



Do Teachers and Students Share the Same Feedback Meaning? A Quantitative Study among Secondary Schools in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe

Stella Muchemwa, PhD*

Professor of Languages and Communication
Midland State University, Zimbabwe

*Corresponding author: muchemwas@staff.msu.ac.zw

Abstract: *Teachers' feedback has been used for centuries by students who use English as second language to improve their writing skills. This study sought to find out the students and teachers' responses to teacher corrective feedback in composition writing among Secondary Schools in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe using parallel questionnaires for teachers and students. The study also analyzed whether there was a significant difference between teachers and students' responses. Fifty-six teachers and 251 'O Level English students randomly selected from 25 secondary schools in Bulawayo were the sample of the study. Data collected from the questionnaires was analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 10). Findings showed that there were high overall means for Feed Up, Feed Back and Feed Forward for both teachers and students who valued these response aspects although they disagreed on some aspects. Independent samples Mann-Whitney U test showed that there was a significant difference between the teachers' and students' responses on Feed Up and Feed Back, Sig = .000. It is only in Feed Forward that there was no significant difference in responses as shown by a Sig of .072. The study therefore recommended that teachers should always have mechanisms in place to find out whether the students have understood teachers' feedback or not in order to assist learners accordingly as well as using such information on planning and developing useful teaching strategies. The schools administration should provide teachers with the necessary resources for them to be able to adequately and properly assist learners in the composition writing process.*

Key words: Zimbabwe, composition writing; corrective feedback, responses

1. Introduction

Composition writing in English to speakers of other languages has proved to be difficult. When the students and the teachers share the same meaning communicated by the teacher, the students often improve their writing skills. However, if the students' understanding of teacher's feedback is different from the teacher's intended communication, little can be accomplished in composition writing. Again, without the detailed feedback from their composition work, students are unlikely to improve in their composition performance as Peterson (2010) argued. Innovation is therefore essential in order to solve this problem. English composition teachers try their best to give students corrective feedback in the form of Feed Up, Feed Back and Feed Forward. Hattie and Timperley (2007) described Feed Up as

teacher's composition writing goal clarification. This is meant for students to know what is expected whenever given a composition topic to write on. Peterson (2010) said that feedback is most useful when students have a clear understanding of the expectations.

When considering Feed Back, it alludes to the teacher's riposte to students' written compositions in usually written form and also in oral form. Nielsen (2015) explained it as teachers' communication to students during the learning process; it shows students' position in relation to the set target. Brown and MacBeath (2018) found out that students value corrective teacher feedback as feedback from a credible source. On the other hand, Feed Forward is linked to the use of assessment data and feedback to plan for the future. On this note, Dreher (2016) purported that focusing on improving students' future performance is more helpful than

concentrating on discussing the past performances that can hardly be changed. Feed Forward is concerned with making use of past actions to inform the crafting of new strategies for future improvement. Y1Feedback (2016) placed Feed Forward as effective feedback. This study therefore focused on the students' and teachers' response to teacher corrective feedback in composition writing in a bid to find solutions to the problem of students' poor performance in composition writing. The study also analyzed whether there was a significant difference between teachers and students' responses.

2. Literature Review

Effective corrective feedback is essential in composition writing. Reynolds (2013) and Amrhein and Nassaji (2010) resorted that teachers should be sensitive to the individual needs of the student; they went on saying that students are different in nature and they need different approaches in order to suit them when it comes to feedback, for instance, a comment "concentrate on your work" can be taken as a guide by one student but injure another student. Guo (2014) also emphasized this aspect of teacher sensitivity to student needs which is also the focus of this study.

Effective feedback can also be enhanced by keeping of grades and grade books as a way of tracking students' progress as propounded by Catapano (2017). CI Schoolkit (2012) also found record keeping as a critical component of refining teaching strategies because the records help the teacher to spot patterns. On a similar note, Brown and MacBeath (2018) found that effective corrective feedback should include both what the student has done well and what need to be improved while Hattie and Yates (2014) found it useful when errors are welcomed by the composition teachers. Therefore, this study also aimed at finding from teachers and students what can make feedback in composition writing effective.

At times corrective feedback can be ineffective; Amrhein and Nassaji (2010), on their review why feedback can be ineffective, found misunderstanding between the students and the teachers as well as students failing to comprehend teacher's feedback as the major causes. In their investigation on how ESL students and teachers perceive the usefulness of different types and amounts of written corrective feedback, they found different responses between the teachers and the students. On a related study on the similarities and differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about written corrective feedback, Çağla (2016), found differences among the

two groups. This is why Keegan, Brown and MacBeath (2018) found that teachers and students have their own views on what constitutes effective feedback. The reviewed literature draws a bigger spectrum to the problem of this study especially by citing similar researches and their findings worldwide.

While English teachers spend a lot of time correcting and giving feedback to students' composition work, such feedback may be less useful to the students when they don't put the same feedback meaning intended by the teacher. This study therefore sought to find out the responses of students and teachers to teacher corrective feedback to English composition writing among Secondary Schools in Bulawayo, Zimbabwe, attempting to answer the following questions:

1. What are the teachers and students responses on teachers': Feed Up; Feed Back and Feed Forward?
2. Is there a significant difference between teachers and students' responses on: Feed Up; Feed Back and Feed Forward?

3. Research Methodology

This study used a quantitative research approach with "O" Level English Language teachers (124 in number) and 48 418 students from 42 secondary schools in Bulawayo Province in Zimbabwe as the population of the study. The teacher sample initially comprised all the "O" Level English teachers (who were about 2 per school) from the randomly selected 25 schools making a total of about 56. However, only 47 teachers returned the filled in questionnaire, thus composing the actual sample for teachers. Student sample was composed of 10 randomly selected "O" Level English students from the 25 randomly selected secondary schools in Bulawayo province making a total of 251 students.

The researcher used constructs found from literature review to furnish parallel questionnaires for teachers and students. To achieve the construction of parallel questionnaires, a questionnaire for teachers was constructed first then modified to suit the other one for the students.

The researcher carried out a pilot study from ten randomly chosen teachers and thirty randomly selected students in five secondary school in Bulilima District, Matabeleland, a geographical place which is outside the main data collection zone. The Cronbach Alpha for teachers' questionnaire sections were as follows: Feed Up= .779; Feed Back = .918;

Feed Forward = .886; Teacher Feedback knowledge = .819; Resources Availability = .695; Teacher Attitude to Feedback = .800 and Teacher Motivation = .877. The Cronbach Alpha for students' questionnaire sections were as follows: Feed Up = .750; Feed Back = .757 and Feed Forward = .851. Therefore, all the sections for teachers' and students' questionnaires met the expected reliability coefficient of .7, so the instruments (questionnaires) were adopted for the study.

The researcher followed a systematic data gathering procedure. After receiving the permission letter from the Ministry of Education, Zimbabwe, to carry out the study, the researcher collected data for the pilot study and carried out Cronbach Alpha analysis for both students' (a total of 30) and teachers' (a total of 10) questionnaires (section by section). The researcher made necessary adjustments and corrections in accordance to the advice from experts. The researcher then planned and made data collection arrangements with the chosen school Headmasters and Headmistresses, the English "O" Level teachers and their Heads of Departments (HoDs) on questionnaire distribution for data collection.

The researcher, with the help of the English HODs, distributed 56 questionnaires to all the "O" Level English teachers out of which 47 questionnaires were returned. This is due to the fact that some teachers who opted to take the questionnaires home and asked the researcher to come and collect them at a later date could not fulfil their promise. All the 251 questionnaires distributed to students were retrieved.

Statistical Treatment of Data

Data was analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 10). When all the questionnaires were gathered, the researcher checked them to see if there were anomalies and discovered that there were a few anomalies in some questionnaires. Therefore, the researcher decided to disregard responses with anomalies. Questionnaires were numbered and then the data was coded into SPSS ready for analysis. The researcher then analyzed data specifically carrying out the following statistical analyses: Descriptive statistics to analyze demographics and questionnaire sections with data on the English "O" Level composition teachers' written corrective feedback practices and the corresponding students' responses. Optional responses ranged from 4- strongly agree, 3- agree, 2- disagree and 1- strongly disagree and scale of mean score interpretation was as follows: 3.50-4.00 = strongly agree, 2.50-3.49 = agree, 1.50-2.49 =

disagree and 1.00-1.49 = strongly disagree. Mann-Whitney U-Test was employed to find out if there were significant differences in response between the "O" Level composition teachers and the students on Feed Up, Feed Back and Feed Forward sections of the questionnaire.

4. Analysis and Results

This section presents analysis of data and results obtained after data analysis. The study was guided by two research questions. The first research question dealt with descriptive statistics while the second one dealt with inferential statistics which involved hypotheses testing.

4.1 Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive statistics present the perception of students and teachers regarding various aspects in this study whereby respondents were to tick most appropriate options in the questionnaire predetermined options ranging from 4- strongly agree, 3- agree, 2- disagree and 1- strongly disagree.

Research Question One: *What are the teachers' and students' responses on teachers' Feed Up; Feed Back and Feed Forward?*

This research question required teachers and students to describe their feelings about feed up, feedback and feed forward as follows:

Feed Up

Quantitative data on teacher Feed Up is shown in Table 1. A mean of 3.50 to 4.00, 2.50 to 3.49, 1.50 to 2.49 and 1.00 to 1.49 indicates strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly agree, respectively. Table 1 shows that teacher respondents strongly agreed that they were sensitive to individual students' composition needs and explained the different types of compositions to their students, mean 3.68 and 3.74, respectively. Very low standard deviation of .471 and .491, respectively show homogeneity of teachers' responses. Teacher sensitivity finding is supported by Reynolds (2013) who made call on teacher to be sensitive to individual student needs when marking. Also, teachers agreed that they marked students' composition when they had ample time to give necessary detailed comments to students, mean 3.53. This shows teachers' strength. Table 1 further shows that teachers agreed that they explained the "O" Level composition goals to their students; told their composition students the goals for each composition that they write and they informed their composition students about their requirements in composition writing, mean 3.45, 3.55 and 3.72, respectively. The standard deviation of .697, .619 and .540, respectively show

homogeneity of responses. This shows that teachers adequately guided their students in composition writing. In the same Table, teachers agreed that they thought carefully before giving corrective written feedback to their students, mean 3.62 and standard deviation of .548, an indicator of homogeneous response. This is teachers' effort which was realized by the students as reflected in their responses in Table 2. Such good work by the teachers is likely to

boost students' performance in composition writing. Teacher Feed Up overall mean was very high (3.56) which means that it is an important component of teacher feedback practice. Therefore, teacher should put effort on Feed Up practice if students' composition improvement is to be realized.

Table 1: Teachers' Feed Up Descriptive Statistics

SN	Item	Mean Score	Std. Deviation
1	I am sensitive to individual composition needs of my students	3.68	.471
2	I explain the different types of compositions to my students	3.74	.491
3	I explain the "O" Level goals to my students in composition writing	3.45	.697
4	I tell my composition students the goal for each composition they write	3.55	.619
5	I inform my composition students about requirements in writing	3.72	.540
6	I help my students with composition writing resources	3.27	.688
7	I tell students the total marks of the composition I ask them to write	3.70	.548
8	I inform my students the basis of my grading	3.35	.674
9	I think carefully before giving corrective written feedback to students	3.62	.535
10	I mark composition when I have ample time to give necessary comment	3.53	.687
Feed Up Overall Mean		3.56	

Table 2: Students Feedback Descriptive Statistics

SN	Item	Mean Score	Std. Deviation
1	My composition teacher is sensitive to our composition needs	3.10	.836
2	My teacher explains the different types of compositions to us	3.51	.736
3	My teacher explains the "O" Level goals in composition writing to us	3.31	.852
4	My teacher tells us the goals for each composition that we write	3.15	.890
5	My teacher informs us about the requirements in composition writing	3.58	.680
6	My teacher helps us with composition writing resources	2.88	.931
7	My teacher tells us the total marks of the compositions that we write	3.20	.959
8	My teacher informs the basis of his/her grading	2.55	1.032
9	My teacher thinks carefully before giving corrective written feedback	3.08	.871
10	My teacher marks composition when s/he has time to give comments	2.69	1.083
Overall Student Feed Up Mean		3.11	

Quantitative data on students' response on Feed Up is shown on Table 2. Likewise, a mean of 3.50 to 4.00, 2.50 to 3.49, 1.50 to 2.49 and 1.00 to 1.49 indicates strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly agree, respectively.

Table 2 shows that students agreed that composition teachers were sensitive to their composition needs with a mean of 3.10 and a relatively standard deviation of .836 which shows moderate homogeneity of responses. Similarly, Guo (2014) emphasized the aspect of teacher sensitivity to student needs. The students also strongly agreed that their teachers explained the different types of compositions to them; explained the "O" Level goals in composition writing as well as telling them the goals for each composition that they wrote with the mean of 3.51, 3.31 and 3.15, respectively. Standard deviations of .736, .852 and .890 show a moderate homogeneity of responses. Therefore, one can say

that teachers are doing a good job by telling students the broad national goals and specific goals for each composition type in the "O" Level English Language syllabus; Peterson (2010) said that feedback is most useful when students have a clear understanding of the expectations.

Students' response to the statement: *My teacher informs us about the requirements in composition writing*, was highly scored with a mean of 3.58 and a low standard deviation of .680 which shows that students' responses were fairly homogeneous. In response to whether the composition teachers help students with composition writing resources, the respondents agreed to this statement with a mean of 2.88 and a standard deviation of .931 which shows heterogeneous students' responses. The wide standard deviation becomes a cause of concern because it shows that some students have some dissatisfaction on composition writing resources.

This is an issue that needs redress by the teachers in order for students to write meaningful, well worded and standard compositions that can compete at “O” Level national examinations platform. Composition teachers and the school authorities should therefore do something to alleviate the problem and provide the necessary composition writing resources. Jumba (2016) in a study Kenya on composition resources recommended provision of bought materials (textbooks) as well as the improvised ones (pictures).

Students questionnaire responses to the statement that teachers tell students the total marks of the compositions that they write was fairly agreed by a mean score of 3.20. A relatively high standard deviation of .959 indicates that there was a heterogeneous response among the students. This shows that some students did not comprehend teachers’ message on total marks. This can be either due to unclear teachers’ instructions or variation in total marks for similar compositions. Teachers’ instructions should therefore be very clear and well disseminated to the students.

The respondents lowly rated the statement which says that teachers inform them of the basis of their composition grading with a moderate mean of 2.55 and a very high standard deviation of 1.032 which shows that students’ responses were varied. There is therefore great need for teachers to explain clearly to their students on how they allocate marks to composition work. This can help students on what to focus on during composition preparation and writing. This is in line with Peterson (2010) who found that feedback is most useful when students have previously been given the assessment criteria.

Respondents fairly rated their composition teachers as people who consider them as learners. The statement: *My teacher thinks carefully before giving corrective written feedback to us* has a relatively high mean of 3.08 which shows that teachers value giving feedback to students. Questionnaire respondents also agreed to the statement: *My teacher marks our composition when s/he has ample time to give us necessary detailed comments* with a mean of 2.69. A high standard deviation of 1.083 shows that responses were varied. The high standard deviation shows that some students were not receiving the necessary detailed comments that they were expecting. This may explain the low English pass rate in Bulawayo Province and in Zimbabwe in general. Composition teachers should always give themselves time when marking students’ compositions so that they can give students detailed and meaningful informed feedback on the students’

performance. Without the detailed feedback from their composition work, students are unlikely to improve in their composition performance as Peterson (2010) argued.

Overall student Feed Up mean was also high, 3.11 as compared to overall teacher mean of 3.56. This is an indication that both teachers and students see value in teacher Feed Up practice. This will likely make students improve in their composition writing if each part put maximum effort in the endeavor at hand.

Feed Back

Table 3 shows descriptive statistics on teachers’ questionnaire responses on Feed Back. 3.50 to 4.00, 2.50 to 3.49, 1.50 to 2.49 and 1.00 to 1.49 indicates strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree, respectively.

The table further shows that teacher respondents agreed that they reacted positively to the errors in their students’ compositions mean, 3.45. They put detailed comments so that students could get all the necessary information meant for their improvement, mean 3.60. Low standard deviation of .583 and .538, respectively indicate homogeneity in responses. These findings tally those by Keegan, Brown and MacBeath (2018) who found that students take feedback from the teacher as feedback from a credible source which challenges the teacher to do the work well. Similarly, teachers highly agreed that they used simple and clear English so that their students could understand the written comments as indicated by a very high mean of 3.72 with a very low standard deviation of .452 which shows respondents’ homogeneity of response. Student respondents concurred with the above teachers’ responses.

Again, just like what the students perceived, teachers strongly agreed that they used correction codes, for instance, sp for a spelling mistake, when marking compositions, mean 3.74 with a low standard deviation of .488. However, although the teachers agreed that they gave students elaborated codes (codes with their meanings), mean 3.21 and relatively low standard deviation of .832, this was not exactly what the student respondents said they just agreed to the statement with a mean of 2.64 and a high standard deviation of 1.067. Also, teachers’ assumption that students understood the codes meanings that they used in students’ composition exercise books, mean 3.33 and relatively low standard deviation of .762, was negated by some students who could not understand the line codes. Teachers should put effort to explain whatever they

use so that all students can benefit. Amrhein and Nassaji (2010), on their review why feedback can be ineffective, found misunderstanding between the students and the teachers as well as students failing

to comprehend teacher's feedback as the major causes.

Table 3: Teachers' Feedback Descriptive Statistics

SN	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I react positively to the errors in students' compositions	3.45	.583
2	I put detailed comments for students to get the necessary information for improvement	3.60	.538
3	I use simple and clear English so that students can understand	3.72	.452
4	I use correction codes (eg. sp for a spelling mistake) when marking compositions	3.74	.488
5	I give students an elaborated code (codes with their meaning)	3.21	.832
6	My students understand the codes meanings that I use	3.33	.762
7	I mark and promptly return composition exercise books	3.19	.851
8	The mark that I give to students fairly reflect their performance	3.61	.537
9	I give performance comments on the written composition at the end of the composition	3.58	.543
10	I consider the possible uses my students will make of the feedback I give them	3.29	.708
11	I keep record of my students' progress in composition writing	3.66	.568
Teacher Feed Back Overall Mean		3.48	

Table 4: Students feedback Descriptive Statistics

SN	Item	Mean	Std. Dev
1	My teacher reacts positively to the errors in my compositions	3.12	1.020
2	My teacher puts comments for the necessary information meant for improvement	3.43	.794
3	My teacher uses simple and clear English so that I understand written comments	3.54	.712
4	My teacher uses correction codes (eg. sp for a spelling mistake) when marking	3.63	.666
5	My teacher gives elaborated code (meanings of the code)	2.64	1.067
6	I understand correction code that my teacher uses in my composition	3.12	.978
7	My teacher marks and promptly returns our composition exercise books	3.23	.971
8	The mark that I get from my teacher fairly reflect my performance	3.19	.950
9	My teacher puts my general performance comments at the end of my composition	3.09	.948
10	My teacher considers the possible ways I can utilize his/her feedback	2.83	.961
11	My teacher keeps record of my progress in composition writing	3.33	.813
Student Overall Feed Back Mean		3.2018	

A mean of 3.19 for teacher respondents with a relatively low standard deviation of .851 for the statement: *I mark and promptly return students' composition exercise books*, is relatively low to that for the statement: *The marks that I give to my students fairly reflect their performance*, mean 3.61 with a low standard deviation of .537. This shows that teacher have some difficulties in prompt marking and returning of students composition exercise books. What the students said (that the English classes are large) can be what prevented teachers from prompt marking. Teachers with large examination classes should therefore be exempted from other duties so that they have ample marking time. Teachers and students' responses were similar on the above issues.

Teacher strongly agreed that they gave general performance comments on the student's written composition at the end of the composition, mean 3.58. Students responses also revealed the same and also agreed with their teachers that the teachers kept

records of students' progress in composition writing, mean 3.66. A standard deviations of .543 and .568, respectively, show homogeneity of responses. This is similar to [Catapano \(2017\)](#) and Ellis in Kang and Han (2015) who suggested the keeping of grades and grade books as a way of tracking students' progress. However, the fact that the teachers considered the possible uses their students would make of the feedback they gave them, mean 3.29 is different from students' responses. Furthermore, teacher Feed Back overall mean is high, 3.49. This shows that teachers highly value their Feedback practices to the students.

Table 4 shows students Feed Back descriptive statistics. 3.50 to 4.00, 2.50 to 3.49, 1.50 to 2.49 and 1.00 to 1.49 indicates strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly agree, respectively. The table shows that students agreed that their teachers reacted positively to their errors in their compositions with a mean of 3.12 and a very high standard deviation of 1.083, an indication of highly varied responses. This

means that the teachers understood the errors committed by the students and were prepared to correct them. This is commended by Hattie and Yates in (2014) who argued that feedback is more effective when errors are welcomed. Respondents also agreed that their teachers put detailed comments so that the students can get all the necessary information meant for their improvement, mean 3.43 with a relatively moderate standard deviation of .794 which shows fairly homogeneity of responses. One can conclude that composition teachers put effort in giving students comments as Feed Back to their written composition work.

Respondents highly commented on clarity of teacher's written comments in terms of simplicity and simple English used so that students could understand the teachers' written comments, mean 3.54. A moderate standard deviation of .712 shows homogeneity in students' responses. Respondents also strongly agreed that teachers used correction codes (for example, *sp* for a spelling mistake) when marking students compositions with a very high mean of 3.63 and a moderate standard deviation of .666 which shows homogeneity of response. However, teachers rarely gave students elaborated code (meanings of the code) as shown by a low mean of 2.64 and a high standard deviation of 1.067, an indicator of heterogeneous responses. This becomes an obstacle to students in composition writing if codes are used but not shown and explained to them. Therefore, chances are very high that some students may fail to benefit from the coded feedback when they fail to comprehend them. Students' interviews confirmed that some students failed to understand line codes. Although teachers rarely gave correction codes, students seemed to relatively understand them as indicated by a mean of 3.12 and a standard deviation of .978 shows relatively varied responses.

Respondents further agreed that teachers mark and promptly return composition exercise books, mean 3.23. Also, the marks that students got from their teachers fairly reflected their performance, mean 3.19. Standard deviations of .971 and .950, respectively, show heterogeneous responses. This shows that students were somewhat happy with the composition marks they received from their teachers as feedback to the compositions they wrote.

Respondents agreed that their teachers considered the possible ways they could utilize the written feedback they got from their teachers, mean 2.83 with a high standard deviation of .961. Respondents also agreed that teachers kept records of their progress in composition writing, mean 3.33 and a

relatively moderate standard deviation of .813 shows a fairly homogeneity of responses. This is a strength on the part of the teacher because if a student's progress record is kept, the teacher knows how to advice students as individuals accordingly. These finding are supported by CI Schoolkit (2012) who found record keeping as a critical component of refining teaching strategies because the records help the teacher to spot patterns and suggest improvements.

Students' overall Feed Back mean is also high, 3.20, when compared to the teachers' overall Feed Back mean of 3.49 an indicator that both teachers and students put vale into teachers' Feed Back practice. This is a positive step towards the improvement of students' Feed Forward. Teachers should there be committed to the Feed Back procedure so that the students get the necessary help they need in composition writing.

Feed Forward

Table 5 shows teacher questionnaire responses on Feed Forward. The mean of 3.50 to 4.00, 2.50 to 3.49, 1.50 to 2.49 and 1.00 to 1.49 indicates strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly agree, respectively. Table 5 shows that teachers did not always explain and justify the highest and lowest composition marks they gave to student in compositions and justify them, mean 2.94. However, students agreed that teachers gave students time to reflect on the written comments before they wrote another composition, mean 3.24. They also agreed that teachers gave students opportunities to ask for justification on their composition marks and comments so that they improve in future compositions, mean 3.13. This means that teachers did justice to students and help them understand teachers' marking.

The other findings from teachers are that they gave students time for correction making as a way of error elimination, mean 3.57; they assisted students in correction making explaining the wrong items, mean 3.51; they gave students composition model answer samples when necessary in preparation for future work, mean 3.45 and their feedback showed what the students needed to do in order to improve, mean 3.53, were just as those of students in Table 6. These finding are similar to Keegan, Brown and MacBeath (2018) who found that effective feedback should include both what the student did well and what needed to be improved. Also, what the teachers agreed, that their feedback showed what students had done correctly which they should maintain, mean 3.38; the feedback showed what students had done

incorrectly which they should improve, mean 3.51 and that they gave students confidence in composition writing, mean 3.57, tally students responses. This is a healthy atmosphere for both the teachers and the students. Whereas teachers' overall Feed Forward mean was 3.35, it can be concluded

that teachers value all their three feedback practices namely, Feed Forward as indicated by overall means.

Table 6 shows students responses on Feed Forward. The mean of 3.50 to 4.00, 2.50 to 3.49, 1.50 to 2.49 and 1.00 to 1.49 indicates strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly agree, respectively.

Table 5: Teachers' Feedforward Descriptive Statistics

SN	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I briefly explain the highest and lowest composition marks and justify them	2.94	.870
2	I give students time to reflect on my comments before writing another composition	3.24	.736
3	I give students an opportunity to ask for justification on their composition marks and comments so that they improve in future compositions	3.13	.824
4	I give students time to discuss marked compositions to learn from each other	3.06	.791
5	I give my students time for correction making as a way of error elimination	3.57	.617
6	I assist my students in correction making explaining the wrong items	3.51	.585
7	I give students composition model answer samples in preparation for future work	3.45	.686
8	I give students consultation time preparing them for future compositions tasks	3.17	.789
9	My feedback shows what my students need to do to improve	3.53	.504
10	My feedback shows what students have done correctly which they should maintain	3.38	.677
11	My feedback shows what students have done incorrectly for improvement	3.51	.505
12	I give my students confidence in composition writing	3.57	.580
13	I use feedback from students to plan for future composition	3.47	.654
Teacher Overall Feed Forward Mean		3.35	

Table 6: Students Feed Forward Descriptive Statistics

SN	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	My teacher explains the highest and lowest composition marks and justify them	2.40	1.155
2	My teacher gives time to reflect on my written comments before I write another one	2.97	.989
3	My teacher gives me an opportunity to ask for justification on my composition marks and comments so that I improve in future compositions	2.98	1.032
4	My teacher gives time to discuss my marked compositions with peers for improvement	3.02	.996
5	My teacher gives us time for correction making as a way of error elimination	3.29	.881
6	My teacher assists us in correction making explaining the wrong items	3.25	.931
7	My teacher gives us model answers when necessary preparing us for future work	3.08	.970
8	My teacher allows us consultation time with her/him preparing for future compositions	3.11	.978
9	My teacher's feedback shows me my strengths and my weaknesses	3.43	.834
10	My teacher's feedback shows me what I need to do to improve	3.50	.717
11	My teachers' feedback shows me what I did correctly which I should maintain	3.44	.791
12	My teachers' feedback shows me what I did incorrectly which I should improve	3.37	.804
13	My teachers' feedback makes me builds confidence in composition writing	3.21	.909
14	My teacher uses feedback from us to plan for our future composition work	2.96	.997
Student Feed Forward Overall Mean		3.14	

Table 6 shows that students disagreed that their teachers explained the highest and lowest composition marks in class and justified these marks when returning their composition books for students' future references as indicated by a mean of 2.40 and standard deviation of 1.155 which shows heterogeneity. This shows that the issue of mark allocation was not well clarified. Teachers should therefore tell students how marks are allocated in general and in a given composition exercise so that students know where to focus on. Students also agreed that their composition teacher gave them time to reflect on the written comments before they write another composition, mean 2.97 and standard

deviation of .989. It is necessary for teachers to give students ample time to reflect on the written comments in class for some students cannot do it on their own. Teachers should also give students opportunities to ask for justification on their composition marks and comments so that they improve in future compositions, a thing which some teachers were doing as show by a mean of 2.98 and a high standard deviation of 1.032 which shows heterogeneous responses of students.

Students further agreed that teachers gave them time to discuss their marked compositions with their peers so that they learn from each other and improve, mean

3.02 and standard deviation of .996. This finding is commended by Alrubail (2015) as well as Gielen, Tops, Dochy, Onghena and Smeets (2010) who found in their studies that peer feedback is helpful to students in improving their composition writing. Students also agreed that their teachers gave them time for correction making as a way of error elimination and assisted them in correction making, mean 3.02 and 3.29 respectively. The standard deviation of .970 and .978, respectively, show variations in responses. It should be noted that students were happy with their teachers who gave them model answers when necessary, preparing them for future work, mean 3.25. They were happy with their teachers who allowed them consultation time preparing them for future compositions, mean 3.08. The standard deviations of .931 and .970, respectively, show variations in responses. Therefore, teachers should make a real call for consultation so that students are aware that the teacher has such time.

Students valued their teachers' feedback for the feedback shows them their weaknesses and strengths, mean 3.11 and a standard deviation of .978; teachers showed students what they needed to do in order to improve, mean 3.43 and standard deviation of .834; showed them what they did correctly which they should maintain, mean 3.56 and standard deviation of .717 which shows fair homogeneity of responses; teachers also showed students what they did incorrectly which they should improve on, mean 3.44. This shows that students received meaningful feedback from their composition teachers and this made them build confidence in composition writing, mean 3.37.

Students' overall Feed Forward high mean of 3.14 shows that students value teacher Feed Forward practice. It can be argued that both teachers and students have seen the importance teachers' Feed Up, Feed Back, Feed Forward practices as indicated by high overall means for both groups. This gives room for potential improved composition writing by students specifically when the teachers' feedback is well written and well communicated to the students. This means that, both the teachers and the students share the same feedback meaning.

4.2 Hypotheses Testing

The second part of data analysis deals with hypothesis testing which was guided by the second research question.

Research Question Two: *Is there a significant difference between teachers' and students' responses on a) Feed Up b) Feed Back c) Feed Forward?*

Feed Up

The differences explained between teachers' and students' responses on Feed Up were statistically tested using Mann-Whitney U test and the results are shown on Table 7a and 7b. The use of this statistical tool, which is non-parametric, was due to the fact that students highly outnumbered the teachers, thus parametric conditions were not met.

Table 7a shows independent samples Mann-Whitney U test on Feed Up ranks. The mean rank for students was 135.75 which is lower than 219.46 (mean rank for teachers). This means that teachers and students had a possibility for significant different perceptions.

Table 7a Mann-Whitney U Test on Feed Up

a) Ranks				
	Type of Respondents	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feed Up	Students	250	135.75	33938.50
	Teachers	47	219.46	10314.50
	Total	297		

Table 7b: Test Statistics on Feed Up

Test Statistics	
	Feed Up
Mann-Whitney U	2563.500
Wilcoxon W	33938.500
Z	-6.140
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Grouping Variable: Type of respondents

Table 7b shows a Sig of .000 which means that the differences between students and teachers responses

is statistically significant, thus the null hypothesis for the independent samples Mann-Whitney U tests on

Feed Up which says: *There is no significant difference between student and teachers' responses on Feed Up*, is rejected. This means that teachers' and students had different perception on Feed Up questionnaire items, teachers having higher mean scores than students. This finding tally that by Çağla (2016) who, in a study on similarities and differences between students' and teachers' perceptions about written corrective feedback found differences among the two groups. This has a negative effect on students' composition learning and writing because teachers and students assign different meanings to teacher Feed Up practice. Therefore, there is a need for teachers to initiate the opening up of the Feed Up grey areas. In other words, teachers should make sure that they communicate properly the composition writing goals and expectations to students so that their efforts reward students' performance in composition writing.

The differences in response between the teachers' and the students' responses toward Feed Back were tested in Table 8a and 8b. Table 8a shows ranks on

Mann-Whitney U test. The mean rank for student, 141.28, is seemingly lower than that of teachers which is 190.05. This suggests a possibility that the teachers highly rated themselves more than what the students expected. Table 8b confirms that the differences in responses between the teachers and the students on Feed Back as significantly different, Sig = .000. Therefore, the null hypothesis which says: *there is no significant difference between student and teachers' responses on Feed Back*, is rejected. This means that the teachers and students responded differently on Feed Back questionnaire items. Similarly, Keegan, Brown and MacBeath (2018) found that teachers and students had their own views on what constitutes effective feedback. This calls for teacher to put effort in understanding students' views on Feedback with the hope that such understanding on the part of the teacher can help him/her to decide how to give useful Feed Back to students.

Table 8a Mann-Whitney U Test on Feed Forward

a) Ranks				
	Type of respondents	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Feed Forward	Students	250	145.12	36280.50
	Teachers	47	169.63	7972.50
	Total	297		

Table 8b Test Statistics for Feed Forward

b) Test Statistics	
	Feed Forward
Mann-Whitney U	4905.500
Wilcoxon W	36280.500
Z	-1.796
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.072

a. Grouping Variable: Type of respondents

Feed Forward

The differences in response between the teachers' and the student' respondents on Feed Forward was tested and the results are shown on the Table 8a and 8b. Table 8a shows ranks for independent samples Mann-Whitney U test on Feed Forward where there is a possible difference between mean ranks for students, 145.12 and for teachers which is 169.63. Table 8b shows that the independent samples Mann-Whitney U test on Feed Forward indicates no statistical difference between the teachers and students responses, sig =.072 which is greater

than the critical value. Therefore, the null hypothesis which says: *there is no significant difference between teacher and student responses on Feed Forward*, is accepted. This means that there was homogeneity on teachers' and students' responses on Feed Forward questionnaire items. This implies that there is a healthy situation whereby both teachers and students assign the same meaning to teacher Feed forward practice. Students are likely to

benefit by improving their performance in composition writing under such conditions.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

High overall means for Feed Up, Feed Back and Feed Forward for both teachers and students shows that these aspects are important in composition writing which can enhance students' improvement in composition writing skills. Teachers need to give clear composition writing goals and expectations to the students before they engage in the writing process (Feed Up). Teachers should also give students informative comments that they should adhere to during the writing process (Feed Back). Again, teachers should wisely make use of the feedback they get from their students for planning and innovative purposes in the teaching of composition writing (Feed Forward).

Results from the Mann-Whitney U test which showed that there is a significant difference between the teachers' and students' responses on Feed Up and Feed Back, which is an indicator that not all students got the intended feedback meaning of the teacher. Aspects of Feed Up, Feed Back and Feed forward should therefore be well understood by teachers, a component that can be included by teacher-educators in teacher training programs; workshops can also help the already practicing teachers.

Schools should provide teachers with the necessary resources for them to be able to adequately and properly assist students in the composition writing process. Further, teachers should be committed to their work in such a way that they put effort during the feedback process so that the value that the teacher wants to give to the student is the same value communicated to the students, thus eliminating discrepancies between the teacher and the student meaning. Committed teachers should always have mechanisms in place to find out whether the students have understood teachers' feedback or not in order to assist them accordingly as well as using such information on planning and developing useful teaching strategies.

Reference

- Alrubail, R. (2015). *The power of peer feedback*. Retrieved from <https://www.edutopia.org/discussion/power-peer-feedback>.
- Amrhein, H. R. & Nassaji, H. (2010). Written corrective feedback: What do students and teachers prefer and why? *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics / Revue canadienne de*
- linguistique appliquee*, 13 (2), 95-127. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ944129>
- Çagla, A. (2016). Contrasting perceptions of students and teachers: Written Corrective Feedback. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12 (2), 166-182. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1117969>
- Catapano, J. (2017). *Teaching strategies: The essentials of giving feedback*. Retrieved from <http://www.teachhub.com/teaching-strategies-essentials-giving-feedback>
- CI Schoolkit (2012). *Importance of record keeping*. Retrieved from <http://cischooltoolkit.com/q/teachers/c-after-school-entry-1/2---review-progress/report-your-progress.php>
- Dreher, A. (2016). *Giving positive and corrective feedback*. Retrieved from <http://www.mentorleadershipteam.com/articles/giving-positive-and-corrective-feedback>
- Gielen, S., Tops, L., Dochy, F., Onghena, P., & Smeets, S. (2010). *A comparative study of peer and teacher feedback and of various peer feedback forms in a secondary school writing curriculum*. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36 (1), 143-162. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01411920902894070>
- Guo, Y. (2014). *Classroom age composition and vocabulary development*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5029468/>
- Hattie, J. & Timperly, H. (2007). *The power of feedback*. Retrieved from www.growthmindsetaz.org
- Hattie, J. A. C. & Yates, G.C.R. (2014). *Using feedback to promote learning*. Retrieved from <http://teachpsych.org/ebooks/asle2014/>
- <http://scholarship.shu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article>
- Jumba, P. K. (2016). *The role of pictures in teaching English composition writing in upper primary school in Emuhaya sub-county, Vihiga County, Kenya*. Retrieved from <http://irlibrary.ku.ac.ke/bitstream/handle/123456789/14952/>
- Kang, E. & Han, Z. (2015). The Efficacy of Written Corrective Feedback in Improving L2 Written Accuracy: A Meta-Analysis. *The*

- Modern Language Journal* __, 99 (1).
Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/modl.12189/pdf>
- Keegan, P., Brown, G. & MacBeath, J. (2018). *Teacher and students perception on feedback*. Retrieved from <https://www.coursera.org/learn/learning-assessment/lecture/Xl5bY/teacher-student-perceptions-of-feedback>
- Nielsen, D. (2015). *The impact of formative feedback on student motivation to write in eighth grade English courses*. (Thesis). Paper 440. Retrieved from <http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu>
- Peterson, S. S. (2010). *Improving students writing using feedback as a teaching tool*. Retrieved from https://thelearningexchange.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/WW_Improving_Student_Writing.pdf
- Reynolds, L. (2013). *20 ways to provide effective feedback for learning*. Retrieved from <https://www.teachthought.com/technology/20-ways-to-provide-effective-feedback-for-learning/>.