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Abstract

Teacher feedback plays a significant role in helping learners to acquire their writing skills. However, research findings have consistently pointed to the fact that feedback on single draft essays does not help learners much in improving their essays because they do not have the opportunity to revise, rewrite, and resubmit their work. Therefore, this study aims at examining how students respond to teacher feedback on their compositions in terms of content and form by instituting the multiple-draft procedure. The participants in this study were 28 second year English major students from Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus. These students wrote a first draft, revised it after getting feedback on content, and further revised it after receiving feedback on form. The sources of data were from written texts and completed questionnaires. The findings show that generally most students responded successfully to teacher feedback on their first and second drafts that resulted in improved final drafts. However, some students could not respond well to content-focused feedback that specifically asked them to discuss their ideas. This is largely attributed to their limited language competence. Students also found it difficult to respond to form-focused feedback in relation to tenses, word choice, subject-verb-agreement, nouns, adverbs and rephrasing of sentences. The difficulties in grasping the rules embedded in these categories could be the factor for the low percentage of revision success. Teacher feedback also resulted in students using different types of revision strategies such as closely followed, initial stimulus, avoidance by deletion and not related. Among these strategies, closely followed is considered successful and it is the most used strategy for both content and form-focused feedback. The implication of the study is that giving written feedback to students is beneficial because it improves their essays. However, written feedback should be complimented with oral feedback so that the teacher would be able to get to the problems that students face when writing their essays.

Introduction

Writing, unlike other language skills such as speaking, reading, and listening, has created a lot of problems among learners of English as a Second Language (ESL). These ESL learners face writing anxiety, mental block, and an inability to connect grammar rules with sentence formation, as well as the ineptness in using the rhetorical style of the target language. These problems make it difficult for ESL learners to produce a piece of writing which is interesting, clear, concise, and effective.

Throughout the decades, researchers have been trying to find ways to improve second language writing instruction so that learners can be proficient in their writing. Writing proficiency is reflected when learners writing in target language are able to substantially present the content using linguistically well-formed structures. In addition, the basic assumption that writing can be learned, developed, and mastered has led language teachers to believe that writing skill can be taught, if appropriate foreign language writing pedagogy is
made available. This awareness among researchers and teachers ushered in a fresh outlook in second language writing pedagogy – process – oriented approach to writing instruction.

Process writing gives ESL learners the opportunities to do a number of revisions on their essays that can result in improved writing quality and fairer grades. According to Brown (2001:336), the process-oriented approach gives students the opportunity to think as they write because unlike conversation, writing can be planned and given in an unlimited number of revisions before students produce a good piece of writing as the finished product. With the advent of process considerations in writing, teachers are able to intervene at all stages of students’ writing by providing their comments and suggestions. The statement made by Hadley (2001:281) reflects this process approach in which she views writing as “…a continuum of activities that range from the more mechanical or formal aspect of ‘writing down’ on the one end to the more complex act of composing on the other”. Thus it can be seen that the process-oriented approach to writing instruction emphasizes the notion that writing is a continuous process in which students have to come up with a series of drafts before the finished product emerges.

However, writing teachers must balance the process and product-oriented approach because writing must certainly come to an end at some point. As Brown (2001: 336) puts it, “Process is not the end; it is the means to the end” Therefore, we can see that it does not serve the purpose of writing, just to have students going through the process of reviewing and revising their work many times without giving any significance to the final product. It is only then fair to grade students’ writing not on final products of single drafts but on finished products of multiple-drafts that have been reviewed by teachers at all stages of writing (Cohen, 1994). Multiple drafting means that learners have to go through a series of revisions before the final product of their writing is graded. These revisions are essential in the writing process to give learners the chance to improve their writing. The revising strategies will be effective without the help of teachers throughout the writing process.

In second language writing pedagogy, it cannot be denied that ESL teachers plan an important role in providing feedback to their students. Even though many things have changed in the field of composition research and pedagogy over the last several decades, one thing has remained constant and that is the significance of the teacher feedback on writing (Ferris, 1995). Neman (1995) contends that, “The greatest growth in writing takes place when students under supervision, revise and rewrite their work”. However, providing feedback on multiple-draft compositions takes teachers’ time and energy especially if the writing class is a big one. So, teachers may refrain from providing feedback to the student writers.

According to Fathman & Whaley (1990) as cited in Ferris (1995:35), teachers cannot do away with their commentary on students’ essays because in their study they demonstrate that, “Students’ revisions improved in overall quality and in linguistic accuracy when they received comments and/or corrections on both the content and form of their essays”. If teachers understand this viewpoint, they certainly will provide expert feedback to their students.

When learners are given the chance to revise their work, expert feedback would be one of the sources used as a guideline to discover their mistakes and clarify their ideas in order to improve their essays. Expert feedback can be conceptually defined as the response made by the teachers in L2 writing using form focused approach (i.e., feedback on rules, lexical choices, etc.) and content-focused approach (i.e., feedback on ideas, organization, etc.) with
the intention of improving the composing skills of EFL writers. Students expect teachers to give their feedback on their L2 composing because they are of the opinion that teachers have expertise in the content as well as the form of the essays. Research done on EFL writing instruction has shown that students expect and value their teachers’ feedback on their writing (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Hedgecock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Mc Curdy, 1992) as cited in Ferris (1995:34).

Teachers, on their part, after spending much time and effort in providing written or oral feedback to their students feel that such response is a critical part of their job as writing instructors (Ferris, 1995:34). They try their best to give effective feedback so as to help students in their writing. Teachers may assume that their feedback is effective in helping students because they have made comments on all aspects of students’ essays including those on content and form. Students, on the other hand, may not find the comments helpful because of various factors. For example, in their perspective, there is little clarity in the feedback given by teachers. Some students feel that words and phrases used by teachers are not appropriate to their level of proficiency. And, sometimes there is little oral feedback given by the teachers. In addition, the illegibility of teachers’ handwriting can be another factor why students are notable to respond positively to teacher commentary. In such situations, a multiple-draft procedure may help in bringing about changes in the ESL writing classes. There is thus a need to examine the shortcomings of the feedback giving and receiving situation in ESL classrooms.

This study hopes to see how multiple drafting in EFL classrooms affect students’ revision in response to teacher feedback. Ferris (1995:36) says that, “It makes sense that student attention to preferences regarding teacher feedback would differ in a pedagogical setting in which multiple drafting is required”. Ferris’s argument is that when students have to rethink and revise their drafts, they will pay more attention to teacher feedback rather than when they are not required to submit a final with changes. A multiple drafting pedagogical setting is thus chosen so that student response to teacher feedback can be analyzed.

Statement of the Problems

Some teachers give their feedback only once on the first draft of students’ essays and do not require them to write out the second draft. Teachers expect their students to utilize the feedback on the next essay topic to be assigned. This has also resulted in students not being able to remember the previous errors made and they tend to isolate the use of the previous feedback from the next essay topic to be written. Thus by instituting a multiple-draft procedure in the classroom, the researcher would like to see the extent of students’ response towards teacher commentary on their essays.

When teachers give feedback, it is their assumption that students would understand the feedback and they would use these teachers’ commentary to improve their drafts or writing. But when students submit their revisions, teachers find that little improvement has been made. The ancillary objective of this research is to study why student do not improve their work even though expert feedback has been provided.

The problem in using the target language to express their ideas in writing is common among ESL writers. Sometimes students have the ideas for their essays but owing to a lack of proficiency in the language, they cannot produce content that is convincing. On the other hand, there are students whose language is quite satisfactory but they lack ideas and the result is that their essays do not have a positive effect on the reader. So teacher feedback that
focuses on form and content should be given to the students so that their writing can be improved. They are then able to substantially present the content using linguistically well-formed structures.

Research Questions

The researcher intends to find out the potential effects of feedback on multiple-draft compositions. The main objective is to examine how students are going to respond to teacher feedback on their multiple-draft compositions in ESL classrooms. This study is guided by the following research questions with regard to student response and teacher feedback that she intends to investigate.

1. Are students able to incorporate teacher feedback into their own revision process?
2. What are the effects of teacher feedback on students’ revision strategies?
3. Is there a significant relationship between students’ preliminary draft and final draft after receiving content-focused feedback?
4. Is there a significant relationship between students’ preliminary draft and final draft after receiving form-focused feedback?

Definition of Concepts

1. Expert feedback is conceptually defined as the response made by teacher on L2 writing using form-focused approach (i.e., feedback on rules, lexical choices, etc.) and content-focused approach (i.e., feedback on ideas, organization, etc.) with the intention of improving the composing skills of learners.
2. L2 composing is conceptually defined as writing in the target language where the content is substantially presented using linguistically well-formed structures in which case writing proficiency is reflected.
3. Multiple-draft composition is conceptually defined as a piece of paragraph which has to be revised, rewritten and resubmitted more than once to ensure the improvement of learners’ writing skills.
4. Preliminary draft is conceptually defined as an earlier draft (first or second draft) that is being revised after getting feedback and resubmitted without receiving any grade.
5. Final draft is conceptually defined as a third draft that is being revised after receiving form-focused and content-focused feedback, submitted, and graded.
6. Closely follow is conceptually defined as revisions that respond exactly to the teacher commentary.
7. Initial stimulus is conceptually defined as revisions that fail to respond to the actual issue of teacher commentary.
8. Avoidance of deletion is conceptually defined as ignoring the problematic feature found in teacher commentary without submitting anything else to improve the revision.
9. Not related is conceptually defined as revisions that are irrelevant in relation to teacher commentary and result in revision failure.
10. Successful revision is conceptually defined as the ability of ESL learners to incorporate teacher commentary in their paragraph revisions specifically in the second draft for content-focused feedback and in the third draft for form-focused feedback.
11. *Unsuccessful revision* is conceptually defined as the inability of ESL learners to incorporate teacher commentary in their paragraph revisions specifically in the second draft for content-focused and in the third draft for form-focused feedback.

12. *Not attempted* is conceptually defined as general revisions that do not include necessary changes in relation to particular teacher commentary.

**Research Design**

The study was conducted at Prince of Songkla University, Pattani Campus. The participants in this study were 28 second year English major students. They took 417-212 Paragraph Writing course as their compulsory course, a requirement that they had to fulfill in order to obtain their degree. The sources of data were from written texts, interview transcripts and completed questionnaires. The written texts were in the form of multiple-draft essays that were produced by all the participants involved in the study. In addition, questionnaires were distributed to all the participants to find out their response to expert feedback and L2 composing. This study was further aided by the data obtained from the teacher. She was interviewed to get her response regarding the feedback given and the students’ essays revisions.

Students were asked to write an expository essay and they had to write it in three drafts including a final version. The first draft was submitted to the teacher and she focused her comments on the content of the essay. The researcher requested the teacher to grade the first draft without disclosing the score to the students. The scripts with the content-focused feedback were then returned to them. The students rewrote and resubmitted their second draft together with the corrections they had made in response to the feedback given on their first drafts. The teacher then commented on the language used and graded the papers (for the researcher’s consumption only). The teacher returned the second together with form-focused feedback to the students.

Finally, the students handed in the final version of their essays with the corrections made in response to form-focused feedback. The teacher still made some more comments that she thought fit on the third draft. She graded the papers and disclosed the scores to the students so that they knew how their writing performance was like.

The researcher collected all the three sets of drafts and analyzed them subsequently. An understanding of how students responded to the feedback was obtained through contextual data.

In addition, two raters were chosen to mark the students’ essays. The first rater was the class teacher and the second rater was also an experienced teacher form the same university.

The researcher did not train these teachers because to her knowledge they were familiar with the marking of students’ essays. Due to time constraint, the teachers scored the essays at different time of the semester. The class teacher scored the essays according to the pace of the students in which between the submission of the first draft and the second draft there would be a gap of one or two weeks. The researcher typed all the three drafts of essays to be marked by the second rater. The second rater had the chance to scrutinize all the three drafts of each student simultaneously and to score them in one sitting. After running a statistical reliability test, it was found that the first, second and third draft had a reliability of 0.615,
0.595 and 0.457 respectively. The reliability for the first draft was reliable and the reliable for the second and third draft was quite reliable. The researcher proceeded with the analysis even though she could not get the reliability of 0.7 because it was difficult for her to get the two teachers to mark the essays again. The class teacher could be more lenient to her students because she knew the effort they put into rewriting their essays. As for the other teacher, she was unfamiliar with the students that resulted in some differences in the scoring of students’ essays between the two teachers.

Teacher commentary consisted of content-focused feedback and form-focused feedback. These two types of comments were written on students’ essays – content-focused feedback was found on the first draft and form-focused feedback was found on the second draft. As for content-focused feedback, the comments made were on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Thesis Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Topic Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Content 1: Extra time for revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Content 2: More opportunities for discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Content 3: Availability of lecturers for consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Conclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

And the comments made on form were categorized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Tenses</th>
<th>2. Adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Plural Nouns</td>
<td>6. Spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Singular Nouns</td>
<td>8. Rephrasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Count Nouns</td>
<td>10. Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Subject-Verb-Agreement</td>
<td>16. Insertion of words and phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Nouns</td>
<td>18. To-infinitives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Adjective</td>
<td>20. Deletion of words and phrases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On top of that, questionnaires were distributed to the participants to find out their response to expert feedback on their multiple-draft essays specifically in relation to feedback made on content and form. The independent variables were operationalized using interval level of measurement. The respondents had to answer 9 questions in the form of Likert Scale and five open-ended questions. All the questions were developed by Hedgcock ans Lefkowitz (1996), Porte (1997), and Ferris (1995) and adopted by the researcher. These questions were related to the students’ interest in L2 writing, their preference of and focus on the types of feedback, ability in handling the types of comments and perceived usefulness of teacher feedback.

**Findings**

**Content-focused feedback and Student Performance**

The researcher was interested to know whether students’ essays improved after getting content-focused feedback. Content-focused feedback was given on the first draft that was
also known as a preliminary draft. The grade for this draft was not disclosed to the students but was given to her researcher. A T-Test was run to see whether there was a statistically significant relationship between students’ preliminary draft (first draft) and final draft. It was found that there was a statistically significant mean difference between the first draft and the final draft ($t = -17.450$, $p < 0.05$). It means that there was an improvement between the first draft and the final draft of students’ essays. This shows that because students were able to respond successfully to preliminary drafts, their essays tend to improve in the final draft. The researcher was certain that if students did not respond positively to preliminary drafts or first drafts, their essays would definitely fail to improve. This shows that students welcomed teacher feedback on content in their first drafts. They agreed that teacher feedback on content should be given on the first draft and due to this they responded well to the feedback that thus resulted in the improvement of their essays in the final draft.

**Form-focused feedback and Student Performance**

After receiving content-focused feedback on their first draft, students were given form-focused feedback on their second draft. The researcher tried to examine statistically whether there was a significant relationship between the preliminary draft (second draft) and the final draft. It was found that there was a statistically significant mean difference between the second draft and the final draft ($t = -7.125$, $p < 0.05$).

The finding shows that students’ essays improved after receiving form-focused feedback from the teacher. It must be noted here that the second was also considered a preliminary draft in which only the researcher would know the grade. The mean for ‘grammar’ and ‘vocabulary’ is 4.41 and 4.25 respectively. This mean infers that students agreed and expected their teacher to give her feedback and thus improve their essays. Students understood that for an essay to be improved, they must incorporate the feedback on content and form in their revisions.

In conclusion, it can be said that when feedback was given on preliminary draft (first and second draft), students did respond well to these drafts. This response had secured them good grades in the final drafts.

**Teacher and students’ perception of essay improvement**

The researcher had run a T-Test to see how the teacher and her students perceived essay improvement. The finding was an interesting one because the teacher and her students had different perception of essay improvement. The T-Tent shows that the three features, ‘organization’ ($t = -18.335$, $p < 0.05$), ‘content’ ($t = -9.745$, $p < 0.05$), and ‘language’ ($t = -11.040$, $p < 0.05$) had significant results. This shows that the teacher received that the students had improved in their final drafts. The interview held with the teacher was also parallel with the statistical findings. The teacher stressed that she could see improvements in the final drafts of students’ essays especially on ‘organization’. She did not deny the fact that there were a few students who were still struggling when revising their essays. She added that this problem could be remedied by providing them with more personal consultation.

On the other hand, the students did not have similar perception of essay improvement as the teacher. This evidence could be seen in the T-Test. The students’ perception was that they did not make any improvement in the ‘content’ ($t = 0.227$, $p > 0.05$) and ‘organization’ ($t = -
1.696, p > 0.05) of their essays. However, they perceived that they had improved the ‘language’ (t = -3.235, p < 0.05) used in their essays. Why students perceived in such a manner could be due to the fact that to them an essay would be considered as improved only when the grammar was used correctly. ‘Content’ and ‘organization’ did not play an important role in improving their essays. They looked at ‘language’ in isolation and was unable to connect ‘content’ and ‘organization’ to it in which these three features combined would improve an essay. Since there were unable to notice that ‘content’, ‘organization’ and ‘language’ were inseparable in producing a better essay, they failed to perceive any improvement in the ‘content’ and ‘organization’ of their essays. This perception had resulted in a statistically insignificant relationship between ‘content’ in earlier and final drafts and ‘organization’ in earlier and final drafts.

**Teacher feedback: Effect on Student Written Performance**

The students were asked whether teacher feedback was helpful in improving their essays. 24 students responded that they found teacher’s comments helpful. 20 students said that they could improve their essays when the teacher pointed out their mistakes. 26 students stressed that teacher commentary could improve their writing skills.

The students found teacher feedback helpful because they did make changes in their writing when asked to revise. It was found that students made changes in ‘content’ (18 students), ‘vocabulary’ (15 students), ‘grammar’ (14 students) and ‘organization’ (16 students). The reasons given for these changes were to improve their grammar and essays, to have the beat writing without any silly mistakes, and to make the essays more enjoyable to read.

Twenty-four students did not have any problems in understanding teacher commentary. An inference that can be drawn is that teacher feedback was helpful because more than half of the students in the sample did not have problems handling the teacher’s comments. Those students who could not understand teacher feedback sought the help of their teacher. Twenty-one students took the initiative to ask their teacher for help. This indirectly shows that because teacher feedback was perceived as helpful, students were certain that the teacher would be able to clarify the confusion and difficulty they faced in understanding teacher commentary so that their essays could be improved after each draft.

In the teacher’s opinion, the students could somewhat understand her comments, but when they came to see her for a face-to-face consultation, the feedback became more effective. The teacher expressed that giving feedback on content was more effective to the students rather than the feedback on form. She added that students were able to apply the same principle when they rewrote for content but not for language. They still made grave errors when revising for language.

In conclusion, the study shows that students welcomed form and content-focused feedback in their preliminary drafts so as to improve the final drafts of their essays. As a result of this, there was a significant improvement between the preliminary drafts and the final drafts after receiving teacher commentary. However, students perceived that they made improvement in language but not in content and organization that was contrary to their teacher’s perception of essay improvement. The important thing to note here is that students did find teacher feedback helpful in improving their essays.
Summary of findings

Students who were given teacher feedback on their essays were successful in their revisions. Most of them responded well to teacher commentary on their first and second drafts that resulted in improve final drafts. They were able to incorporate content and form-focused feedback in their essay revisions.

Students could respond well to most of the categories in content-focused feedback except for a few categories that required them to discuss their ideas. They could respond well to feedback on categories like Introduction, Thesis Statement, Topic Sentence and Conclusion but as for discussing the body part (Extra time for revisions, More opportunities for discussions and Availability of lecturers for consultation) of the essay, they could limited competence in the English language. Thai limited language competence also results in their inability to discuss creatively and elaborately their ideas. The teacher believed that language was the main factor that prevented students from expressing their ideas well. She added that because of this we could not see their maturity in arguing and presenting their ideas clearly.

The ability of students to incorporate form-focused feedback shows that teacher commentary is effective in securing successful revisions. They could respond well to teacher feedback on the categories identified by the researcher. Out of the 20 categories identified, 14 categories had a revision success of over 70% in response to teacher’s comments. However, students could not respond that well to categories such as tenses, word choice, subject-verb-agreement, nouns, adverbs, and rephrasing of sentences. They had a revision success of less than 70% of these categories. This low percentage of revision success infers that students generally found it hard to grasp the rules embedded in these categories.

Students used different strategies when revising their essays. These revision strategies resulted from the way the teacher gave her comments. There were various revision strategies used by the students. The researcher had identified four of them such as closely followed, initial stimulus, avoidance by deletion and not related.

When a student used a closely followed revision strategy, it means two things. First, the student had understood the teacher’s comments, and second, that the she followed the comments closely without really understanding why the teacher made such comments. The letter situations could be found frequently occurring when students revised form-focused feedback on their essays. Most of them followed closely the feedback given without really understanding the rules of grammar that were needed when revising their essays.

Another effect of teacher feedback on students’ revision strategies was initial stimulus. When students revised using this strategy, it shows that they were confused with the teacher’s feedback. As a result of this their revisions did not really respond to the issue in question. From the finding we can conclude that students were more confused with content-focused feedback rather than on form-focused feedback. This can be supported by the statistics in which the occurrence of initial stimulus was more (19%) due to content-focused feedback than the initial stimulus due to form-focused feedback that was only 3.7%.

Avoidance by deletion was another revision strategy that occurred due to the effect of teacher feedback. The students who used this strategy were those who avoided from using the feedback in their revision. This could be due to their inability to interpret teacher commentary or they could not see the significance of the comments. The students in this sample used more of this revision strategy when they received form-focused feedback unlike those who
received content-focused feedback who used less of this strategy. This strategy was more frequently used (20.3%) with form-focused feedback then with content-focused feedback (5.2%).

The last revision strategy was not related in which students tried to use the feedback but they were unsuccessful in providing more accurate response. They found it hard to handle the comments but they still tried to use it in their revisions and the outcome of this was whenever they wrote in their revisions was not related or irrelevant to what the comments necessitated them to do.

**Conclusions**

Teacher commentary in preliminary drafts was important because students needed this to have improved final drafts. It was found that students responded well preliminary drafts in which they were able to incorporate teacher feedback in their revisions successfully and also they had used this feedback extensively in their revisions. It can be concluded that students responded positively to feedback because they knew that improved final drafts would secure them better grades.

However, students believed that they only improved in the language aspect when they responded to teacher feedback but not on the content and organization of their essays. This was in contract with what their teacher perceived. The students’ perception of themselves could be due to the fact that they rated themselves as having average writing proficiency and between weak to average ability in the writing features above. The conclusion is that the teacher who guided them the whole semester could see at least some improvements made in the three writing features: language, content, and organization. The students might be those who lacked confidence and really needed encouragement from their teacher.

To sum up, the study had shown that teacher feedback is very much needed and called for in a process-oriented writing pedagogy to help ESL learners write well in the target language. Most students look forward to having teacher commentary on their essays so as to make their writing clear, concise and impressive to the readers who are the teachers themselves.

**Implications for Teaching Writing**

The study has brought about certain realization to the researcher with regard to teaching writing to ESL learners. Teachers find that teaching writing is not a task to be enjoyed and also a tedious one. Only those committed teachers could bear to handle this time consuming task. The researcher could see that giving written feedback to students is beneficial to their improvement in L2 composing. However, written feedback should be complemented with oral feedback so that the teacher would be able to get to the problems that students face when rewriting their essays.

Students are sometimes not interested in getting feedback after they have written their essays because it does not solve their problems. However, there are students who do not want their teacher’s inference while writing but they welcome the written comments after submitting their work. If the classroom were small the teacher would be able to identify the students who need her feedback then or later.

Giving feedback could be made easier if thing-aloud protocol is introduced to ESL learners. This is where the learners record whenever is on their mind while they are writing so that
when the teacher corrects their essays, she would be able to listen to the problems her students encountered while writing or revising. This will result in a more effective teacher commentary.

Further research on students’ writing and teacher commentary should be undertaken so that the findings can be added to the body of knowledge. The researcher suggests that a study on form-focused feedback be done whereby the teacher does not provide the correct response for the errors made by the students. What she needs to do in her feedback is to identify the errors by providing only proofreading symbols. It would then be interesting to note the response of students towards teacher commentary when using these symbols on their multiple-draft compositions.
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