so on). It also sees the elements of essays; such as introduction, body and conclusion and organizational patterns of essay types. Moreover, learners are given the opportunity to engage themselves on a wide range of writing process; as a result, it is contemplated as writer-centered approach. Nunan (1991) added that in process-oriented approach, writers are encouraged to get their ideas on paper in any shape or form without worrying too much about formal correction, so it enhances motivation and positive attitude towards writing.

Moreover, Hyland (2003) believes that process writing open a way for learners to write and rewrite, so they can easily develop fluency. In process- oriented approach, feedback has a vital role to help students develop their writing. Therefore, the intention of feedback is to be formative (process- oriented) to help students learn more (Brook hart, 2008; Sadler, 1989, cited in Askew, 2000). Likewise, Nation (2009) suggested the aim of process (formative assessment) is encouraging learners to keep writing and to write more, thus providing constructive feedback on the content and form of writing is desirable. Nation (2009) added that feedback is useful if it occurs several times during the writing process and is expressed in ways that the writer finds acceptable and easy to act on and it provides writers opportunity to focus on the language used in the writing.

On the other hand, Williams (2003) stated that process- oriented was innovated for three reasons: the first is to ask students write often, in meaningful context, the second is in order to address frequent feedback on working progress and the last focus on making students revise numerously based on that feedback.

Hyland (2009) listed out the characteristics of writing as a process

- ☞ Writing is problem-solving: writers use invention strategies and extensive planning to resolve the rhetorical problems that each writing task presents.
- ☞ Writing is generative: writers explore and discover ideas as they write.
- ☞ Writing is recursive: writers constantly review and modify their texts as they write and often produce several drafts to achieve a finished product.
- ☞ Writing is collaborative: writers benefit from focused feedback from a variety of sources.
- ☞ Writing is developmental: writers should not be evaluated only on their final products but on their improvement.

## **What is a paragraph?**

A paragraph is a collection of sentences dealing with a single topic. It should be unified, coherent, and well-developed. One idea should be kept, in one paragraph.

### **Elements of a Paragraph**

A paragraph is made up of a topic sentence, the developing details, and a concluding sentence.

o **Topic Sentence:** expresses the main point of the paragraph. It is typically the first sentence of the paragraph. It helps the reader to understand what the topic of the paragraph is going to be. The purpose of the topic sentence is to state the main point of the paragraph and to give the paragraph a sense of direction.

o **Concluding Sentence:** is the ending line of the paragraph. It should restate the main idea of the paragraph.

o **Adequate Development;** It is important to fully develop and discuss the topic of the paragraph. If the paragraph is only 2-3 sentences, it is clear that the paragraph is not well developed.

Here are some ways you can develop and support your topic:

1. Use examples
2. Tell a story illustrating the idea
3. Compare and Contrast
4. Give data (such as facts, statistics, etc)

A good way to think of a paragraph and how it is structured is like a sandwich. The topic sentence is the top layer of bread, the concluding sentence is the bottom layer, and all of the developing details in-between are the

## **2.3 Paragraph Writing**

Paragraph writing can be described as an act of composing a text using different words, phrases, clauses and sentences. It is the basic unit of organization that consists of several sentences which are arranged together chronologically. These groups of sentences together discuss one main idea. Oshima and Hogue (2009) states that a paragraph is a basic unit of organization in writing in which a group of related sentences develops one main idea. Similarly, Rajatanun (1988) states that a paragraph is a unit of writing which expresses one central idea and consists of two kinds of sentences: a topic sentence and a number of supporting statements. Hart and Reinking (1990, p.

11) claim, "writing builds larger units from smaller ones; that is, writers use words to make sentences, sentences to make paragraphs, and paragraphs to make such compositions as letters, reports, and college themes." According to (Reid, 1994), a paragraph has basically three most important parts). These three parts are the topic sentence, body sentences, and the concluding sentence. A topic sentence usually comes at the beginning of a paragraph which is usually the first sentence in a formal paragraph. It is also believed to be the most general sentence in a paragraph. The other sentences are called supporting sentences. This is because they explain the idea mentioned in the topic sentence. Paragraphs often have more supporting ideas and a concluding sentence, which concludes the information that has been presented in the paragraph. These different elements are combined to form one complete meaning in the paragraph. Thus, these elements must be presented in logical order by using transitional signals or linking words which indicate the relationship between the ideas in the text. Similarly, O'Donnell and Paiva (1993) provides more details about the essential parts for paragraph writing which include atopic sentence, supporting sentences for details, logically ordering and a concluding sentence keeping its unity and coherence using logical connectors. To restate the major point in the paragraph, writers may use a concluding sentence.

The concluding sentence summarizes the text, offers a solution to the problem, predicts a situation, makes a recommendation, or states a conclusion (Reid, 1994).In addition, Anchale and Pongrat (2010) state some components of paragraph that could help for the correct arrangement of ideas in the paragraph: Unity and coherence are also the main components of a paragraph, together with the main idea and the supporting details. Even when a paragraph is unified, and the topic sentence is well supported, the paragraph can still "sound" choppy unless the writer uses cohesive devices to make the paragraph smoother. Coherence means, "To stick together." In writing, it means that one idea flows smoothly into the next without causing ambiguity, fragment or unclearness. In another way this can also be expressed as fluency. Consequently, to have a coherent paragraph, students keep unity of the paragraph, the paragraph which is expressed by the relationship between sentences in the paragraph and use different cohesive devices that are used to fix sentences together for the signal of flow of ideas in the text. Generally, producing a paragraph is combining different sentences using different cohesive devices to build the central idea which is anticipated to be delivered and summarized using concluding sentences.

### 2.3.1 Accuracy and Fluency in Paragraph Writing

Concerning accuracy and fluency, different scholars have given different definitions. For example, Ellis (2009) holds that fluency means the capacity to use language in real time, to emphasize meanings, possibly drawing on more lexicalized systems, and accuracy means the ability to avoid error in performance, possibly reflecting higher levels of control in the language as well as a conservative orientation, that is, avoidance of challenging structures that might provoke error. (qtd in Yuru Shen , 2013). On the other hand, Crystal (1977), Bryne (1986), and Nation (1991) define fluency as the ability to get across communicative intent without too much hesitation and too many pauses to cause barriers or a breakdown in communication (qtd. in Lan, 1994). Bryne (1988) defines accuracy as the use of correct forms where utterances do not contain errors affecting the phonological, syntactic, and semantic or discourse features of a language (qtd. in Lan, 1994).

However, in this research, accuracy refers to the ability to produce grammatically correct words, phrases, and sentences to write a well-organized paragraph. On the other hand, fluency refers to the ability to write language smoothly, accurately and easily. Hyland,(2003). This includes the ability to produce written language with ease, or ability to write with a good but not necessarily perfect command of intonation, vocabulary, and grammar, the ability to communicate ideas effectively, and the ability to produce a paragraph without causing comprehension difficulties or a breakdown of communication.

In other words, accuracy emphasizes exactness and is often emphasized in formal instruction, language acquisition, grammar competence and grammar-translation method, while fluency describes a level of proficiency in communication and is frequently stressed in procedural skill, expression proficiency, lexical phrases, social interaction, necessary topics and discourse. Accuracy is a base for fluency while fluency is observed when a person improves his/her linguistic competence more and if there is a greater practice of his/her communicative competence. They are much related and cannot be separated.

Early teaching methods promoted accuracy over fluency. For instance, the Grammar-Translation Method (GT M) has been used by language teachers for many years. It is the traditional style of

teaching method emphasizing grammar explanation and translation (Cook, 2001). In such a method, it is important for students to learn about the form of the target language. The role of the teacher is the authority. Students merely do what the teacher says and learn from the teacher, and many students consider that correct answers are essential. If they make errors or do not know an answer, it is the teacher's duty to supply them with the correct answer.

However, accuracy cannot be regarded as enough only by itself in language learning. According to Larsen-Freeman (2000), in the Grammar-Translation Method, the language that is used in class is mostly the students' native language. In this case, there is much less attention to second language speaking and listening. When it comes to speaking and listening skills, fluency needs to be taken in to account in language learning.

To solve such problems, other methods have been emphasized fluency in language learning. It is clear that these approaches are built on learning the use of language not on learning the usage of it. For example, compared with the Grammar-Translation Method, Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) emphasizes the process of communication rather than just focusing on language forms (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Since the concept of CLT places an emphasis on fluency, errors of form can be seen as a natural outcome of the development of communication skills

Another argument in favor of fluency is the implementation of language in an authentic environment. In the real world, language is mostly used to express feeling and thought (Eskey, 1983). When there is a purpose to exchange meaning, fluency is the key element during communication. While communicating with each other, foreign language learners often encounter the difficulty, that is, what they know how to say does not achieve their communicative intention. In order to bridge the gap of such discrepancy, learners may use communicative strategies, such as prediction to make the communication successful. This is because if communicators are in the same context, one may predict what the other is going to say next.

In some cases, although some grammatical errors exist, communicators can still understand each other because they are in the same context. When listeners cannot understand what speakers mean, they usually predict the following conversation and provide immediate response with speakers in the process of meaning negotiation.

However, it must be remembered that the achievement of this level of communicative competence does not mean an equal one of grammatical competence. Eskey (1983p. 319) claims, “Fluency in a language is no guarantee of formal accuracy.” A realistic concern is that focusing on fluency may cause the significant effect on accuracy. “Rewarding a learner’s fluency may, in some cases, actually impede his or her achievement of accuracy.” Eskey (1983p. 319) . For example, in order to get meaning across, language learners find the words, but they either pronounce them wrongly or put them together inappropriately. Such problem happens due to the fact that they can speak English continually but express themselves poorly. Thus, although accuracy is not enough by itself, it is still considered as necessary in language learning.

Although learners can still communicate the message to make sense without correct form, it cannot be denied that in order to use the language, learners still need to be able to convert linguistic forms into the ability to actually use them. Therefore, when using CLT approach, correcting for accuracy will still be offered by teachers. Although prediction in communicative context may benefit successful communication, fluency is not enough in this circumstance. Without accuracy, misunderstanding may occur because of misspelling, poor pronunciation and wrong grammatical structures. It is therefore clear that as language teachers, both fluency and accuracy must be equally concerned in teaching students to use a language in general and to write accurate and fluent paragraph in particular.

From the above points, we can understand that, both accuracy and fluency are very important in paragraph writing in particular and in language learning in general. One is not enough without the other. Because of this, language teachers have to keep the balance between accuracy and fluency not only when they provide feedback but also when they prepare their teaching material. This is due to the fact that we cannot harvest what we haven’t saw. This is similar with our local proverb’ *Waan facaasan haammatu*’. In relation to this the researcher tried to summarize what Yurushen (2013) expressed in his research focusing on how to keep a balance between accuracy and fluency in English classroom teaching as this can also help students to improve their paragraph writing accuracy and fluency. The researcher tried to summarize this as follows.

### **Methods of Balancing Accuracy and Fluency in Teaching Writing Skill**

According to Yurushen (2013), to keep a balance between accuracy and fluency in English classroom teaching, teachers can employ the following methods.

### ***1. Using Communicative Approach with Grammar-translation Method***

Nowadays, due attention is given to English language learners 'communicative competence. This competence needs correctness and readiness from the learners to use relevant strategies in coping with certain language situations. For this researcher, (Yurushen2013), communicative approach has been recommended in English language teaching institutions. But with the change of time, they have found that no single teaching method can deal with everything that concerns the target language. Thus, grammar analysis and limited utilization of translation from or to the target language (English) are still an indispensable part of teaching. Vocabulary work and pattern drills are still good ways of familiarizing students with sentence structures. This can help them acquire linguistic competence, which, involving the spontaneous, flexible, and correct manipulation of the language system is the basis on which English language skills get improved. Thus, teachers had better combine communicative approach with grammar-translation method in their classroom teaching. By doing this, students can not only develop paragraph writing accuracy and fluency but also better their English language skills.

To use the two methods together, teachers need to make English teaching partly communicatively oriented so as to help students familiarize themselves with appropriate language usage instead of just teaching grammar and drilling grammar patterns as before. That means, in practicing linguistic competence, classroom activities such as expressing themselves in writing, simulations, and real-life interactions should also be organized to provide as much practice as possible for students to develop their communicative competence.

Based on the above ideas, the researcher can say that, to develop students' language learning skill in general and paragraph writing accuracy and fluency in particular, using mixed teaching methods is very essential in addition to providing appropriate feedback. Focusing only on one teaching method enforces us not to accept new technologies, not to adapt with different learning styles of our students, and generally not to be flexible to diversified nature of foreign language teaching (FLT).

## **2. Encouraging Guided Peer-interaction and Student-teacher Interaction**

According to (Yurushen 2013 ), if learners are not supervised and guided in EFL context, no doubt that they can be exposed to a large number of errors. If they practice their writing task in this way for a long time, they may write ambiguous sentences, paragraphs or etc. Fluency will be emphasized at the expense of accuracy. To avoid it, we had better encourage guided peer-interaction by offering students some hints before and during the whole interactive activity. We can remove the linguistic —props<sup>l</sup> of already formulated structures as soon as possible so as to provide a balance between activities focused on linguistic forms and those focused on language use to help learners achieve autonomy.

In addition to guided peer-interaction, teachers have to encourage more student-teacher interaction in and outside class. Teachers, usually with rich English knowledge and strong English skills, can act as models as well as guides to students. With teachers little help in correction of mistakes and with their occasional encouragement, students will gain confidence and be perfect enough to write more and gradually they can express themselves effectively.

## **3. Teachers' Transferring Their Roles**

Teachers should take on the following roles in modern English classroom teaching.

First, instead of being the dominator in the classroom, they must become learning facilitators to facilitate the communicative process between all participants in the classroom and between these participants and the various activities and texts by giving guidance and advice when necessary. They should also act as interdependent participants within the learning-teaching group (Breen & Candlin, 1980), which means that they need to perceive students as having important contributions to make, and then teachers must continually seek potential and exploit and actively share the responsibility for learning and teaching with them. They must realize that any unnecessary intervention from them may prevent students from becoming genuinely involved in the activities and thus hinder the development of their communicative skills. However, this does not necessarily mean that they should be passive observers. Instead, they should develop students 'potential through external direction and help them develop their distinctive qualities.

Next, as teachers want students to be life-long learners, they must develop a motivation for learning, a desire and an aptitude to continue discovering new knowledge and exemplify by constantly refreshing their knowledge and skills to keep abreast with the latest developments in their area of specialization.



Then, to keep pace with the times, teachers also need to be creative and innovative in integrating their teaching with learning processes. They must give students more opportunities for expression and provide an environment where creativity can flourish. For this reason, they must encourage students to question and to express their thoughts freely so that they will have interested minds to learn.

As society and industry are changing very fast from time to time, whatever knowledge and skills one acquires today may not be relevant tomorrow, teachers need to remain sensitive and receptive to changes and to be able to anticipate further changes that may come their way. At the same time they must inculcate in their students a mindset for adapting and receiving changes to prepare them for the changing need of society.

Shortly, in addition to sharing knowledge, teachers need to be in the best positions to determine the most effective teaching methods to bring out the best in each student. For this purpose, on the one hand, they need to recognize learning as an interpersonal undertaking over which no single person can have full control, and realize that there will be differences between ongoing learning processes. They have to accept the fact that different learners learn different things in different ways at different times and that some learners may enter periods when it seems that little or no progress is being made and that sometimes learning is typified by silent reflection. On the other hand, we should continually develop new skills and embrace new ideas to bring a fresh perspective to every lesson and to inspire in our students a love for learning and passion for their subject; Teachers should motivate students to always make full use of their time, talents and abilities; They should develop students as individuals according to their talents and abilities. In other words, to help students fit in with the needs of the society, they should work as organizers of resources and as resources; as guides and managers of the classroom procedures and activities and as researchers and learners, with much to contribute in terms of appropriate knowledge, abilities, and actual and observed experience in the nature of learning and organizational capabilities (Breen and Candlin, 1980)

From the above points, the researcher understands that in teaching- learning process in general and in balancing accuracy and fluency in particular, teaching system should not depend on

teacher centered. Teachers have to share roles for their students. As teachers and students have common goals to fulfill in teaching learning process, they should also have common roles to perform. Teachers have to give attention to the value of their students' contribution to learning process. They have to attract their students towards their teaching by appreciating their participation, their ideas, their view points, suggestions, etc even if they are not perfect today because they can become perfect tomorrow through continuous practice. Without their students' active involvement, participation, creative thinking, commitment, teachers cannot deliver perfect teaching even if they are perfect teachers.

The next idea is that teachers have to update themselves with the new technology to satisfy the changing needs of their society by producing active learners who accept and practice the new technology. This means that first teachers have to be ready by themselves to adapt themselves with the new technology. From time to time, they have to add something new to their teaching material, teaching method and also they have to reduce or even remove if necessary the old teaching material or method if they thought it is not productive. Being a good role model by themselves in this way, they have to direct and attract their students towards the right way.

The other idea is that to meet the diversified learning styles of their students, teachers have to use mixed teaching methods. By using only one teaching method, it is impossible for teachers to meet different needs (learning styles) of their students. It is known that there is no best teaching method because, if one teaching method is best for some group of students, it may not be suitable for other groups. Thus, the best teacher is that who uses different teaching methods to satisfy different learning needs of his/ her students.

##### **5. *Teachers' Equipping Themselves with Knowledge and Appropriate Teaching Methods***

Liu Runqing, professor of English at Beijing Foreign Studies University, said, a teacher must take into account two things in his actual teaching What to teach? and How to teach?

What to teach? Involves pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, semantics, discourse, pragmatics and the ability and skill in listening, speaking, reading, writing and translation, while. How to teach? or How do you teach the language? has something to do with the teaching method a teacher may use in his teaching. What to teach? and How to teach? require us teachers to be equipped with all kinds of knowledge. This means that, not only should we know something

about linguistics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, education and so on, and be able to demonstrate the target language with enough accuracy, but teachers are also expected to know a variety of teaching methodologies, correct ways to research, and some basic principles of testing. We must realize that it is obligatory for us teachers to adopt different methods when dealing with different teaching materials and when faced with students with different levels of English proficiency. To achieve the purpose, teachers must enrich their knowledge of English and improve their English skills by various means such as listening to programs in English, watching English programs on television and surfing the English versions of various news items on the Internet frequently. In a word, to improve students' oral proficiency, teachers should try every possible means to make themselves walking encyclopedias so that they can teach any student anything with skill and ease.

#### ***6. Giving Equal Importance to Both Accuracy and Fluency Exercises***

As stated earlier, accuracy and fluency are so closely related that they are inseparable. Because of learners' limited capacity of attention, there could be trade-off effects between accuracy and fluency Skehan (1998). This means, when concentration is given to accuracy, fluency is missed and vice versa (qtd. in Patanasorn, 2010). Because of this attaching equal importance to both accuracy and fluency exercises is a must.

The accuracy exercises help students express their ideas correctly whereas the fluency exercises encourage free expression. Doing accuracy exercises does not mean 100% error-free, but a high degree of accuracy is required, and as a result, students are encouraged to make as few errors as possible and to manipulate the language as spontaneously and flexibly as possible. Soon after the students have mastered the language forms, they ought to be given intensive fluency practice, which is directed at inviting them to express themselves freely without being at all concerned about 100% accuracy. At this stage, we should not only tolerate students' errors and encourage them by emphasizing that error-making is a natural and common practice in the learning of a foreign language, but also assess their performances at the end of each fluency so that they can realize their own weaknesses and become more and more conscious of their errors. In this way, accuracy and fluency, which are interdependent, can be practiced almost simultaneously. However, when assigning accuracy and fluency exercises, teachers have to keep in mind the following: The first one is, while assigning exercises; they have to start with questions taken

from the contents students are familiar. Because it is found that the personal task which is based on information well known to learners allows them to be more fluent in their performance.

The other thing is that, we have to give students more planning time. Concerning this, it has been suggested that providing learners with more planning time prior to conducting the task helps them produce more fluent and complex language. Generally, the more planning time they are given, the more familiar they will be with the inherent structure of discourse and as a result, the more accurate and fluent they will be in their performance, because —familiarity with content and opportunity to plan help lessen the load of information processing which allows learners more intentional resources to focus on formal aspects of language as well as help them to become more fluent in their performance (Patanasorn, 2010).

From the above points, the researcher understands that, both accuracy and fluency are very important in language learning in general and in paragraph writing in particular. One is not enough without the other. Because of this, language teachers have to keep the balance between accuracy and fluency not only when they provide feedback but also when they prepare teaching materials for their students. This is due to the fact that we cannot harvest what we haven't sown. This is similar with our local proverb 'Yoo facaasan haammatu'. To achieve this goal, in addition to providing effective feedback teachers have to combine communicative approach with grammar translation method, encourage guided peer interaction & student teacher interaction, teachers have to equip themselves with knowledge and appropriate teaching methods and also teachers have to give equal importance to both accuracy and fluency exercises so as to help their students write accurate and fluent paragraph.

## **2.4. Definition of Feedback**

There are different definitions of the term “feedback”. Some are as follows: Askew and Lodge (2000) gave extensive definition of feedback to include all dialogue to support learning in both formal and informal situations. In this definition, feedback is almost everything that happens in a classroom. In contrast, Remaprasad's definition (1983) is more precise. He claims that feedback is the information which can effectively bridge or at least narrow the gap between the student's language proficiency and the teacher's response. He states that the question is whether the information given by the teacher can alter such a gap, which is the key criteria whether it is a

feedback or not (Ramaprasad, 1983). Ramaprasad's definition is modified by Sadler (1998). He explains that the teacher has to possess a concept of the standard form of the language (or goal or reference level) that is being aimed for. They also have to be able to compare the students' actual level of performance with the standards and engage in appropriate actions which lead to the closure of the existing gap. "Closing the gap" as is explained by Sadler (1989) provides an effective and practical framework for teachers. In addition to this Robert E. Slavin (2006, p.340) defines feedback as '...information on the results of one's effort.' Here, it is used to refer to both information students receive on their performance and the information teachers obtain on the effects of their instruction.'

### **2.4.1 Different kinds of Feedback on Students writing**

According to Nigussie (2001), feedback can be provided in different ways by different teachers for students' paragraph writing. This includes, self-feedback and correction, peer feedback and correction and teacher feedback and correction.

#### **Self-feedback and Correction**

Error treatment is better if it begins with the student who made the error her/himself. In such case teachers show their students that he/she made errors, but leave the student to make his or her own correction. Self-feedback is a scheme in which Students tell the teacher the kind of help they want. White and Atnd (1991) cited in Jourdan (1997).

#### **Peer feedback and correction**

This is a type of feedback that requires the involvement of students in feedback provision of each other's writing. Being in pair or group, students can provide such type of feedback under supervision of their teachers. According to Edge.J(1989),peer correction has two great advantages:

1. When two or more students work together to correct each other's work the discussion helps each one to learn from his/he own errors. Two heads are greater than one.

2. We all have difficulty in seeing our own mistakes even if a teacher has given us a signal as to what sort of a mistake it is. Cooperation helps develop an ability to see our own mistakes. However, in both self and peer feedback, students are not well enough to give feedback and

correction on their work. To support this Stanely (1992) states that untrained students tend to focus on surface errors rather than an organization or style. To fill this gap, teachers' written corrective feedback is the best alternative.

### **Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback**

It is another type of feedback in which the teacher himself or herself provides feedback for his/her students' written work or in this case, paragraph. Written feedback comments which specifically focus on language use(grammar, vocabulary, mechanics) are referred to as written corrective feedback (WCF), and are commonly used by ESL and EFL teachers (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). 'If we think that a mistake needs to be corrected and if neither the student who makes the mistake nor any other student can correct it, then the teacher has to give more help.' Edge (1989 p.27). Here the teacher shows a mistake has been made and gives some clues to learners to correct it. According to Yang, in feedback on EFL students' composition writing, teachers have to be take care of the following points when providing feedback on their students' composition writing(which is also true for paragraph writing).

1. Focusing mainly on grammar: some teachers mainly focus on separate sentences even clauses rather than the whole unit of discourse. This leads to think good writing equals correct grammar and they may neglect more global elements of good writing.
2. Providing corrections: giving corrections does not make writers critical on their own work. It is more beneficial for learners if they try this by themselves.
3. Giving vague comments: teachers have to provide clear comments for their students. Teachers' comments are of little use if students do not know what they mean.
4. Over emphasizing negative points: some teachers only point out problems rather than telling students good points in their writing. As a result students may perceive written teachers' comments as negative and feel frustrated.

In addition to this, English language teachers also have to follow some guidelines when they provide Feedback for their students' composition writing (which is also important in paragraph writing).(YANG Yang). According to this, since teachers know that in appropriate and negative feedback shows no positive direction for students, they have to provide constructive comments. Constructive comments not only alert students to specific problems with the text but also help them to develop their future writing. This guide lines include:

1. Teachers have to praise students (use praise)

It is important to praise what is done well and explain why it is good. By using words like ‘good’ or ‘well done’, it is better to explain good points. For example the teacher has to explain by saying ‘This is a good description because it used vivid details like in paragraph 2...etc. so that the writer can understand the good points. ( O’Malley and Pierce, 1996, p.136-137). Suggest the following:

2. They have to use questions

- Comments in the form of question can effectively help students.
- It makes them revise and develop critical sense of their writing.
- Questions can refer to content, organization, or grammar and choice.
- These questions have to be written on the margin of students paper

3. They have to give advice

- ✓ In giving comments, teachers have to list a few things for students to pay attention to the next time.

Smith (1997) also provides a conceptualization of teacher feedback in her research. She grouped teacher comments into three categories: judgmental comments, reader response comments, and coaching comments. Judgmental comments evaluate the student’s writing in terms of what is good, what needs further work, or what can be written better according to the teacher. There are four characteristics of good comments: focused, applicable, clear, and encouraging. Reader-response-comments offer the teacher’s reaction as a reader to the student’s writing and describes her experiences while reading the student’s work. The comments are highly personal and characterized by the use of the 1st person statement. Coaching comments advice students on ways to develop their writing, and they tend to be facilitative, which means that the comments act as guides for students to consider the features of their writing, such as word choice, sentence formation, organization and writing style. They also encourage the students to look at their writing critically.

## **2.4.2 Different Methods of Teachers’ Feedback Provision**

There are two major ways of teachers’ feedback provision: (Direct and Indirect Feedback)

Direct feedback is a kind of feedback that based on correcting students' error by giving an explicit written correction. On the other hand, indirect feedback is another kind of feedback in which the teacher indicates that an error has been made by means of an underline, circle, code, etc. Both methods can improve student's writing, but researcher like Ferris (2002) argued that indirect feedback is generally more appropriate and effective than direct feedback and brings more benefits to students' long-term writing development than direct feedback. Because it can guide learning and help the students to solve problem by themselves, students are able to express their ideas more clearly in writing and to get clarification on any comments that teachers have made. In addition, students feel that indirect feedback is useful in encouraging them to reflect on aspects of their writing. Indirect feedback can be done by a code representing a specific kind of error. When giving indirect feedback, teachers underline errors and use codes to indicate the type of error such as SP(spelling error), P (fault in punctuation), and VT (wrong verb tense). This method gives students the opportunity to fix errors themselves. However, teachers should familiarize their students with the codes, so that they will not be surprised when they see teachers' written comments. On the other hand, Ferris (2006) found that students utilized direct feedback more consistently and effectively than indirect types, partly as it involves simply copying the teacher's suggestion into the next draft of their papers. Thus, direct feedback can be more beneficial to students in some contexts, especially when revising syntax and vocabulary. According to Ferris (2002), direct feedback is appropriate method of feedback provision (1) for beginner students; (2) when errors are 'untreatable' i.e., errors not amenable to self-correction such as sentence structure and word choice and (3) when teachers want to draw students' attention to other error patterns which require student correction.

### **2.4.3 The Importance of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback**

Teachers' written corrective feedback is important both for teachers and learners.

#### **The Importance of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback for Learners**

(Kulik and Kulik 1998), as cited in Slavin (2006, p.340) suggests that 'since correctness and wrongness are inevitable from students' written work, feedback is inseparable from learners. It is an advice that helps learners to show their progress. It serves as incentives. However to be an effective motivator, teachers' written corrective feedback must be clear, specific, frequent, and cloth in time to the performance.'



### **Providing Clear Feedback**

If feedback is not clear for students, it cannot bring the intended outcome. Feedback is effective when students understand what to improve for the future.

### **Providing Specific Feedback**

Teachers frequently put generalized comments on students writing. However what is needed is more specific guidance to help students understand how to revise their writing and to lead them through cycle of revision (Zamel) cited in Jourdan (1981). According to this view for example, praises on a well-developed written paragraph should specify which part the student did well. “good work, I like your word choice”. ‘Specific feedback tells students what they did right, so that they will know what to do in the future and helps give them an effort based attribution for success. Effort contributions are most conducive to continuing motivation’Kulik and Stock (1998) cited in Slavin (2006, p.340).

### **Providing Frequent Feedback**

As stated in Slavin (2006), teachers’ written corrective feedback should be delivered frequently to students to maintain their best efforts. It is unrealistic to expect most students to work hard for 6 or 9 weeks in the hope of improving their grade unless they receive frequent feedback. No matter how powerful a reward is, it might have little impact on behavior if it is given infrequently. Small frequent rewards are more effective incentives than large infrequent ones.

### **Providing Immediate Feedback**

Slavin (2006), points out that feedback must be given close in time to the performance. If students complete a project on Monday and do not receive any feedback on it until Friday, the informational and motivational value of feedback will be diminished. That means

1. If they made errors, they might continue all week making similar errors on related material that might have been averted by feedback on the performance.
2. Along delay between behavior and consequences confuses the relation between the two.

### **The importance of Teachers’ Written Corrective Feedback for Teachers**

#### **Themselves**

Feedback provides information not only for learners but also for teachers. According Slavin (2006, p.451), ‘...teachers cannot be expected to be effective if they do not have information about whether students have grasped the main points of their lessons.’ This is to mean that teachers can also get information about their students through feedback.

### **Teachers’ Attitude towards Their Learners’ Mistakes**

The other important point that we have to know in relation to teachers’ written corrective feedback is teachers’ attitude towards their learners’ mistakes. If teachers have negative attitude towards their learners’ mistakes, they do not provide constructive feedback for them. And this neglects students from writing something because of fear of punishment. To support this, Edge (1989) says most language teachers are usually think of errors as problem or crime.

### **Learners Attitude towards Their Teachers’ Feedback**

While teachers may have negative attitude towards their students’ mistakes, learners also do have negative attitude towards their teachers’ discouraging feedback. Concerning this, Atkins, Hailom and Nuru (1966, p.139) say this:

“Due to some discouraging teachers’ feedback on students writing, most Ethiopian high school students tend to think that it is bad to make mistake that they will be ridiculed by other students or by the teacher. So, they are very careful not to take any risk, not to say anything unless it is correct.’

Writing teachers should know their learners’ attitudes toward the kinds of the comments teachers give because learners’ preferences can affect the usefulness of the provided comments and may increase their engagement and motivation (Amrehin& Nassaji, 2010).

However, errors should not be understood in this way. According to H. Douglas Brown(2007,) mistakes, misjudgments, miscalculations and erroneous assumptions form important aspects of learning virtually and skill fully for acquiring information through process. Concerning this he also stated that we learn to swim first by jumping in to water and failing arms and legs until we discover that there is a combination of movements. In addition to this, Atkins(1996, p.139) states ‘Errorsare signs of stages in the learning process. So, all students should be encouraged to try

with language because, unless they make mistakes they cannot be to work out ways of expressing their idea better in English.’ The same is true to write correct paragraph.

However, skillful teacher can change this negative attitude of his/her learners by providing constructive feedback. Edge (1989, p.64) points out that “Students should feel confidence they are making their right sort of progress through committing errors with the help of their teachers’ feedback provision.”



## **CHAPTER-THREE**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

In this chapter, the research design, and methodological steps, the study population, sampling techniques, data collection instruments, methods of data analysis and procedures used to carry out the study were discussed.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

Preparing research design enables the researcher to provide relevant evidence with minimum effort, time and money, Kothari (2004). For him, the selection of research design mainly depends on the research purpose. Accordingly, this study is mainly experimental since it tries to find out the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency. Concerning this, Creswell (2012) also states that some quantitative researchers want to test whether an educational practice makes a difference for individuals and experimental research procedures are suitable for that study. For him, experimental designs are procedures in quantitative research in which the investigator determines whether an activity makes a difference in results for participants. This can be assessed by giving experiment for one group and holding the activity from another group. This study also investigates students' attitude towards their teachers' feedback as this can also affect the effectiveness of teachers' feedback. To this effect, it calls for a qualitative approach. Thus, to get valid and relevant data for this research, the researcher used quasi-experimental design (with pre-test, post-test, for control, and experimental groups) and descriptive design, (interview and questionnaire for teachers and the sample students respectively). Thus the study has used a mixed method approach.

#### **3.2 Research Variables**

The independent variable of the study was English teachers' written corrective feedback. The dependent variables of the study were EFL learners' writing performance in line with the accuracy and fluency of learners' paragraph and their attitude towards the feedback. In this study, it was planned to see the effect of written corrective feedback on learners' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency.

### **3.3 Sources of Data and Study Site**

There were two types of sources of data that the researcher used. These were primary and secondary data. For primary data, testing on paragraph writing, questionnaire and interview were held. As a secondary data, previous related researches, review of literature and other related written documents were used. The study site was Jiren secondary school which is found in Oromia region, Jimma zone, Jimma town, Ginjo Guduru Kebele. The school was selected purposively for three reasons: the first reason was that the researcher has been teaching in this school and knows the problem of writing skill in this school closely. The second reason for the selection of the school was due to her anticipation for getting more cooperation and necessary support in gathering authentic, valid and reliable data. The third was that the school was also selected because of the fact that conducting research here has advantages for the researcher as it saves time, energy and money since it was her regular work place. `

### **3.4 Population, Sample and Sampling Procedure.**

The target population of this study was grade 12 EFL teachers and their students of Jiren high school. The total number of EFL teachers was 5 and since they are small in number, they were taken as they are. On the other hand, the total number of grade 12 students of the school was 500 from which sample of the study was selected. There were 20 sections of grade 12 in the school. From these sections, four classes (which have 25 students in each due to covid-19) were taken by using purposive sampling method to implement the intervention. This sampling method was selected by the researcher because the study at hand requires the same grade level students with almost similar characteristics with the whole (original) population. After selecting the sections, the researcher sorted the four sections as experimental and control groups by using the same sampling method. This was done because the two sections were homogeneous in many ways such as in their grade levels, age and almost equal number of students in the many of grade twelve sections of the school. For these two groups, the researcher provided 10 items as check lists to rate students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency. These were format, organization, grammar (error free sentences), mechanics (punctuation, capitalization and spelling), content, language use, diction, coherence, unity and spelling as these all are related to accuracy and fluency. These scoring criterion within their value are found at the end of appendix part.

### **3.5 Data Collection Instruments**

The instruments used to collect data for the study were pre and post-tests, questionnaire and interview. All of them were taken from International English Proficiency Test (iEPT) for academic writing skills. The rationale for selecting iEPT test was because it is prepared to test English language learners in EFL context. Besides, iEPT test has standard ways of testing EFL learners at every grade level and educational background. Since iEPT test is standardized as it is designed by the scholars in the field, the researcher adopted the techniques by giving instructions to the learners who has taken the test. Both the pre- and post-tests were almost similar in many various procedures like in their instruction, familiarity to the students, in the time they have been taken to be accomplished and in the way they were completed.

#### **3.5.1 Pre-test**

A pre-test was used to collect data from the two selected sections about the students' level of paragraph writing in line with accuracy and fluency. Since the research design used here was quasi experimental study, the students' accuracy and fluency in writing a paragraph before the intervention were assessed. The learners' writing performance in the two groups before the experiment was compared to test the first hypothesis stated in this study.

#### **3.5.2 Post-test**

A post-test was used after the intervention. This question had much similarity with the pre-test. The students in control and experimental groups were ordered to take it immediately after the intervention. The main purpose of the post-test was in order to test the hypothesis formulated as whether there is any significant effect of using direct written corrective feedback on grade ten students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency after the intervention. Besides, the post test was used to compare which group has more accurately and fluently than the other.

#### **3.5.3 Questionnaire for Students**

Questionnaire for students was one of the tools used for gathering data for this study. A questionnaire with closed and open-ended questions was designed and distributed to students in the experimental group in order to find out their attitude towards the given teachers' written corrective feedback. The questionnaire was only given for students in the experimental group.

This is because there were question items which give meaning only for students who participated in the experimental group. It was assumed that the students' responses would throw light on to what extent was teachers' written corrective feedback has been accepted by them students and its' value in improving their paragraph writing accuracy and fluency.

### **3.5.4 Interview for Teachers**

In this study, a structured interview was conducted with five English language teachers. The main objective of the interview was to cross check the results obtained through students' questionnaire so as to arrive at the right conclusion about students' attitude towards their teachers' feedback. The researcher has tried to make the questions general as much as possible to avoid confusion which might be occurred on the side of those teachers who do not participate on students' experiment and do not know the criteria's provided as a check list.

### **3.6. Material for the Intervention**

The free paragraph writing lessons included in the students' textbook were the main materials for this study. The researcher shaped them to be suitable for the purpose of the present research. In order to shape these free writing activities, the researcher used additional reference materials from various resources. Moreover, students in both groups were encouraged to rewrite a paragraph after they had been made to engage in a thirty minutes explanation of the corrective feedback given on their attempt. The group members who were going to be involved to get correction through written corrective feedback were urged to follow the correction given to rewrite the paragraphs they produced. Both groups have been explained clearly if they don't understand the correction given on their writing.

### **3.7 Controlling Mechanisms of Erroneous Result**

As explained above, the instruction and level of difficulty of the pretest and the posttest items were directly be taken from iEPT. This simplified the problems that could be created from not using standardized instrument. The questionnaire and interview instruments quality was also checked by two Jimma University lecturers who have PhD in TEFL and Literature. The face, construct and content validity of the tests were held by giving the sample tests to the two advisors, and two English teachers who have been teaching at grade twelve. The comments given from these teachers were used to redesign the tests. A



pilot was conducted on both instruments to check the reliability of these tests. The reliability of the texts was made on grade twelve students taken from Seto Semerow Secondary School. According to Selinger and Shohamy (1989 p 184), reliability provides information on the extent to which the data collection procedure elicits accurate data; validity provides information on the extent to which the procedure really measures what it is supposed to measure. In testing writing skills, a test should first be reliable as a measuring instrument, therefore, an attempt was made to consider test/ re-test reliability.

In order to achieve this, the test should be administered to the same group on different occasions with no language practice taking place between these occasions. This is because a test must be consistent in its measurement without any language input given. Accordingly the testing process is repeated with a group of test takers, and essentially the same results would be obtained. Various kinds of reliability coefficients, with values ranging between 0.00 (much error) and 1.00 (no error), are usually used to indicate the amount of error in the scores. The following table shows the Chronbach’s alpha of the test-retest reliability of both pretest and posttest made in grade 12 students of Seto Semero Secondary school.

**Table 3.1 Reliability statistics of test-retest reliability of Pretest and Posttest**

	Cronbach Alpha	N of Items
Pretest	.772	2
Posttest	.763	2

The above test was statistically reliable since the Cronbach Alpha of the pretest was .772 and of the post test is .763 for the 2 test items that were used to test the students. Both pre and posttests are reliable because according to the score of the Chronbach’s alpha, a test which has a score above 0.6 is the acceptable one.

### **3.8 Ethical Consideration**

This proposal was approved by ethical clearance obtained from Jiren high school and formal letter from department of English language together with a permission letter approved by Jimma town administrative office and all selected staff teachers. Each study participant was verified on the study objective and verbal consent was granted and confidentiality was assured for any information obtained.

### **3.9 Method of Data Analysis**

A researcher can choose either quantitative or qualitative based on the nature of the research problem. Creswell (2012) . As it can be seen from the above research design, the present research problem can fit with experimental design on one hand and descriptive design on the other in order to test the hypotheses formulated. Thus, the mixed approach (quantitative and qualitative methods of data analysis) were used to see the mean differences, standard deviation, t-value and also students' attitude towards the feedback. The mixed method approach is a recent achievement in educational research. Most researchers believe that mixed method approach enables researchers to avoid bias. This approach is usually referred to as triangulation. The concept of triangulation is based on the assumption that by using several data sources and methods, one can minimize bias in one's particular study. It is often stressed that different methods have different weaknesses and strengths, and therefore the main effect of triangulation is to overcome the weaknesses of any single method (Seliger and Shohamy, 1989; Cohen and Manion, 1998; Laws, 2003; Creswell, 2003). Thus, in this research, the researcher used triangulation method to avoid bias through cross checking the results obtained from one instrument with the other.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

As it has been stated in chapter one, the general objective of this study was to investigate the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on grade twelve EFL students' paragraph writing accuracy and

fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback. The chapter was also attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there any statistically significant difference between the mean values of control and experimental groups' paragraph writing performance before and after the intervention?
2. Is there any statistically significant effect of using TRCF on EFL learners' fluency in paragraph writing?
3. Is there any statistically significant effect of using TRCF on EFL learners' accuracy in paragraph writing?
4. How do EFL learners accept the given written corrective feedback?

To achieve the above general and specific objectives, this chapter presents the results of data gathered through pre-test and post-test from both control and experimental groups students and the results collected through questionnaires and interviews from experimental group students and their teachers respectively regarding students attitude towards the feedback. In this chapter, different phases and steps were followed to analyze and interpret the data collected for this study.

The first phase of the discussion has been made to analyze and discuss the demographic information of the selected students in two groups. And then, the data that has been collected from the results of test scores of the experimental and control groups in the pre- and post- test scores have been fed in the SPSS 20 software and elaborated for this study. In this analysis, the mean, mean differences, standard deviations, case processing summary, standard errors and the Pearson correlations were identified and expressed in tables and followed with discussions. In addition to this the results obtained through the questionnaire and interview was analyzed and interpreted.

## **4.2 Participants' Demographic Information**

The personal information like sex, age, a grade level of the students those who had been selected as the experimental group and control group were identified and presented in the table1 below and followed with their discussions

**Table 4.1 Demographic Information of the Sample Students**

No	Variables	Information	Responses	Percent
1	Sex	Male	43	47.8%
		Female	47	52..2.%
		Total	90	100%
2	Age	18-20	87	96.7%
		21-23	3	3.3%
		Total	90	100%

As it can be seen from the above table, the selected students sorted in the experimental and control groups were male and female students. 43 (47.8%) of the students were male and 47(52.2%) of the students were female. This implies that the numbers of female and male students were almost proportional in that there was no gender bias in this study. The little difference existing between them shows the reality. That means in our school, now a days the number of female students is becoming greater than the number of male students. The ages of the students were ranged between 18 and 23 years. All the respondents were selected from grade 12 by using purposive sampling technique.

### 4.3 Case Processing Summary

The case processing summary was analyzed to identify the valid, excluded cases by computing the number of students for the experimental and control group in the pre and post-test. Table 4.2 shows a case processing summary to see whether all participants engage in taking the tests.

**Table 4.2 Case Processing Summary for Experimental a Control Groups in the pretest and posttest**

		N	
Cases	Valid	90	

Excluded <sup>a</sup>	0	
Total	90	

*a. List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure*

As has been seen in table 4.3, all the selected students were sat for the pretest and posttest and the scores were analyzed. Therefore, no one was excluded from the case in that 90 (100%) selected were valid and 0 was invalid in the above case processing summary.

## 4.4 Results of Pretest and Posttest of Control and Experimental Groups

### 4.4.1 Pretest Result of Control and Experimental Groups

First of all, the pretest and posttest given before and after the intervention was computed in order to check the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL learners' paragraph writing accuracy. The following tables show the data computed using SPSS version 20.

#### 4.4.1.1 Descriptive Statistics of the Pretest

The descriptive statistics of the pretest and posttest statistics were computed in order to get the mean, the standard deviation, the minimum and the maximum results. The table below depicts the data of descriptive statistics.

Table 4.4 Descriptive Statistics of Pretest

Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
control group	45	61	80	73.20	4.466
experimental group	45	48	82	71.44	6.493
Valid N (list wise)	45				

As we can see from the above table, the minimum and maximum achievements of the control group in the pretest were 61 and 80 respectively whereas the minimum and maximum achievements of the experimental group in the pretest were 48 and 82 respectively. In addition to this, the mean of the control group in the pretest was 73.20 and the mean of the experimental group in the pretest was 71.44. This shows that there is no statistically significant difference between performances of the control and the experimental group students in the pretest. Thus, before the experiment, the two groups were almost supposed to be comparable.

#### 4.4.1.2 Independent Sample t-test of Pretest

To confirm the above result, an independent sample t-test was computed. The following table displays the result of the independent sample t-test for the pretest of both experimental and control groups.

**Table 4.5 Independent Sample t-test of Pretest**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)	MD	SED	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Pretest Result	Equal variances assumed	.870	.353	-1.483	88	.142	-1.756	1.184	-4.108	.597
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.483	77.523	.142	-1.756	1.184	-4.112	.601

An independent-samples t test was calculated comparing the mean scores of the experimental and control groups. No significant difference was found ( $t(-1.483) : .142, p(.142) > .05$ ). The mean of the control group ( $m = 73.20, sd. = 4.466$ ) was not significantly different from the mean of experimental group ( $m = 71.44, sd. = 6.493$ ). This confirms that the first null hypothesis which is stated as there is no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of experimental and control groups in line with learners' in paragraph writing before the intervention was not rejected.

#### 4.4.2 Posttest Result of Control and Experimental Groups

In order to test the hypothesis that was stated as if there is no any statistically significant difference in the mean scores of the control and experimental groups after the intervention, the posttest results were compared.

#### 4.4.2.1 Descriptive Statistics of Posttest

The table underneath shows the descriptive statistics of the posttest result of both control and experimental groups.

**Table 4.6 Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Control group students	45	54	89	73.62	8.608
Exp group students	45	69	99	84.89	7.572
Valid N (listwise)	45				

As we can see from the above table, the minimum and maximum achievements of the control group in the posttest were 54 and 89 respectively whereas the minimum and maximum achievements of the experimental group in the posttest were 69 and 99 respectively. In addition to this, the mean of the control group in the posttest was 73.62 and the mean of the experimental group in the posttest was 84.89. This shows that there is statistically significant difference between the performances of the control and the experimental group students in the posttest. Thus, after the experiment, there is a great difference between the performance of control and experimental group. This means that after receiving teachers' written corrective feedback, the experimental group has shown a great change (improvement) on their paragraph writing accuracy. This implies that teachers' written corrective feedback has positive effect in improving students' paragraph writing accuracy.

This result is consistent with the study of Ali and Rahnama (2013) which revealed that those who used teachers' written corrective feedback performed better than the comparison group (control group) in relation to writing accurate paragraph. On the other hand, this finding opposes the half part of the second hypothesis which states that there is no any statistically significant effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on EFL learners' in paragraph writing before and after the intervention. Based on this result, it is also possible to answer the second research question which asks "Is there any statistically significant effect of TRCF on EFL learners' accuracy in paragraph writing? Thus, the result shows that TRCF has significant effect on learners' paragraph writing accuracy.

#### 4.4.2.2 Independent Sample t-test of Posttest

To substantiate the descriptive statistics analyzed above, independent sample t-test on posttest result was computed. Thus, the table below shows the inferential statistics made on the posttest results of control and experimental groups after the intervention.

**Table 4.7 Independent Sample t-test Posttest**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	MD	SDE	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
Posttest Result	Equal variances assumed	.450	.504	6.581	88	.000	11.244	1.709	7.849	14.640
	Equal variances not assumed			6.581	86.597	.000	11.244	1.709	7.848	14.641

*(MD – Mean Difference; SDE – Standard Deference Error)*

The above table shows the independent sample t-test of posttest. An independent sample t-test was computed to compare the mean scores of the posttest of both experimental and control groups. It was found that there is a significant difference between the means of the two groups ( $t(88) = 6.981, p(.000) < .05$ ). The mean of the control group was significantly lower ( $m = 73.62, Sd. = 8.608$ ) than the mean of the experimental group ( $m = 84.89; Sd. = 7.572$ ). Therefore, the hypothesis that was stated as there is no any statistically significant difference between the mean scores of control and experimental groups after the intervention was rejected.

#### 4.5 Comparing Both Tests for a Group

To assess whether using written corrective feedback on EFL learners' paragraph writing performance, the researcher compared the mean scores of both tests for each group separately. This method was implemented to test the following two null hypotheses:



1. There is no any statistically significance difference in the mean scores between the pretest and the posttest of control groups.
2. There is no any statistically significance difference in the mean scores between the pretest and the posttest of experimental groups.

### 4.5.1 Results of Control Group

To test the hypothesis whether there is no any statistical significance difference in the mean values of pretest and posttest results of the control group, descriptive statistics that portrays the minimum, maximum, mean and standard deviation and inferential statistics which shows paired sample t-test were calculated..

#### 4.5.1.1 Descriptive Statistics

The table below shows the descriptive statistics of the pre and posttest of the control group.

Table Descriptive statistics of pre and posttests of Control groups

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest Score	45	61	80	73.20	4.465
Posttest Score	45	54	89	73.64	8.605
Valid N (listwise)	45				

As has been seen from the above table, the mean values of the pretest and posttest are 73.20 (*Sd.* = 4.465) and 73.64 (*Sd.* = 8.605) respectively. The mean difference between the two means is .40. This is to mean that learners have shown a .40 progress though they attend the class based on the conventional teaching method for about six week. This improvement can be attained because of the contact hours, some samples' effort to improve writing or some learners' interest to writing.

### 4.5.1.2 Paired Sample t-test of Control Group

The paired sample t-test was computed in order to see if there is no any statistically significant difference between the mean values of the pretest and posttest of the control group. The data is presented in the table below.

**Table Paired Sample t-test of the pre and posttest of Control Group**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		M	Std. D	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Control Group	Pretest Score - Posttest Score	-.444	7.272	1.084	-2.629	1.740	-.410	44	.684

A paired-samples t -test was calculated to compare the mean score of the pretest to the mean score of the posttest. The mean on the pretest was 73.20 (*Sd.* = 4.465), and the mean on the final was 73.64 (*Sd.* = 8.605). No significant difference from midterm to final was found ( $t(44) = .684, p >.05$ ). Therefore, the hypothesis that was stated as there is no any statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the control group in the pretest and posttest was failed to reject.

### 4.5.2 Results of Experimental Groups

In order to check whether there was no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental groups in the pretest and posttest, descriptive statistics and paired sample t-test were calculated.

### 4.5.2.1 Descriptive Statistics of Experimental Groups

The following table displays the result of descriptive statistics made on the pre and posttests of experimental group.

**Table Descriptive statistics of experimental group**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	45	48	81	71.44	6.566
Posttes	45	69	99	84.89	7.572
Valid N (list wise)	45				

It is clearly seen from the above table that there is a big difference between the mean scores of experimental group in the pre test  $M = 71.44$  ( $Sd. = 6.566$ ) and the posttest  $M = 84.89$  ( $Sd. = 7.572$ ). Thus, the difference is 13.45.

### 4.5.2.2 Paired Sample t-test

To check the above data, and to accept or reject the stated hypothesis, paired sample t-test was calculated. The table below shows the data of the paired sample t-test.

**Table Paired Sample t-test of Experimental Group**

	Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	M	Std. D	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Exp. Pretest – Group Posttest	-13.444	7.313	1.090	-15.642	-11.247	-12.333	44	.000

As has been depicted in the above table, a paired-samples t -test was calculated to compare the mean score of the pretest to the mean score of the posttest the experimental group. The mean on the pretest was 71.44 ( $Sd. = 6.566$ ), and the mean on the post test was 84.89 ( $Sd. = 8.572$ ). A significant increase from pretest to posttest was found ( $t(44) = -12.333, p(.000) < .05$ ). Therefore, the hypothesis that was stated as there is no any statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the pretest and posttest of the experimental group in was rejected.

## 4.5 Learners' Accuracy and Fluency in Paragraph Writing

### 4.5.1 Paragraph Writing Accuracy and Fluency before the Intervention

The control and experimental group students' result on accuracy and fluency of paragraph writing was computed before the intervention using the pre-test. The data is displayed in the following table.

**Table 4.2.3 Summary of the two Groups' Result on Accuracy and Fluency in the Pre-test**

	Accuracy					Fluency				
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD.	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD.
<b>Control Group</b>	45	61	80	73.09	4.466	45	60	82	72.89	4.244
<b>Exp. Group</b>	45	48	82	72.27	6.493	45	47	81	71.91	6.352

The table above indicates accuracy and fluency results of control and experimental group in the pre-test. The minimum and maximum scores of the control group in the pre-test for accuracy were 61 and 80 whereas 60 and 82 for fluency respectively. Besides, the mean scores of the control group in the pre-test were 73.09 and 72.89 for accuracy and fluency respectively. From this we can understand that the accuracy and fluency results of the control group in the pre-test were almost related.

On the other hand, the lowest and highest scores of experimental group in the pre-test for accuracy were 48 and 82 respectively whereas 47 and 81 for fluency respectively again. Furthermore, the mean scores of the experimental group in the pre-test were 72.27 and 71.91 for accuracy and fluency respectively. This result shows that the accuracy and fluency results of the experimental group in the pre-test were almost comparable. This table generally depicts that the control and experimental groups made no significant difference over their accuracy compared to their fluency results in the pre-test.

### 4.5.2 Paragraph Writing Accuracy and Fluency after the Intervention

A summary of Control and Experimental Group Students' Result on paragraph writing accuracy and fluency after the intervention was made by checking learners' attempts from the Post-test. The table underneath depicts the data collected from learners' result they got in the posttest

## Table Summary of the two Groups' Result on Accuracy and Fluency in the Posttest

	Accuracy					Fluency				
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD.	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD.
<b>Cont. Group</b>	45	54	89	73.62	8.608	45	53	88	73.51	8.487
<b>Exp. Group</b>	45	69	99	84.89	7.572	45	67	96	84.78	7.425

The above table reveals accuracy and fluency results of control and experimental group in the post-test. The minimum and maximum scores of the control group in the post-test for accuracy were 54 and 89 whereas 53 and 88 for fluency respectively. Besides, the mean scores of the control group in the post-test were 73.62 and 73.51 for accuracy and fluency respectively. From this we can understand that the accuracy and fluency results of the control group in the pot-test were almost related.

In the same way, the minimum and maximum scores of experimental group in the post-test for accuracy were 69 and 99 respectively whereas 67 and 96 for fluency respectively again. Furthermore, the mean scores of the experimental group in the post-test were 84.89 and 84.78 for accuracy and fluency respectively. This result shows that the accuracy and fluency results of the experimental group in the post-test were almost comparable.

As noted from the two tables above, teachers' written corrective feedback has positive and comparable effect on students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency. That means both control and experimental groups have related scores in accuracy and fluency during the pre-test. In the same way control and experimental groups have also almost equal results on accuracy and fluency during the post-test. Based on this result, it is possible to answer the first research question (Is there any statistically significant difference between the mean values of control and experimental groups paragraph writing performance before and after the intervention?). This result shows that, before the intervention there is no significant difference, but after the intervention, there is significant difference between the two groups paragraph writing performance.

According to Ellis (2009), accuracy is the ability to avoid error in performance/ avoidance of challenging structures that might provoke error and fluency is the capacity to use language to emphasize meaning. Thus, as the researcher understands from the above results, when students try to improve their paragraph

writing accuracy, (when they try to avoid error in performance or when they avoid ambiguous parts from their written paragraph), indirectly they can also produce meaning full language (fluent paragraph to some extent). That means the improvement of the one can also be the development of the other. In supporting this, Yurushen (2013) states that accuracy is the basis of fluency while fluency is a further improvement of a person's linguistic competence. The two are so closely related that they are inseparable.

#### **4.5 Results of Students' Questionnaire**

The data collected were tabulated and the results were presented below (The result which is shown in table 4.3 is found at the end of appendix part).

As shown in table 4.3, most students (66.67, 22.22%) strongly agreed and agreed respectively to the item stating that I'm interested in WCF given by my teacher. While few students (6.66%, 2.22%) disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively to this idea. and 2.22% of the subjects did not comment regarding this. This implies that most of the students want their TWCF for their paragraph writing performance. In the same way, about 71.1%, 17.17% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed to the idea that TRCF helps them write a well-organized paragraph. Whereas (4.44%, 2.22%) of them disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively to the idea. On the other hand and one student (2.22%) abstained from giving comments. This result reflects that most of the students believe TWCF enables them to write a well-organized paragraph. Parallel to this, most students (55.55%, 37.77.33%) agreed and strongly agreed respectively to the idea that their teacher is knowledgeable enough to correct their grammar related errors. However, only (4.44, 2.22%) said they disagreed and strongly disagreed to this statement. This implies that most of the students accept and respect their teachers' comments in relation to grammar. Concerning students' difficulty to read their teachers' comments, most students (44.44%, 35.55%) strongly disagreed and disagreed respectively to the fact. But few students (8.88%, 4.44%) said that they agreed and strongly agreed to this statement and three students had no any ideas regarding this. This result clearly indicating that most students do not face difficulties to use their teacher comments for rewriting their drafts.

Generally, as we can observe from the above results, students have positive attitudes towards their TWCF in relation to improving their paragraph organization, grammar related errors, the use of mechanics, the use of reliable content, how to use appropriate language in appropriate place and situation, style of writing, use of diction, unity of paragraph, coherency of paragraph specifically and to improve their paragraph writing accuracy and fluency generally.

Likewise, for the last two items (open ended questions) of the questionnaire, students required to write general comments, regarding the weak and strong sides of their TWCF. A significant number of the students (35 out of 45) reported that TWCF has strong sides to them as it guides them towards the right direction. Twenty five of the respondents suggested that they have now realized as feedback and writing have strong relationship and important to improve their paragraph writing accuracy and fluency in particular and their writing in general. Four other students underscored the importance of getting feedback on their writing so that they would be able to improve their paragraph writing accuracy and fluency in writing. Two students on the other hand expressed their feelings that even though they got opportunity to practice the paragraph writing accuracy and fluency related items in their writing, they were still unsatisfied to their present status of paragraph writing performance. The remaining students also reported that English language teachers should prepare additional paragraph writing related teaching materials. They agreed that they need an extra hour of learning and supplementary material in addition to their textbook to develop their paragraph writing skills in line with getting appropriate feedback. This is because their teachers are only guided by the textbooks and most secondary school teachers think that their responsibility is only to cover the textbook, and therefore they do not give additional exercises and practices. They also pointed out that the reduction of classroom teaching hours due to Corona virus created a big problem for them. This is because the time is very fast and not enough both for teachers and students to include additional writing practices.

#### **4.6 Results of Teachers' Interview**

As raised in chapter three, the main objective of this teachers' interview was to identify whether teachers have awareness about their students attitude towards their feedback as this can affect the effectiveness of teachers' feedback. The researcher also expected that having an interview with all Grade twelve EFL teachers might have some contribution to this study as it can solve some problems related to feedback provision which was also expected to get solution from teachers themselves. The researcher has tried to make the interview questions general as much as possible

not to confuse those teachers who were not participated on the experiment. Accordingly, the findings of the interview questions were discussed as follows.

Regarding whether or not teachers provide feedback for their students, all of the interviewee expressed their ideas by saying that they provide feedback for their students even though the frequency of their feedback provision is different from one teacher to the other. The other question presented to them was to check whether they know their students including of their comments for their next writing. For this three of the interviewed teachers said that they include most of their comments. In contrast to this, two of the teachers said “Most of the time we teachers do not have enough time to give paragraph writing practices repeatedly, so I cannot blame them not to include our comments for the next time.” The next question they have been asked was about to what extent their students respect their opinion, suggestions comments so as to guide them write accurate and fluent paragraph. In relation to this question all of the teachers announced that their students have no problem on this. They further added that their students have great interest and respect for their teachers’ comments since they believe that teachers’ comments are very clear and adequate compared to peer comments. The other additional questions presented for teacher interviewee were concerned with whether their students face difficulties of understanding their comments or not, if any what were the solutions of such problems, how do teachers treat them when they make errors, what was teachers focus in providing feedback, whether teachers provide feedback for their students on time or not and also they have been asked what other points they have about their students attitude towards their feedback. Four of the teachers said that there is no problem regarding difficulties of understanding their comments. However, one of the teachers expressed her views as some of their students fail to recognize what to improve for the next time due to their personal carelessness. For this, she has tried to put solution by saying writing club should be established in the school so as to motivate and attract students towards writing skill by prizing and giving other promotions for model students. Regarding teachers’ treatment of their students in mistake, almost all of them said that, they accept their students’ mistakes positively and do not punish them rather they appreciated their students for their try, instead of being silent. Thus these findings on interview results almost confirm with the questionnaire findings as they show students’ positive attitude towards their teachers’ feedback.



## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter includes summary of the overall process of the study, conclusions drawn from the findings of the study and recommendations of the effect of teachers' written corrective feedback on Grade 12 EFL students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback.

## 5. 2 Summary

The study focused on identifying if there is significant difference between the achievement of control and experimental group students before and after the experiment. It was also attempted to examine whether TWCF has effect on students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency before and after the intervention. Furthermore, the study tried to identify whether students accept their teachers' comments positively or not.

To achieve the objectives of this study, quasi experimental was the main research design used. In addition to this, questionnaire and interview were also used as a descriptive part to supplement the experiment design. In trying to address these issues, quantitative and qualitative method of data analysis (mixed approach) was used. In this study, ninety Grade 12 EFL students were chosen as a sample using random sampling technique. In addition to this, five Grade 12 EFL teachers were also used as target population. In order to achieve the objectives, four data gathering tools were employed. These were pre-test, post-test, questionnaire and interview. Based on the analysis of the data presented in chapter four, the findings could be summed up as follows:

1. The results of the experiment revealed that the experimental group students outperformed the control group students (the mean score is 84.89 and 73.62, respectively in the post test). This indicates that teachers' written corrective feedback has a positive impact on students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency.
2. TRCF has positive effect on EFL learners' paragraph writing accuracy. Table 4.26 shows this result in the post-test (84.89). That means the result of experimental group students in accuracy increased from 73.09 in the pre-test to 84.89 in the post-test.
3. In the same way, TWCF has also positive effect on EFL learners' paragraph writing fluency. Again Table 4.26 depicts this result in the post-test (84.78). This is to mean that the result of experimental group students in fluency increased from 71 .91 in pre to 84.78 in the post-test. This result indicates that teachers' written corrective feedback has positive effect on students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency.
4. The results from the questionnaire and interview also indicate that students have positive attitude towards their teachers' written corrective feedback which in turn plays its own role in approving the effectiveness of TWCF. This finding is consistent with a number of studies showing the

positive effect of teachers' written corrective feedback in improving and assisting students to develop their writing achievements. Ali (2013), Shafiee(2015) and Sultan H. Alharbi(2016) even though they are different from this study in their title, design, method of data analysis and etc. Finally, conclusions and recommendations were made based on the findings of the study.

### 5.3 Conclusions

The current study examined the effect of a teachers' written corrective feedback on Jiren EFL secondary school students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency and students' attitude towards the feedback. The findings showed that teacher's written corrective feedback had a significant positive effect on students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency. Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn.

1. Teachers' written corrective feedback has relationship with students' writing performance. That is why it had great contribution on students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency.
2. The result of the experiment shows that there was statistically significant difference between control and experimental group students' paragraph writing performance after the intervention. That is after the experiment, the mean values of control group was (73.62, 73.51) for accuracy and fluency respectively, whereas the mean values of experimental group was (84.89, 84.78) for accuracy and fluency respectively as shown in Table 4.26.
3. The result of the experiment also revealed that there was statistically significant effect of TWCF on students paragraph writing accuracy (the mean score of experimental group students in accuracy increased from 73.09 in pre to 84.89 in the post).
4. Likewise, the result of experimental group in fluency increased from 71.91 in pre to 84.78 in post. Thus, from these discussions (no. two, three and four), it is possible to conclude that TRCF has almost equal positive effect on students paragraph writing accuracy and fluency.
5. The results obtained from questionnaire and interview justify that students have positive attitude towards their teachers' feedback. As it can be seen from Table 4.3 and 4.4, the responses of most of the students and teachers were affirmative. These indicate that students seem to respect their teachers' comments, suggestions corrections and consider it as an input and integral part of learning writing skill.

## 5.4 Recommendations

Feedback in general and teachers' written corrective feedback in particular should not be seen as additional part of writing skill. Rather it should be taken as an important and integral part of writing skill. Without teachers' feedback, it is difficult for students to recognize their current level of understanding on what they have written. Without providing feedback, (observing their students work), teachers also cannot know their students potential. In relation to this Slavin(2006) stated that feedback provides information not only for learners but also for teachers. As he said, teachers cannot be expected to be effective if they do not have information about whether students have obtained the main points of their lessons or not.

Thus, based on this the researcher can say that without feedback, it is difficult both for teachers and students to improve students paragraph writing accuracy and fluency in particular and writing skill in general. Accordingly, to improve students' paragraph writing accuracy and fluency in general the following recommendations were forwarded.

1. Teachers have to provide clear, specific, frequent and immediate feedback for their learners because, if the feedback is not clear, students cannot recognize what to improve, if the feedback is not specific, they do not know which part of their writing is good and which one is not good and also teachers' feedback should be continuous to maintain their students better efforts. Concerning this Kulik and Kulik 1998 stated that to be effective motivator, teachers 'written corrective feedback must be clear, specific, frequent and cloth in time to the performance.
2. Teachers have to give equal attention to both accuracy and fluency in preparing teaching materials, in applying teaching methods, in providing exercises, in using writing processes as much as possible. This is due to the fact that accuracy and fluency are so related and they are very important parts for paragraph development. That means one is not enough without the other in paragraph development.
3. Paragraph writing (writing skill in general) is very important especially for grade11 and 12 students as they have to prepare themselves for entrance exam and university program. To motivate and attract these and others towards writing skill, one of the interviewed teachers said that writing club should be established in this school. As one staff member of this school, the researcher also supports this idea. In combination with Jimma University (since the school is

cloth to the University), EFL teachers of the school including the researcher have to start this. By doing this it is possible to prize (give other promotions) to model students so as to attract others towards writing skill.

4. Workshops and other training programmers on writing skill also should be given to EFL teachers and students of this school. By doing these and others it is possible to be good role model for other departments in the school and then even for other schools.

## References

- Ali and Rahnama(2013), The Effect of Written Corrective Feedback Mode on EFL Learners' Grammatical and Lexical Writing Accuracy: from Perceptions to Facts
- Al-Sawalha, A. M., & Chow, T. V. Foo (2013). Mother tongue influence on writing apprehension of Jordanian student studying English language:  
Case study. *International Journal of English and Education*, 2(1), 46-51
- Amrhein, H. R., & Nassaji, N. (2010). Written CF: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(2), 95-127.  
and Heinle Publishers
- Anchale, S. & Pongrat, R. (2008). *Analysis of Errors in Paragraph Writing in English by First*

*Year Medical Students from the Four Medical Schools at Mahidol University*

Atkins J .Hailom Band Nuru. M(1996) skills development methodology part 2 Addis

Abeba University

Bitchener, J., Young, S., & Cameron, D. (2005). The effect of different

types of corrective feedback on ESL student writing. *Journal of Second Language*

Boughey, C. (1997). Learning to write by writing to learn: a group-work approach. *ELT Journal*, 51 (2), 126-134.

Brookhart, S. (2008). How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students. United State of

America. ASCD Publications

Brown H. Douglas (2007): Principles of Language Teaching and Learning Long man

*Writing*, 14(3), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2005.08.001>

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1998). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge

Creswell, J.W. (1994). Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approach. Thousand Oaks,

CA: Sage.

Dinamikalimu ( 2017 ) The Effect of Different Feed back on Writing Quality Students With Different

Cognitive Style

Edge J ( 1989). Mistakes and Corrections Long man group UK.

Ellis, Rod. (2009). The Differential Effects of Three Types of Task Planning on the

Fluency, Complexity, and Accuracy in L2 Oral Production. *Applied Linguistics*

Ferris (2002). *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing*. Ann Arbour: University of Michigan University of Michigan Press

Ferris, D R (2005). Treatment of Errors in Second Language Students Writing Mechanism

Ferris (2006) Does Error Feedback Help Student Writers? *New Evidence on the Short- a Long-term Effects of Written Error Correction.*

Ferris (2007). Preparing Teaching to Respond to Students Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16/3, pp.165-193

Geremew Lemu. (1999). *A study of the Requirements of Writing for Academic Purpose at Addis*

*Ababa University*. Unpublished (PhD Dissertation): Addis Ababa University

Grabe&Kaplan (1996). *Theory and Practice of Writing*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.

Hamouda, A. (2011). A study of Students and Teachers' Preferences and Attitudes towards Correction of Classroom Written Error in Saudi EFL Context. *English Language Teaching*

Hart, A.W. & Reinking, J.A. (1990). *Writing for College and Career*. (4th ed.) New York: St. Martin's Press

Hedge, T. (1988). *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University press.

Hong, F. (2006). Students Perceptions of Peer Response Activity in English Writing Instruction. *CELEA*

*Journal*, 29(4), 48-52

Hyland, K. & F. Hyland (2006). Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing. *Language*

Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: CUP

Jordan R.R. (1981) : *Academic Writing Course* : Cambridge University

*Teaching journal*, 39, pp. 83-101.. Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to theoretical linguistics.*

Cambridge University Press. :

Kelly, W. J. & Lawton, D.L. (1998). *Odyssey: A guide to Better Writing*. New York: Cambridge

University pres.

- Kothari, C.R. (2004), *Research Methodology, Methods and Techniques*.
- Kroll, B. (2001). Consideration for Teaching an ESL/EFL Writing Course. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language* (3rd ed.) (PP219-232): Boston (2<sup>nd</sup> revised edition) New Delhi: New Age International Ltd
- Laws, S. (2003). *Research for Development: A Practical Guide*. SAGE Publications Ltd. London.
- Lyons, J. (1968). *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McDonough & Shaw (1993). *Material and Methods in ELT*. UK: Black Publishers Press
- Nation, I. S.P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Nigusie Teka (2000) : *English Language Teachers' Feedback Provision on Students Writing*, Jimma University
- Nunan (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*. Prentice Hall International printing press.
- O'Donnell, T. D. & Paiva, J. L. (1993). *Independent Writing. (2nd Ed)* Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers
- Oshima, Alice & Hogue, (2006). *Writing Academic English*. Pearson Education. Inc: Longman. 68  
London. Mac Millan. Pincas, A. (1984). *Writing in English*. London. Mac Millan.
- Pincas, A. (1984). *Writing in English*. London. Mac Millan. Pincas, A. (1984). *Writing in English*.
- Rajatanun, K. (1988). *A Refresher Course in Writing*. (2nd ed.) Bangkok: Thammasat University Press.
- Reid, J. M. (1994). *The Process of Paragraph Writing*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.



Slavin Robert E (2006) : Educational Psychology, Theory and Practice, John Hopkin University.

Seliger, H.W. and Shohamy, E.(1989). Second Language Research Methods. Oxford:

Oxford University Press

Sultan, H .Alharbi (2016) Effect of Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback on Saudi EFL University Students' Writing Achievements. King Saud University

Williams, J., & Jasmine, G. (2003). Providing feedback on ESL students' written assignments. *TESL-EJ*, 10(4), 1-6. [Online] Available: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Williams-Feedback.html>

Williams, J, D. (2003). Preparing to Teach Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice. Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

YANG Yang (100872): [http// www.Linguist.org](http://www.Linguist.org). Feedback on College EFL Students Composition Writing

## **Appendix- A**

**Jimma University**

**College of Social Sciences and Humanities**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

**Pre-test**

Code \_\_\_\_\_

**Time allowed: 40 minutes**

**Instruction:** Write a paragraph which has at least seven or at most ten sentences on the **title** “Impacts of COVID 19 on My Academic Life”. Your attempt of writing the paragraph is going to be assessed using the criterion such as format, organization, grammar (error free sentences), mechanics (punctuation, capitalization and spelling), content, language use, diction, coherence, unity and spelling as these are related to accuracy and fluency. You will have 40 minutes to finish your writing. . Before starting the pretest, please look at the highlights given on each criterion below.

### **High Lights on Scoring Criterion for Students’ Paragraph in the pretest**

#### **Accuracy Related Criterion**

- 1.Format - did the paragraph has a topic?
  - was the paragraph indented?
  - were those combined sentences sufficient enough to form a paragraph?
2. Handwriting- having readable hand writing
- 3 .Grammar- were tenses (e.g. present simple, past simple, present perfect, or others used properly?
  - How articles (a, an or the) if any were used in the paragraph?
4. Mechanics- were the correct spelling, punctuation and capitalization used?
5. Subject-verb disagreement- were singular nouns used with singular verbs?
  - were plural nouns used with plural verbs?

#### **Fluency Related Criterion**

1. Organization (arrangement of ideas)
  - were a topic sentence, supporting details and concluding sentence properly and orderly written?

2. Content: were all important points included?

- were all included points relevant to the topic?

3. Language use- were appropriate languages used in appropriate place and situation?

4. Diction- were synonymous words used interchangeably to avoid repetition of similar words?

- were the words used clear (not ambiguous)?

5. Coherence- were the ideas in the paragraph built up on one another?

- was there smooth flow of ideas between sentences?

6.Unity- did the paragraph focus only on a single idea?

- were all sentences support the topic?

***Impacts of COVID 19 on My Academic Life***

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Appendix- B  
Jimma University**

**College of Social Sciences and Humanities**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

**Post-test**

**Code :** \_\_\_\_\_

**Time Allowed:** 40 Minutes

**Instruction:** Write a paragraph which has at least seven or at most ten sentences on the **title** *“Impacts of COVID 19 on My Academic Life”*. Your attempt of writing the paragraph is going to be assessed using the criterion such as format, hand writing, organization, grammar (error free sentences), mechanics (Spelling, punctuation and capitalization), content, language use, diction, coherence and unity and as these are related to accuracy and fluency. You will have 40 minutes to finish your writing.

*Impacts of COVID 19 on My Academic Life*

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Appendix- C**  
**Jimma University**

**College of Social Sciences and Humanities**

**Department of English Language and Literature**

**Checking Rubrics with Values for Learners' Accuracy in**

**Paragraph Writing**

<i>Format</i>	<i>Handwriting</i>	<i>Grammar</i>	<i>Mechanics(spelling, punctuation\$ capitalization)</i>
---------------	--------------------	----------------	--

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Rates</i>	<i>Attempts seen</i>	<i>Out of 40</i>	<i>Out100%</i>
5	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Writing the topic of the paragraph, indenting the paragraph, writing sufficient sentences(7-10)</li> <li>- Using from readable to very legible handwriting;</li> <li>- Writing the grammar parts used properly</li> <li>- Capitalizing Punctuating all sentences</li> <li>-Very few spelling Error</li> </ul>	35 - 40	87.5 % - 100%

4	Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Writing the topic of the paragraph, the paragraph was not indented, writing six to eight sentences;</li> <li>- Using above average legible handwriting</li> <li>- Having very few problems related to grammar</li> <li>-Capitalizing almost all sentences</li> <li>- Punctuating all sentences correctly</li> <li>- Few spelling error</li> </ul>	25 - 34	61.5% - 87%
3	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Writing the topic of the paragraph, Writing four to seven sentences, indenting the paragraph</li> <li>- Using moderately readable handwriting</li> <li>- Having some problems related to grammar</li> <li>- Capitalizing many of the sentences</li> <li>- Punctuating many of the sentence correctly</li> <li>- A few spelling errors</li> </ul>	15 - 24	35.5% - 60%
2	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Missing the topic of the paragraph, writing two to four sentences, indenting the paragraph</li> <li>- Many of the words readable</li> <li>- Many grammar related errors</li> <li>- Capitalizing the sentences</li> <li>- Using Punctuation for some of the sentences</li> <li>- Many spelling errors, error in capitalization</li> </ul>	8 - 14	18% - 35%
1	Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No topic, writing one to two sentence</li> <li>- Poor hand writing</li> <li>- Many grammar related errors</li> <li>- Very for capitalization</li> <li>- Not punctuating correctly</li> <li>- Many spelling errors</li> </ul>	1 - 7	1% - 17.5%
0	No Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The paper is returned without writing on</li> </ul>		

<i>Total</i>		
--------------	--	--

**Checking Rubrics with Values for Learners' Fluency in  
Paragraph Writing**

<i>Orga nizat ion</i>	<i>Unity</i>	<i>Content</i>	<i>Coherence</i>	<i>Dicti on</i>	<i>Langu age use</i>
-------------------------------	--------------	----------------	------------------	---------------------	--------------------------

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Rates</i>	<i>Attempts seen</i>	<i>Out of 40</i>	<i>Out 100%</i>
--------------	--------------	----------------------	------------------	-----------------

5	Excellent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Topic, supporting and concluding sentences are organized very appropriately.</i></li> <li>- <i>All sentences are relevant to the topic</i></li> <li>- <i>The message of the paragraph is completely clear</i></li> <li>- <i>Completely appropriate cohesive devices are used</i></li> <li>- <i>Choosing varied and appropriate vocabularies</i></li> <li>- <i>Sentences show above very fluent command</i></li> </ul>	35 - 40	87.5% - 100%
4	Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Topic, supporting and concluding sentences are organized appropriately;</i></li> <li>- <i>Very few sentences are irrelevant to the topic</i></li> <li>- <i>Message of the paragraph is generally clear</i></li> <li>- <i>Most of cohesive devices are appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Most vocabularies are varied and appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Sentences showed above good command</i></li> </ul>	25 - 34	61.5% - 87%
3	Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Topic, supporting &amp; concluding sentences are organized well</i></li> <li>- <i>Some sentences are irrelevant to the topic</i></li> <li>- <i>Message of the paragraph is slightly clear</i></li> <li>- <i>Some of the cohesive devices are appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Many vocabularies are varied and appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Sentences showed good command</i></li> </ul>	15 - 24	35.5% - 60%
2	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Organization of topic, supporting &amp; concluding sentences is weak</i></li> <li>- <i>Many sentences are irrelevant to the topic</i></li> <li>- <i>Message of the paragraph is not clear</i></li> <li>- <i>Many of the cohesive devices are appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Few vocabularies are varied and appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Sentences show weak command</i></li> </ul>	8 - 14	18% - 35%



1	Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Topic, supporting &amp; concluding sentences are not organized</i></li> <li>- <i>Most sentences are irrelevant to the topic</i></li> <li>- <i>Message of the paragraph is not clear</i></li> <li>- <i>Many of the cohesive devices are appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Very few vocabularies are varied and appropriate</i></li> <li>- <i>Sentences show weak command</i></li> </ul>	1 - 7	1% - 17.5%
0	No Trail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>The paper is returned without writing on</i></li> </ul>		
<i>Total</i>				

**Appendix- D**  
**Jimma University**

**College of Social Sciences and Humanities**  
**Department of English Language and Literature**  
**Questionnaire for Experimental Group Students**

*Dear Students,*

The main purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data about the attitudes you have towards your teachers' written corrective feedback. Teachers' written corrective feedback is the comment, correction, and editing given by your teachers on your written work (in this case paragraph). This correction feedback can be underlining or circling the error, writing the correct spelling or grammar, and the rearrangement of words and sentence of your paragraph. Your participation in this study is very important and will contribute to the improvement of the learning writing skill in general and paragraph writing accuracy and fluency in particular for your academic and non-academic career. Please respond to the items in this questionnaire as carefully and honestly as possible. Since this questionnaire is used to survey your attitude and it is not a test of your knowledge about writing skill, do not write your name or other indication of yourself on the paper. Your answers will remain confidential and by completing this questionnaire, you are taking your part of improving your language skill.

*Thank you in advance for your cooperation.*

*Direction: Please put the (x) mark in the box that best reflects your attitudes towards teachers' written corrective feedback against each of the following statements using the five Likert scale that are rated as: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Undecided; 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree.*

	<i>Student's attitude towards TWCF</i>	<i>Scale</i>				
	<i>I am interested in the written correction feedback given by my teacher.</i>					
	<i>I improved my paragraph writing skills because my teachers gave me written feedback on my paragraph.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback guides me to use appropriate format in writing a paragraph.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback helps me write a well-organized paragraph.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback is important to improve my paragraph writing in line with my style of writing.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback helps me to keep the unity of my paragraph.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback in relation to content increase my fear of writing for the next time.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback encourages me to compose error free paragraph.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback directs me to use appropriate language in appropriate place and situation.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback enhances my diction so that I choose appropriate and varied vocabularies.</i>					

	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback helps me to improve my use of capitalization and punctuation.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback encourages me to give due attention to my spelling</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback makes me write a coherent paragraph so that I use various cohesive devices appropriately</i>					
	<i>I am very happy if all teachers use written corrective feedback on learners' written attempt.</i>					
	<i>My teacher's written corrective feedback helps me to identify the common errors committed on paragraph writing.</i>					
	<i>Since I learned a lot about writing a paragraph, I would like to receive more feedback on my writing in the future.</i>					
	<i>I learned that teachers' written corrective feedback is more useful than using a one shot (or a big tick mark).</i>					

What weak sides have you seen in your teachers' written corrective feedback?

---



---



---



---

What strong sides have you seen in your teachers' written corrective feedback?

---



---



---



---

## Appendix E

Jimma University

College of Social Sciences and Humanities

Department of English Language and Literature

Interview for EFL Teachers

Dear teachers,

First of all, thank you so much for your willingness to take part in this interview which is exclusively for research purpose as a part of my MA study at Jimma University. The purpose of this study is to gather data concerning your students' attitude towards your written corrective feedback. Your responses are very essential for the success of this study as many solutions are expected to be obtained from your efforts.

1. Do you provide feedback for your students so as to help them write accurate and fluent paragraph?
2. Do they include your previous comments for their next writing work (in this case for paragraph accuracy and fluency)?
3. Do they respect your opinion, suggestions, comments so as to guide them write accurate and fluent paragraph for the next time?
4. Do your students face difficulties of understanding your comments, suggestions, and opinion while writing a paragraph e.g. in relation to accuracy and fluency? What do you think about solutions of such problems?
5. How do your students perceive your comments? How do you see your students' errors? How do you treat them when they make errors in writing accurate and fluent paragraph?
6. What do you focus on when you provide feedback for your students' writing, is that on the specific or the general part of the paragraph?
7. Do you provide feedback on time for your students to write accurate and fluent paragraph?
8. Do you give negative comments to your students' written work? How do you treat them positively so as to help them free from fear for their next task?
9. What other points do you have concerning your students' attitude towards your feedback?

---

---

---

---

## **Appendix F**

Jimma University

College of Social Sciences and Humanities

Department of English Language and Literature

Intervention Materials

C.1. Titles students are ordered to write on

C.2 Strategies and Criteria of Direct Corrective feedback

C 2.1 Identifying error and providing correct form

C.3 Strategies and Criteria of Indirect Corrective feedback

C.3.1 identifying error by using error code

C.3.2 Underlining and circling the errors without providing correct form

**Table.2. Average scores of Rater One and two on Pre and post test results for the selected students**

Group E( Experimental )					Group C ( Control )				
No	Code of the	Results out of 100(100%)			Code of	Results out of 100(100%)			
		Pre	P	Diff		Pre-	P	Dif	
		-	os	eren		test	os	fer	
1	E1	80	99	19	C1	80	85	5	
2	E2	80	92	12	C2	80	82	2	
3	E3	75	95	20	C3	78	84	6	
4	E4	77		13	C4	76	80	4	
5	E5	76	98	22	C5	76		5	
6	E6	76	97	21	C6	76	80	4	
7	E7	74	99	25	C7	74	82	8	
8	E8	79		14	C8	76	89	13	
9	E9	71	89	18	C9	78	80	2	
10	E10	70	89	19	C10	76	80	4	
11	E11	75	90	15	C11	78	78	0	
12	E12	71	84	13	C12	79	80	1	
13	E13	78	95	17	C13	76	78	2	
14	E14	72	81	9	C14	73	78	5	
15	E15	74	88	14	C15	70	85	15	
16	E16	72	81	29	C16	74	80	6	
17	E17	67	90	23	C17	70		8	
18	E18	70	85	15	C18	71	78	7	
19	E19	79	85	6	C19	79	80	1	
20	E20	72	84	12	C20	72	73	1	
21	E21	73	80	7	C21	72	73	1	
22	E22	68	90	22	C22	70	71	1	
23	E23	81	92	11	C23	77	79	2	
24	E24	66	83	17	C24	71	73	2	
25	E25	70	85	15	C25	66	68	2	
26	E26	64	88	24	C26	71	71	0	
27	E27	72	79	7	C27	80	81	1	
28	E28	72	76	4	C28	68	69	1	
29	E29	66	79	13	C29	72	73	1	
30	E30	74	89	15	C30	78	77	1	
31	E31	67	79	12	C31	64	65	1	
32	E32	70	75	5	C32	70	72	2	
33	E33	65	81	16	C33	70	71	1	
34	E34	50	83	33	C34	66	67	1	
35	E35	48	73	25	C35	61	62	1	
36	E36	76	84	8	C36	76	56	20	
37	E37	71	76	5	C37	75	54	21	
38	E38	65	78	13	C38	76		2	
	E39	70	76	6	C39	70		.	
	E40	78	84	6	C40	72			
	E41	72	73	1	C41	71			
42	E42	71	69	2	C42	72			

4	E43	70	79	9		C43	76		
4	E44	70		5		C44	68		
4	E45	70		20		C45	70		
5			90					65	5
Total result		31	38	621	Total result		322	34	22
		99	20				4	45	1
Average		71.	84	13.8	Average				

**Table 4.3.1 Results on Students' Attitude towards Teachers' Written Corrective Feedback**

No	Student's attitude towards TRCF	Scales					
		5	4	3	2	1	
1	I am interested in the written corrective feedback given by my teacher.	<i>f</i>	30	10	1	4	1
		<i>%</i>	66.7	22.2	2.2	6.7	2.2
2	TWCF helps me write a well-organized paragraph.	<i>f</i>	32	8	2	2	1
		<i>%</i>	71.1	17.8	4.4	4.4	2.2
3	My teacher is knowledgeable enough to correct my grammar related errors	<i>f</i>	25	17	---	2	1
		<i>%</i>	55.5	37.7	---	4.4	2.2
4	I face difficulties to read my teacher's comments (e.g. related to mechanics).	<i>f</i>	2	4	3	16	20
		<i>%</i>	4.4	8.8	6.7	35.5	44.4
5	Teacher's comments in relation to content increase my fear of writing for the next time.	<i>f</i>	11	13	4	10	7
		<i>%</i>	24.4	28.8	8.8	22.2	15.5
6	TRCF encourages me to compose error free paragraph.	<i>f</i>	32	10	---	2	1
		<i>%</i>	71.1	22.2	---	4.4	2.2
7	TWCF directs me to use appropriate language in appropriate place and situation.	<i>f</i>	29	12	2	1	1
		<i>%</i>	64.4	26.7	4.4	2.2	2.2
8	My teachers' written corrective feedback is important to improve my paragraph writing in line with my style of writing.	<i>f</i>	25	15	2	3	---
		<i>%</i>	55.6	33.3	4.4	6.7	---



9	TRCF enhances my diction so that I can choose appropriate and varied vocabularies.	<i>f</i>	27	13	1	2	4
		%	60.0	28.9	2.2	4.4	4.4
10	TWRCF helps me to keep the unity of my paragraph.	<i>f</i>	21	19	---	3	2
		%	46.7	42.2	---	6.7	4.4
11	TRCF encourages me to give due attention to spelling.	<i>f</i>	26	14	---	4	1
		%	57.7	31.1	---	8.9	2.2
12	TRCF makes me write coherent paragraph so that I can use various cohesive devices appropriately.	<i>f</i>	15	10	---	18	2
		%	33.3	22.2	---	40.0	4.4
13	I am very happy if all teachers' use written corrective feedback on learners' written attempt.	<i>f</i>	30	10	3	2	---
		%	66.7	22.2	6.7	4.4	---
14	Since I learned a lot about writing a paragraph, I would like to receive more feedback on my writing in the future.	<i>f</i>	25	11	1	5	3
		%	55.6	24.4	2.2	11.1	6.7
15	I learned that TRCF is more useful than using a one shot (a big mark).	<i>f</i>	17	13	2	10	2
		%	37.8	28.9	4.4	22.2	4.4