

PATTERNS OF TEACHER AND STUDENT RESPONSES IN WRITING MULTI-DRAFT COMPOSITIONS

Author's Name: Charmine N. Arabejo¹

Affiliation:

1. Collat Integrated School, Department of Education – Division of Zambales, Philippines.

Corresponding Author Name & E-Mail: Charmine N. Arabejo,

charminearabejo999@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examined the patterns of teacher feedback and student responses in writing multi-draft compositions among Grade 9 students at Judge Jose De Venecia Sr. Memorial National High School. It identified the common types of Written Corrective Feedback (WCF) used by teachers, explored how students responded to these feedback strategies, and looked into whether these patterns improved students' final compositions and writing performance. Using a qualitative research design and a theory-based method of analysis, the researchers reviewed fifty selected multi-draft compositions from three Grade 9 sections. The findings revealed that Direct Corrective Feedback (DCF) was the most frequently used feedback strategy, where teachers directly provided correct forms for students' errors. The results also showed that students generally accepted and applied the corrections from their teachers when revising their work. Although the final composition ratings improved after receiving feedback, the findings suggest that this improvement mainly came from students following their teachers' corrections rather than developing their writing skills independently. The study concludes that while direct corrective feedback effectively supports students in revising their compositions, it may not necessarily lead to deeper writing proficiency without active student participation in the revision process. The findings offer valuable insights for teachers and curriculum developers in choosing appropriate feedback strategies that support students' writing development.

Keywords: Written Corrective Feedback, Direct Corrective Feedback, multi-draft composition, teacher feedback, student response

INTRODUCTION

One of the tasks of a teacher, specifically a language teacher is to give feedback. According to Parreño (2004), "Feedback is primarily given to indicate whether students' answers, opinions or any outputs are correct or appropriate, or on how students should improve." This can be mostly observed in oral or written outputs of the students. It is definitely easier for a teacher to give feedback in written outputs because, unlike in oral outputs such as recitation, individual students are able to find out their mistakes in a more personal and private way.

Feedback-giving is believed to have different effects to different students. Different studies are being conducted because of this. Many researchers have varied findings and suggestions though. This means that there is no best type of feedback to be given. Though there is no best type, studies on this are still conducted to give some suggestions to teachers and everyone involved in the field depending on what areas they focus on. For example, some teachers only focus on grammar, while some focus on everything – grammar, style, content, organization, and others, sometimes even handwriting.

Although the teacher is the one who is responsible for feedback-giving, his foremost consideration must be the students because the response of the students will most likely be affected by the feedback they receive.

METHODOLOGY

In this research, qualitative research was used for this study as it focused more on the patterns of teacher that was employed, and the responses of students to the given feedback, not so much on the numerical figures. The first procedure was the separation of formal themes considering the number of drafts and the feedback used by the teacher. Out of three sections, fifty formal themes were studied and were analyzed using theory based method, which analyzes and interprets data in relation to the presumptions of the theory as defined by Garcia (2003).

PARTICIPANT AND RESEARCH LOCALE

The participants consisted of Grade 9 students at Judge Jose De Venecia Sr. Memorial National High School that examined the patterns of teacher feedback and student responses in writing multi-draft compositions.

DATA COLLECTION

The researchers got permission from the school principal and the English teachers at Judge Jose De Venecia Sr. Memorial National High School (JJDVMNHS) before collecting the necessary data. Once they received approval, the researchers gathered fifty (50) selected multi-draft compositions

from Grade 9 students across three sections. The selections included works that contained two drafts (the first draft and the final draft) along with the written corrective feedback (WCF) given by the teacher. The researchers looked at the first drafts to spot the types of written corrective feedback used by the teachers. They then collected the corresponding final drafts to see how students revised their compositions in response to the feedback. They also obtained ratings for the final compositions to find out if any improvements occurred after the feedback was applied. All collected documents were kept confidential and used only for academic research purposes.

DATA ANALYSIS

The collected data was analyzed using the qualitative document analysis method based on the theoretical framework. First, the researcher categorized the teacher's written corrective feedback into the three types defined by Ellis (2009) – direct, indirect, and coded corrective feedback (DWF, IWF, CWF). The researchers compared the first and last drafts of each composition in order to see how the students responded to the teacher's feedback. All changes found in the last draft were studied to identify whether the students took into account the corrections suggested by the teacher.

Lastly, the researchers analyzed the rating scores obtained for the last draft of students' compositions in order to understand whether the given feedback helped improve their writing performance. All results were analyzed depending on research questions in accordance with the theories and relevant literature cited in the study. This research approach made it possible to analyze common teacher's corrective feedback and students' responses when working on multi-draft compositions.

RESULT

1. Results of the study showed that when the students are given feedback in their compositions, they just follow whatever correction they see.
2. In terms of the final composition, results found out that the pattern used is really effective. However, it is only evident on how students are able to follow the corrections.
3. The result showed that the rating of the students on the final composition increased but it is not a clear manifestation that students really improved because in the first place it was the teacher who identified the mistakes and it was just the task of the students to write whatever they are asked to correct.

DISCUSSION

The data gathered were studied in relation to the research objectives. The formal themes of the three sections from the school were collected and then processed in response to the problems posed in chapter one of this study. Before the initiation of the research study, the main purposes were to identify the most commonly used pattern of the teacher in correcting the multi-draft composition and how the students respond to the feedback. These objectives were accomplished. The findings revealed that Direct Corrective Feedback (DCF) was the most frequently used feedback strategy, where teachers directly provided correct forms for students' errors. The results also showed that students generally accepted and applied the corrections from their teachers when revising their work. Although the final composition ratings improved after receiving feedback, the findings suggest that this improvement mainly came from students following their teachers' corrections rather than developing their writing skills independently.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The most commonly used pattern of teacher in correcting students' composition is the direct corrective feedback (DCF).
2. Findings showed that the students see teachers as experts, so when they are given feedback in their compositions they just follow whatever correction they see.
3. Feedback given by the teacher helps the students' final composition but it is not a clear manifestation of their improvement.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Students see teachers as experts according to Schulz (2001), this means that giving feedback by the teacher is very crucial because it could either help or worsen the knowledge of students when it comes to written language, and spoken as well. Hence, teacher should give feedback seriously.
2. Though students' response to teacher's feedback is not a clear manifestation of improvement, feedback guides the students to reflect on their composition by following the corrections made by the teacher. Moreover, feedback helps the students to be aware of the importance of improvement. For this reason, teachers should not only focus on the first draft but also painstakingly give feedback on final draft.

REFERENCES

1. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (5th ed.). Pearson Education.
2. Cohen, A. D., & Cavalcanti, M. C. (1990). *Feedback on compositions and student responses to feedback*. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155–177). Cambridge University Press.
3. Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT Journal*, 63(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccn023>
4. Ferris, D. R. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33–53.
5. Garcia, M. L. B. (2003). *Research methods in language and literature*. Rex Book Store.
6. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman.
7. Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255–286.
8. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 57–68). Cambridge University Press.
10. Parreño, A. A. (2004). *Educational assessment and feedback strategies*. Rex Book Store.
11. Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Schulz, R. A. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85(2), 244–258.
13. Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the red pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(3), 195–202.
14. Shin, S. J. (2008). Understanding student preferences for written corrective feedback in second language writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, 10(2), 45–61.
15. Wen, Q. (2009). Students' preferences for teacher feedback in English writing. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 41(4), 287–294.