

The Effects of Multiple and Single Draft Feedback On the Writing Skills of Students

Mammo Keefele*

Abstract: *This paper tries to check whether or not multiple draft feedback is more useful than the single draft feedback in making students learn writing. To achieve this objective, the researcher used two kinds of data collection methods. In the experiment, 119 AAU students who were classified into experimental (56) and control groups (63) were taught the same materials for one semester. The former received multiple draft feedback and the latter single draft feedback. To measure the difference in the effects of the two types of feedback on students performance, pre-test and post-test essays were used. Besides, a questionnaire was designed to supplement the findings of the experiment. The overall result was that the EG, identified to be essentially equivalent to the CG in the pre-test, performed better in the post-test at the end of the experiment. Responses to the questionnaire also indicated that students reread their essays and paid more attention to teachers and peer comments on their multiple drafts (100%, 91%) of the process writing than the single draft feedback on the respective end products (57%, 70%). Besides, 15% of the CG were reported to have ignored the single draft feedback, and showed very limited attempt to understand it, whereas only 4% of the EG said that they ignored the multiple draft feedback. In the follow-up activities of the process of feedback involving the revision of the first draft, the EG reported that they added new points, developed ideas with examples, identified illogical relations, used markers to connect ideas, dropped unrelated ideas, readjusted introductions and restated central ideas in their conclusions. However, these revision strategies were reported to be inapplicable to the CG. The responses of both the CG (84%) and the EG (91%) indicated that incorporating feedback in rewriting essays two or more times was more useful to develop writing skills than the single draft feedback. It is further recognized that self - correction was activated in the multiple draft contexts.*

* Associate Professor, Institute of Language Studies, Addis Ababa University.

Introduction

Providing feedback on students' compositions is an important component of teaching writing. According to Keh (1990), feedback is input from a reader to a writer in the form of comments, questions, suggestions, and other clues which guide the student writer to produce a meaningful text. Through feedback the student writer discovers where he/she has confused the reader by failing to supply enough information, illogically organizing ideas and using inappropriate words, tenses, etc. He further states that it is feedback on the various drafts which pushes the writer through the writing process on to the eventual end products. This definition shows that in process writing, feedback is provided on the multiple drafts of student compositions.

In the actual teaching of writing, however, learners, in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia are usually given very little opportunity to learn from feedback. This is because a considerable number of instructors provide feedback on learners' finished compositions known as single drafts or end products and not on earlier drafts. For example, the survey conducted by Getnet (1994) states that 67 % of the Sophomore English instructors at Addis Ababa University (AAU) provided feedback together with the grade on the end products of their students' essays, a situation which may also apply in a greater extent to high schools.

This kind of single draft feedback does not give the opportunity to students to learn writing from using feedback in revising essays. This is because, by employing the traditional product - centered method, most teachers act, according to Hairston (1986), as editors and critics on student writers who are not far enough advanced to benefit from the feedback teachers offer to them. It may thus be unfair, for example, to expect freshman students (at AAU) who come from the high schools with an already poor background to make use of the single draft feedback in improving their texts before they are taught how to revise

them. Under such single draft settings, extensive comments on the end products of learners may be wasteful.

Secondly, teachers who stick to the single draft feedback overemphasize negative points (Semke, 1984; Zamel, 1995; Gwin, 1991; Hairston, 1986) and cause unfavourable reactions from students. Hairston, for instance by citing Rogers (1970), states that most people are defensive and refuse to admit corrective remarks with the aim of protecting their ego. Similarly, students refuse to read the comments on their graded papers since papers heavily marked and given low grades are so frustrating to them. As a result, they throw away their essays and leave the mistakes to persistently repeat in the following compositions (Leki, 1990; Henrickson, 1976; Semke, 1984; Robb et al. 1986).

These instances compel us to change our responding behaviours (Zamel, 1985) and make our students learn from revising compositions by taking the maximum advantage of the multiple draft feedback of the process writing. This would enable learners to handle organization and content problems on the first draft and to edit grammar and mechanics on the next draft, minimum rewriting requirements suggested in the literature. As grading does not apply to earlier drafts, the feedback provided on the rewrites and the concentration on only some of the errors at a time together with the teachers' change of heart (Norrish: 1983) to use mistakes for improvement would probably create an opportunity for students to learn writing in a better way.

From this point of view, knowing the relative merits of the multiple draft feedback and the single draft feedback will be of great importance to teachers as this will help them know a better way of giving feedback. For this reason, this article tries to show to what extent using feedback on multiple drafts is more beneficial to writing than providing feedback on finished compositions.

Some Ways of Providing Feedback on Students' Writing

Teachers and researchers have developed various ways of giving feedback. The most important ones are discussed below.

The first is *direct correction*. In this method, teachers indicate not only the location of erroneous forms but also provide the correct forms instead. Henrickson (1980) believes that we use this correction treatment when we assume that it is difficult for students to correct certain errors. According to this method, teachers underline a word and provide a correction, or bracket a misplaced word and indicate its proper place in the sentence with an arrow. They also cross out a superfluous word or expression and provide the correct form or structure as appropriate.

When direct correction is applied comprehensively on students' work, we have what is known as *comprehensive feedback* (Lalande, 1982). This occurs when a teacher overtly corrects all the errors made. Both comprehensive and direct feedback are very much criticized by researchers. For instance, labelling such feedback as traditional, Byrne (1988) criticizes them for being "time consuming for the teacher and discouraging to students" at least when the latter get back their work covered with red ink. Similarly, Gwin (1991) condemns them as "unproductive" and "spoon feeding". Besides, Raimes (1983) takes the application of comprehensive feedback as an unfair teacher's rewrite of student papers. The practice of covering a student's work with red ink in this way is referred to as *over-correction* by some researchers (such as Byrne, 1988).

The second major way of providing feedback is *indirect correction*. It is actualised by indicating only the specific location of errors to make students correct their errors by themselves. According to Henrickson (1980) and Byrne (1988), teachers use it when they think that students are able to discover an acceptable solution for a given error. This is by

considering the error itself or by using the appropriate self-help references such as textbooks, dictionaries and grammar books. In practice, teachers actually underline or circle the mistakes, insert a caret (^) to indicate the missing word or place a question mark alongside a confusing phrase or structure.

Byrne (1988) and Gwin (1991) suggest the use of some kind of symbols, such as "S" for incorrect spelling, "W.O" for wrong word order, "T" for wrong tense and "C" for concord etc., to focus the attention of students on the kind of mistakes they have made. This is usually accompanied by a checklist (Byrne, 1988) or a correction sheet (Gwin, 1991), which students can see at a glance if they are making any progress. If teachers are going to use a marking code (Hedge, 1988), then it is important that students are familiar with it. It could be displayed on the wall of the classroom on a handmade poster, or photocopied and handed to students (p.152). Students are then given time in class to work through a corrected script, understand the symbols and try to self-correct while the teacher circulates and helps them individually.

Another feedback which results from the indirect method of responding to students' errors and which is closely related to locating errors is *minimal marking*, first suggested by Heyland (1990). This feedback is expressed by putting a cross (x) in the margin alongside the lines in which the mistake occurs. The task of locating and correcting the error is left to the learners. The teacher does not correct the mistakes or indicate the specific errors.

Selective marking is another source of feedback directed only at errors affecting intelligibility and those which require attention for teaching. This means one does not attempt to correct all the mistakes in a piece of writing, but only those recognised in certain areas such as tenses, or articles, because one has decided to focus attention on them for a while.

This approach, according to Byrne (1988), is more positive than *total correction*. In fact, he stated that in practice most teachers exercise

some form of selection. He recommends that the practice needs to be backed up by some form of remedial teaching. It is in this connection that most researchers suggest correction priority to be given to *global errors* which impede understanding and attend to *local errors* in the last stages of the revision. The idea of *total correction* is thus unacceptable by most teachers or researchers.

Written commentary is another major type of feedback teachers provide on students' writing. It is widely practised at higher levels. It usually consists of comments of long or brief and general or specific comments which sometimes involve praise or criticism. Some of these comments are placed on the margins and thus called *marginal comments*. Others which are put at the end are *end comments*. Instances of specific positive comments are suggestions or questions given in the form of complete sentences such as "Can you tell me more? I too have experienced the same thing. That is an excellent choice of words. That is an interesting idea."

Those comments which express the teacher's overall impression of a given piece of writing including phrases like "not clear; word order, confusing" are discouraged as hasty by Raimes (1983) and Zamel (1985) since they are too general or vague. These authorities further state that even comments which deal with content related and organisational problems are also unproductive if they are general. On the contrary, content specific comments which encourage students to revise their work are favoured (Zamel, 1985; Raimes, 1983).

Feedback is *interactive* if it is provided in a face to face conversation between the teacher and student (Keh, 1990; Hedge, 1988). The instructor may ask the student to clarify some of the writing points in organisation, language or topic by way of assisting him to revise the paper. This practice, which is sometimes called *conferencing*, directs the students' attention to these specific features of writing and creates a good opportunity for the teacher to give tactful guidance so as to

encourage the student to think about writing as something that is organised and improved. It also gives students an opportunity not only to talk about their writing and reflect on the process, but also to enable the teacher to listen, learn, and diagnose at the same time.

The last way of giving feedback is *reformulation*. According to the proponents of the process approach (such as Hedge, 1988), it is a valuable technique which makes revising, editing and rewriting part and parcel of the writing classes. The experts think that it serves as a substitution for direct correction which often tends to focus on the surface features of language. It is an attempt by a native writer or teacher to understand what a non-native writer or learner is trying to say and then to rewrite it in a form more natural to the non-native writer or learner. It gives the student the chance to analyse and discuss the organisation of meaning in his or her own writing and that of fellow students.

It is suggested that the reformulated copy and the original should be photocopied and distributed to students for comparison with a model followed by a discussion of the reasons for the change. Hedge (1988) states that this creates an opportunity for students to learn organisation, development of ideas, a writer's sense of audience and appropriate style, all of which are neglected in correction activities. However, it should be noted that some researchers accuse it of being time consuming.

Peer feedback could also be similar in nature to the feedback shown above as students imitate it from their teachers which also involves the different kinds of feedback presented above.

In short, direct correction, comprehensive feedback, or total correction, over correction, etc. are some of the ways of giving feedback that are not approved of by most teachers and researchers. Others such as giving priority to global errors, which focus on organization and content,

selective marking, minimal marking, interactive feedback, written feedback etc. are the ones most often recommended to be provided as appropriate on multiple and single drafts.

The Effects of Feedback on Students' Writing

Research has been mostly concerned with determining the effects of teacher feedback on the overall quality of student writing and on student attitudes toward writing. For example, several researchers (Semke 1984, Leki's review as cited by Knoblauch and Brannon 1990) compared the effects of the different kinds of feedback such as comments only, corrections only, praise, criticism, written comments, oral comments, etc. and discovered that there were no significant improvements in the quality of student writing. Others (such as Graham as cited by Fathman and Whalley, 1990) compared the effects of focusing on all errors or on only one type of error and on every third assignment or not at all. However, none brought any significant differences between them.

This failure of teachers' feedback to bring about any effect on the quality of student writing was attributed to a number of reasons. The first was that language teachers focused on mechanics as opposed to students presentation of facts and concepts to which teachers of other disciplines most frequently responded (Zamel, 1985). For example, 80% of ESL* teachers ranked mechanical errors as the most important criterion for responding to student writing (Applebee as cited in Robb et al. 1986). This shows that, despite the general move from focus on surface errors to focus on content and communication, language teachers are more concerned with specific errors and problems of language.

The second reason is that most teachers give confusing, arbitrary and inaccessible comments to their students. Let alone FL* students, even

* English as a Second Language

* Foreign Language

native speaking students do not often understand the meanings of their teachers' comments (Zamel, 1985). Therefore, teachers should exert the utmost efforts to make their comments very clear (Ferris, 1995). They should use check lists, correction sheets, etc. to create maximum understanding of teachers' feedback.

The third reason is that students do not read teachers' comments or even when they read them they do not attempt to implement the comments as some students usually become offended by the low marks they get on the essay they have laboured on (Hairston 1986, Leki's review 1990). As a result, many researchers suggested the postponement of grade to the final draft of a process writing or the use of the portfolio approach.

The fourth reason is that most teachers do not avoid correction strategies which embarrass or frustrate students (Henrickson, 1978; Semke, 1984; Gwin, 1991). For example, Semke reported that while students expressed hostility at having errors pointed out for them to correct, supportive comments with indication of errors had a positive influence on students attitudes. So teachers must sugar-coat the bitter pills of criticism with praise (Kamla, 1992). This is because, according to Gwin (1991), students remember the praise longer and ultimately be more motivated to learn because of praise than if they received only negative comments. Semke (1984) also stated that achievement is closely related to attitude, so any thing which has a negative effect on attitude tends to retard learning. That was why Henrickson (1978) suggested that when teachers provide feedback, they must take into account the students' attitudes, motivation, personality and language learning history.

The fifth and most important reason given to the failure is students' poor experience of responding to teachers feedback (Hairston, 1986; Leki, 1990). In this regard, even when students understand teachers' comments, they may not necessarily benefit from them. This is because

both L1 and FL students seem to be limited in their repertoire of strategies for processing feedback in revising their compositions (Cohen, 1987; Cohen and Cavalcanti 1990). The task of identifying errors and revising papers to develop editorial skills and self-critical thinking is a crucial classroom role. Thus, involving learners to evaluate peer essays and to incorporate peer feedback is highly recommended for it creates an audience (other than the teacher) with whom learners can collaborate and negotiate in the writing process (Hairston, 1986; Zamel, 1985; Brannon and Knoblauch, 1982). Even shy students can ask questions under this less threatening peer comment context (Moxley, 1989). In other words, the ultimate aim of self-monitoring and self-correction is achieved by marking schemes which indicate mistake types (Wood, 1993). This offers the learner a chance to identify the specific problem, to formulate personal checklists which change as proficiency grows, and to reformulate techniques which teachers suggest for what the student is trying to express. This is realized when both peer and teachers' feedback are given a complementary role in teaching writing.

Because of the above reasons, feedback provided on student papers in a single draft setting may not be useful. It is only with the process feedback that the above weaknesses can be corrected. That was why Ziv (1984) stated that feedback which is not applied in the revision process of a multiple draft setting is of a minor value to student writers.

However, research which compared the effects of feedback in multiple and single draft settings is non-existent as far as the writer's search through the literature in the area can tell. But, if there is any research, it is something associated with revising and students' attitude to teachers' feedback. For example, teacher's underlining of grammatical errors and providing comments on content resulted in the improvement of form and content (Fathman and Whalley, 1990). Furthermore, students who used an error code in rewriting their essays made significant gains more than students whose compositions were corrected directly by the instructor (Lalande cited in Robb et al.).

The other attention to feedback is paid by students who want feedback and teachers who feel obliged to provide it (Fathman and Whally, 1990). An example is Ziv's exploration of how the four college freshmen perceived the specific comments she wrote on their papers and used them in revising (1984). She preferred the case study because the results of the few studies so far done on the effects of teacher response during the writing process have been inconclusive.

Ferris (1995) also carried out a survey of students' reactions to their teachers' feedback in multiple draft contexts. The result showed that ESL students paid more attention to teacher feedback provided on preliminary drafts than on the end draft of the same assignment. But as shown earlier, process oriented feedback does not include only teachers' feedback. It should be complemented by peer correction. Besides, as there is no comparison made between multiple draft feedback and single product feedback, his study has not shown the relative effects of both types of feedback on student performance.

Data Collection Methods and Procedure

Two kinds of data collection methods are used in this study. They are an experiment and a questionnaire.

Subjects, Materials and the Provision of Feedback

In the first one, a pre-test/post-test, control-group experiment involving a t-test was conducted to determine the difference in the effects of feedback provided on multiple drafts and on single end products. In this study, 119 second-year students of the departments of Ethiopian Languages and Literature, Foreign Languages and Literature, Linguistics, and the students of the Faculty of Education who registered for the course, Intermediate English I, were used. Of these, 56 students divided into two classes served as Experimental Group (EG) and the other 63 students put into two more sections were used as Control Group(CG).

The course was given in the second semester of 1998 which lasted 48 hours extending from 16 February to 10 June. All the subjects wrote a post-test essay which could show the changes in the effects of feedback in comparison to the pre-test essay written before the experiment.

The researcher personally taught the course to all of them and provided the multiple draft feedback to the EG and the single draft feedback to the CG. The course, which involved four essay assignments, aims to develop the academic writing ability of second year students. It employed the same materials including readings for models of good writing, topic selection, outlining, readings related to the different writing topics, data collection from different sources, etc.

Two kinds of feedback were given to the EG: the researcher's comments provided on their essays and peer group feedback presented to the respective students in conferences. This model represents the feedback adopted by the process oriented teaching of writing (Ken, 1990). In this model, he responded as a *concerned reader* and communicated *with sincere respect for the student writer as a person and a sincere interest in his improvement as a writer*. He did this by limiting the comments to fundamental problems which take account of students' inability to attend every thing at once.

He also assumed three roles. As a reader he responded to the content with comments such as "good point"; as a writing teacher, he concerned himself with points of confusion in logic, but still maintaining the role of a reader and mostly referring to the specific points of confusion which involved revision strategies. In his final role of a grammarian, he provided reasons for the certain grammatical forms recognized as inappropriate. Thus, his feedback included not only underlining and marginal, but also terminal comments pointing out overall strengths and weaknesses so as to indicate goals for the next rewriting.

In other words, each student in the EG wrote the first draft and submitted it to him. He then provided comments and suggestions as

explained above to improve the content and organization of the student's paper. The student then rewrote the draft incorporating all the necessary changes recommended by the feedback.

Table 1: Providing Multiple Draft Feedback to the EG

Types of Draft	Feedback Type	Assign 1	Assign 2	Assign 3	Assign 4
First Draft	Content +Org+Dev	T	P	T	P
Second Draft	Gram+Mech	P	T	P	T
Third Draft	Some glaring problems: criticism, praise, grade	T	T	T	T

Key: T = teacher, P = peer group

For editing the grammar and mechanics in the respective order in the process, the second draft was given to peer groups. As a support, peer groups were provided with checklists and correction model (Klassen, 1991; Gwin, 1991; Keh, 1990) which make the peer-groups evaluate the papers and make them prepare for the conference for presenting the feedback to the respective writers.

The third draft which was written by integrating the peer groups' feedback was then submitted to the researcher as an end product for final evaluation. This process was repeated with the second, third and fourth essay topics. In other words, his comments came earlier on in the process with a focus on content, organization and development while peer group feedback conferences which focused on grammar and mechanics came on in the next stage of the revising, or the second draft.

In the next assignment, the peer group conference dealt with the content, organization and development of the first draft supported by check lists (Mangelsdorf, 1992; Qiyi, 1993) while his feedback dealt with the grammar and mechanics of the second draft alternating in this way with all drafts of the four writing assignments up to the end of the semester.

On the other hand, the single draft feedback provided to the CG included only the researcher's written comments to replicate the usual traditional feedback provision method which focuses on all the major elements of writing such as content, organization, development, grammar, and mechanics. In other words, the subjects in this group wrote their single drafts most probably in one go and submitted them to him. This means he corrected as much as possible most of the writing errors by underlining mistakes and by writing marginal and terminal comments which showed the strengths and weaknesses of the drafts plus the resulting grade to decide the passing or failing of students.

Marking

In order to find out the differences between the CG and the EG, the 56 and 63 respective pairs of pre-test and post-test essays collected from all subjects were distributed to three FLLD instructors for grading. They were those instructors who were not involved in the teaching of the CG and the EG. They had MA and had a teaching experience of five years.

Table 2: Distribution of the Pairs of the Pre-test and Post-Test Essays to Markers

	CG	EG	Total
Marker 1	21	18	39
Marker 2	21	19	40
Marker 3	21	19	40
Total	63	56	119

Table 2 shows the distribution of the essays to markers. Each marker who received one-third of the pre-test and the post-test essays of the CG and EG was advised to adopt the analytical marking criteria of the Foreign Languages and Literature Department at AAU. And, though they were told to critically compare each pair of the pre-test and post-test essays during the marking, they did not have any ways of knowing

which one was a pre-test and which one a post-test. This was because the papers were coded. Each essay was marked out of 20. And the interval of 16 weeks between the pre-testing and the post-testing was deemed long enough to control any short term memory efforts.

Questionnaire

In the second method of data collection, a questionnaire was designed to solicit students' reactions about the effects of feedback in learning writing in both the multiple and single draft contexts and supplement the data obtained from the experiment (see the Analysis). The designing of the questionnaire was done by adapting Cohen (1987) and Ferris (1995). Some questions which were necessary for the present study were added, others were revised as appropriate and some of them were dropped altogether.

All in all, seven questions which directly supported the data of the experiment were set in the questionnaire. The focus of some of them (Q1 & 2) was to find out how much attention students give to both feedback types, the kinds of strategies (Q3) they employed to understand feedback, the follow-up activities they carried out (Q4) to incorporate feedback in their rewriting of essays and which feedback type was more useful to them (Q5, 6 & 7) in their learning of writing. The information collected in this way was expected to reflect the reaction of students to the respective incorporation of the feedback and the improvements students perceived in the experiment as a whole.

Data Analysis and Discussion

In this section, the results of the experiment and the responses collected by the questionnaire are presented.

Mean Differences

Table 3: Pre test Means (M) and Standard Deviation (SD)

	M	SD	Value of t
CG (n=63)	9.1	3.28	
EG (n=56)	8.7	3.10	0.6, $p>0.05$

Table 3 shows the mean scores of the pre-test of the CG and the EG. As shown in this table, a comparison of the means revealed that no significant differences existed between the two groups ($t=0.6$, $p>0.05$). This confirms the fact that the two groups were essentially equivalent.

Table 4: Post-test Means (M) and Standard Deviation (SD)

	M	SD	Value of t
CG (n=63)	10.8	3.6	
EG (n=56)	12.2	3.28	2.3, $p>0.05$

Table 4 also shows the post-test means for the two groups. A comparison of these means show that the EG as is predicted outperformed the CG ($t=2.3$, $p>0.05$). It is thus safer to conclude that learners have performed better because of the multiple draft feedback of the process writing than because of the end-product feedback.

Student Perceptions of the Effects of Feedback

The survey which assessed student reactions to multiple drafts and end-product feedback supports the results of the experiment.

For instance, student responses to Q1 and 2, whose purpose was to find out how much of their essays' feedback they read and paid attention to, showed that there were significant differences between multiple

drafts and end-products. If we add "Twice" and "More than "Twice" columns of Q1 as well as "All" and "Most" columns of Q2 in Table 5, we see that students were more likely to reread their essays and pay attention to their teachers' and peer comments on their multiple drafts of the process writing than on their single draft products.

Table 5: Reading Essays and Analytically Attending to Feedback

Questions	Groups	More than Twice		Twice		Once		Not at all	
		No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Q1. How many times did you read over the essays when you got each back with all the necessary comments on?	CG(63)	17	(27)	19	(30)	20	(32)	4	(6)
	EG(56)	30	(54)	26	(46)	0	(0)	0	(0)
Q2. How much of each essay returned did you read over each time?		All of it		Most of it		Some of it		None	
		No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
	CG(63)	20	(32)	24	(38)	16	(25)	2	(3)
	EG(56)	41	(73)	10	(18)	5	(9)	0	(0)

This was because as shown in Table 5, 100% of the EG read their essays two or more times, while only 57% of the CG did so. In other words, there were about 38% of the CG who read their essays only once or not at all whereas no one of the EG read less than twice. Student responses for Q2 also show that 91% of the EG read "All" or "Most" of their essays as compared to only 70% of the CG.

The main reason for such a difference could be that the teacher required the EG to revise their essays on the basis of the process feedback provided. As rewriting involves reading essays several times and carefully analyzing the feedback which is probably backed up by check-lists, teacher and classmate explanations as well as other sources, such as grammar books, etc., the opportunities for learning the intricacies of

writing will be greater. On top of that there is more hope of getting better marks for better work as the grade is postponed to the final draft. However, in the single draft setting, the teacher firstly does not allow rewriting and so the learners are not required to explicitly read their essays let alone critically interpret and understand the feedback.

So even the very few motivated students would not go beyond checking the grades as Gwin (1991) indicated. In the second case, as there was a grade given on the single draft, there would be a few other students who would probably be discouraged by the lower marks they obtained and, as a result, would stop paying more attention to the feedback.

Table 2: Post-test Means (M) and Standard Deviation (SD)

Q2	CG (82)	EG (86)	All of it		Most of it		Some of it		None
			No. (%)	SD	No. (%)	SD	No. (%)	SD	
1	20 (25)	41 (50)	24 (30)	2	18 (23)	5 (6)	5 (6)	5 (6)	0
2	10 (13)	10 (13)	10 (13)	2	10 (13)	2 (3)	2 (3)	2 (3)	0

A strong out of mean for the EG read their essays more times while only 25% of the CG did so. In other words, they were about 36% of the EG who read their essays only once or twice at all, whereas no one of the CG read any at all. Student responses for Q2 also show that 51% of the EG read 'All' or 'Most' of their essays as compared to only 20% of the CG. The main reason for such a difference could be that the teacher required the EG to revise their essays on the basis of the printed feedback provided. As rewriting involves reading essays several times and carefully analyzing the feedback which is probably marked up by the teacher and classroom explanations as well as other sources such as grammar books etc. the opportunity for learning the importance of

Table 6: Follow up Activities of Students for Understanding Feedback

Q3	Groups	Follow up activities	A lot		Some		Total		Little		None		Total	
			No.	%	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)
Were there any teacher comments that you didn't understand? If so, describe what you did to understand them?	CG(63)	- consulted teacher	13	21	9	14	22	35	8	13	23	37	31	50
		- sought help from classmates	14	22	21	33	35	55	10	16	9	14	19	30
		- referred to grammar books	20	32	22	35	42	67	6	10	5	8	11	18
		- ignored them	1	2	8	13	9	15	11	17	30	48	41	65
		- read essay comments many times	28	44	12	19	40	63	10	16	4	6	14	22
	EG(56)	- consulted teacher	9	16	8	14	17	30	10	18	24	43	34	61
		- sought help from classmates	16	28	19	34	35	62	12	21	4	7	16	28
		- referred to grammar books, textbooks	21	38	14	25	35	63	11	20	8	14	19	35
		- ignored them	1	2	1	2	2	4	6	11	38	68	44	79
		- read essay + comments many times	25	45	14	25	39	70	4	7	5	9	9	16

The idea that efforts of giving feedback in the single draft setting were mostly wasted was also incidentally strengthened by the data presented in Table 6. This was the very striking difference in which 15% of the CG reported to have ignored the feedback presented on their essays and did not try to understand, while by contrast an insignificant number (only 4%) of the EG reported to have ignored the comments given on their essays. This proves that end-product feedback is probably wasteful because, as shown above, a considerable number of the single draft feedback receivers did not make use of it.

Furthermore, Table 6 shows the follow-up activities most students of both groups employed to help them understand their readers' comments. For example, the EG sought help from classmates (65%), referred to grammar books (67%) and read their essays and comments several times (63%). Likewise, the CG reported that they carried out similar follow up activities to understand the feedback. But these could not be critical as they were not required for application in rewriting their essays.

To find out what revision activities the EG employed in their rewriting of the first draft, the question shown in Table 7 was asked. If we add their responses of "A Lot" and "Some" columns, we understand that 'adding new points', which accounted for 92% of their follow-up activities is the most frequent followed by acknowledging sources (82%), identifying 'illogical relations' and 'linking them by logical markers' (93%), dropping 'unrelated ideas' (89%), readjusting statements of 'purposes in introduction' (70%), developing 'ideas by examples' (79%), restating 'central ideas' and adding 'recommendations in conclusions' (71%). The CG were also given the same question but they reported that this did not apply to them.

Though the two questions presented in Table 8 were also given to the CG, their responses were that they did not apply to them. So they included only the reaction of the EG of which 95% showed a favourable

attitude to the feedback they had got from their peers and the teacher. They indicated that their comments were highly useful for revising their essays. It was only very few of them (2-5%) who said that the peer's and the teacher's feedback was not useful.

Table 7: Follow-up Activities Used By the EG in Rewriting their First Drafts

Q4	Follow up Activities	A lot	Some	Total	Total	Little	None
		No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)
If you attended to the corrections and comments provided on your essays, to what extent did you deal with the following?	Added new points	29 (52)	23 (40)	52 (92)	4 (7)	3 (5)	1 (2)
	Developed ideas by examples	25 (45)	19 (34)	44 (79)	12 (21)	9 (16)	3 (5)
	Acknowledged sources	32 (57)	14 (25)	46 (82)	10 (21)	6 (11)	4 (7)
	Identified illogical relations and used markers	26 (47)	26 (47)	52 (93)	4 (7)	1 (2)	3 (5)
	Dropped unrelated ideas	28 (50)	22 (39)	50 (89)	6 (11)	3 (5.5)	3 (5.5)
	Readjusted purpose in introductions	18 (32)	21 (38)	39 (70)	14 (25)	7 (13)	7 (13)
	Restated central ideas and added recommendations to conclusions	22 (39)	18 (32)	40 (71)	16 (29)	15 (27)	1 (2)

Both the CG and EG were asked to compare the effects of using feedback in the multiple and single draft settings as shown in Table 9. In this respect, if we add "A Lot" and "Some" columns, we understand that using feedback in rewriting essays two or more times (91%) was likely to be more useful to the EG for developing their writing skills. On the other hand, they considered that 'reading feedback without rewriting' essays would probably have very little contribution (14%) to developing their writing skills.

The idea that efforts of giving feedback in the single draft setting were mostly wasted was also incidentally strengthened by the data presented in Table 6. This was the very striking difference in which 15% of the CG reported to have ignored the feedback presented on their essays and did not try to understand, while by contrast an insignificant number (only 4%) of the EG reported to have ignored the comments given on their essays. This proves that end-product feedback is probably wasteful because, as shown above, a considerable number of the single draft feedback receivers did not make use of it.

Furthermore, Table 6 shows the follow-up activities most students of both groups employed to help them understand their readers' comments. For example, the EG sought help from classmates (65%), referred to grammar books (67%) and read their essays and comments several times (63%). Likewise, the CG reported that they carried out similar follow up activities to understand the feedback. But these could not be critical as they were not required for application in rewriting their essays.

To find out what revision activities the EG employed in their rewriting of the first draft, the question shown in Table 7 was asked. If we add their responses of "A Lot" and "Some" columns, we understand that 'adding new points', which accounted for 92% of their follow-up activities is the most frequent followed by acknowledging sources (82%), identifying 'illogical relations' and 'linking them by logical markers' (93%), dropping 'unrelated ideas' (89%), readjusting statements of 'purposes in introduction' (70%), developing 'ideas by examples' (79%), restating 'central ideas' and adding 'recommendations in conclusions' (71%). The CG were also given the same question but they reported that this did not apply to them.

Though the two questions presented in Table 8 were also given to the CG, their responses were that they did not apply to them. So they included only the reaction of the EG of which 95% showed a favourable

attitude to the feedback they had got from their peers and the teacher. They indicated that their comments were highly useful for revising their essays. It was only very few of them(2-5%) who said that the peer's and the teacher's feedback was not useful.

Table 7: Follow-up Activities Used By the EG in Rewriting their First Drafts

Q4	Follow up Activities	A lot	Some	Total	Total	Little	None
		No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)	No. (%)
If you attended to the corrections and comments provided on your essays, to what extent did you deal with the following?	Added new points	29 (52)	23 (40)	52 (92)	4 (7)	3 (5)	1 (2)
	Developed ideas by examples	25 (45)	19 (34)	44 (79)	12 (21)	9 (16)	3 (5)
	Acknowledged sources	32 (57)	14 (25)	46 (82)	10 (21)	6 (11)	4 (7)
	Identified illogical relations and used markers	26 (47)	26 (47)	52 (93)	4 (7)	1 (2)	3 (5)
	Dropped unrelated ideas	28 (50)	22 (39)	50 (89)	6 (11)	3 (5.5)	3 (5.5)
	Readjusted purpose in introductions	18 (32)	21 (38)	39 (70)	14 (25)	7 (13)	7 (13)
	Restated central ideas and added recommendations to conclusions	22 (39)	18 (32)	40 (71)	16 (29)	15 (27)	1 (2)

Both the CG and EG were asked to compare the effects of using feedback in the multiple and single draft settings as shown in Table 9. In this respect, if we add "A Lot" and "Some" columns, we understand that using feedback in rewriting essays two or more times (91%) was likely to be more useful to the EG for developing their writing skills. On the other hand, they considered that 'reading feedback without rewriting' essays would probably have very little contribution (14%) to developing their writing skills.

Though the CG were exposed only to the single draft feedback, they similarly admitted that the multiple draft feedback (84%) was more useful. Thus, since students in both groups with the opposite feelings were fewer, the idea that the multiple draft feedback is more useful could be acceptable.

Table 8: EG Reactions to Peer and Teacher Comments

Questions	Yes		No	
	No	(%)	No	(%)
Q5. If your essays were corrected by peers, did you find their feedback useful for revising your essays?	55	(98)	1	(2)
Q6. If you used the teacher feedback in revising your essays, did you find his feedback useful for revising your essay?	53	(95)	3	(5)

Table 9: The Use of Single and Multiple Draft Feedback

Q 7. How much do the following help you to learn writing?	Groups	A lot		Some		Total		Little		None			
		No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)	No.	(%)		
a. using feedback in rewriting essays two or more times	CG	41	(65)	12	(19)	53	(84)	4	(6)	3	(5)	1	(1)
	EG	41	(73)	10	(18)	51	(91)	5	(9)	3	(5)	2	(4)
b. reading feedback without rewriting essays	CG	20	(32)	10	(16)	30	(48)	29	(46)	15	(24)	14	(22)
	EG	3	(5)	5	(9)	8	(14)	40	(71)	9	(16)	31	(55)

The other interesting thing about multiple draft feedback is that the EG while revising their essays happened to correct on their own other mistakes which were not detected by their readers. As shown in Table 10, the responses of the 93% of the EG showed that they corrected mistakes which their readers did not identify. This proves that the

multiple draft feedback gives opportunity for students to carry out self-correction as well. On the other hand, when this same question was given to the CG, they responded that it did not apply to them and returned the questionnaire without giving responses.

Table 10: Students' Self-Correction

Question 8	Yes		No	
	No	(%)	No	(%)
When you were revising your essays on the basis of the comments provided on them, did you also happen to correct on your own other mistakes which had not been detected by the reader of your essay?	52	(93)	4	(7)

Conclusion

Many teachers in colleges and high schools in Ethiopia provide their students with end product feedback. As a result, they don't create the maximum opportunity for them to learn writing because end product feedback does not allow them to critically understand and incorporate feedback in the rewriting of their essays. What is presented as the objective of this article is thus to show to the reader the difference in the effects of multiple and single draft feedback to make students learn writing.

In this regard, two kinds of data collection methods have been employed. In the experiment, 119 AAU students divided into experimental (56) and control groups (63) were taught the same materials for one semester with multiple and single draft feedback respectively provided to them. Pre-test and post-test essays written by both groups were used to measure the difference in the effects of the two kinds of feedback on students performance. To supplement and triangulate the results of the experiment, a questionnaire was also used. The following are the findings of the study:

- The EG, found essentially equivalent to the CG at the beginning of the experiment (Tables 3 and 4), outperformed in the post-test results.
- As shown in Table 5, students were more likely to reread their essays and pay attention to their teachers' and peer comments on their multiple drafts (100%, 91%) of the process writing than on the respective single drafts (57%, 70%), like some earlier studies (Cohen and Cavalcanti, 1990; Ferris, 1995).
- Like many other previous studies (Leki, 1990; Henrikson, 1976; Semke, 1984; Robb et al. 1986), about 15% of the CG reported that they ignored the feedback presented on their essays and did not try to understand it (Table 6), while, by contrast, only 4% of the EG reported they ignored the multiple draft feedback in the same way.
- In their follow up activities of the multiple draft feedback involving the revision of the first draft, the EG reported that they added new points, developed ideas with examples, identified illogical relations, used markers to connect ideas, dropped unrelated ideas, readjusted introductions and restated central ideas in their conclusions (Table 7). These revision strategies which are extremely useful in developing essays are reported by the CG to be not applicable to them.
- The responses of both the CG (84%) and the EG (91%) indicated that using feedback in rewriting essays two or more times was useful in developing writing skills more than the single draft feedback (Table 9). Also self-correction of students was activated in the multiple draft contexts as shown in Table 10.

All this implies that teachers should use the multiple draft feedback to make students develop their writing skills. Firstly, feedback is presented

to the students by instalments. Only organization, content and development of essays are attended on the first draft while language use and mechanics are taken care of on the second draft. This avoids the students cognitive overload as opposed to the single draft setting in which case the students are made to respond to all components of the writing skill at the same time.

Secondly, the grade is postponed to the final draft and so this creates more hope of getting better grades to the student who could invest more efforts of revision on the preliminary drafts. Nevertheless, the single draft does not invite students to invest more efforts of learning writing, since students who obtain less grades would probably stop examining the feedback as the chances for changing grades for the better would not go beyond the end product.

Another opportunity created by the multiple draft feedback is to make students learn more writing by discovering and rediscovering ideas and taking advantage of all the resources available such as classmate explanations, reference to grammar books, dictionaries, checklists, correction models, etc. Thus, rewriting in the multiple draft setting is more than what is just the practice of writing. However, the single draft feedback does not by nature give to students even the usual practice since it is an examination type assignment and does not enable students to use readers' comments which entail more critical analysis of their own writing.

Therefore, involving students in correcting peer essays in groups and in understanding and interpreting feedback, as well as incorporating it in rewriting their preliminary drafts would not only develop students editorial and self correction skills which would be useful in their further writing but also learn all the other complexities of writing. In short, the findings of this research show that the multiple draft feedback is probably more useful than the single draft feedback for teaching writing.

References

- Byrne, D. 1988. **Teaching Writing Skill**. London: Longman.
- Cohen, A.D. 1987. *Student Processing of Feedback on their Compositions*. In Wenden, A. and J. Rubin (ed.), **Learner Strategies in Language Learning** (pp.57-69). New York: Prntice-Hall.
- Cohen, A., D., and Cavalcanti, M.C. 1990. *Feedback on Compositions: Teacher and Student Verbal Reports*. In B. Kroll (ed.), pp. 155-177.
- Cohen and Cavalcanti 1990. *What Does Time Buy? ESL Student Performance on Home Versus Class Composition* in B. Kroll (ed.), P.155-176.
- Fathman, A. .K. and Whalley E. 1990. *Teacher Response to Student Writing: Focus on Form Versus Content*. In B, Kroll (ed.), , PP-178-190.
- Ferris, D.R. 1995. *Student Reactions to Teacher Response in Multiple-draft Composition Classrooms*. **TESOL Quarterly** 29 (1)
- Getnet Tizazu. 1994. *The Responding Behaviour of Sophomore English Instructors of AAU to Student Writing*. An MA Thesis, Institute of Language Studies, AAU (Unpublished).
- Gwin, T. 1991. *Giving Students the Write Idea: A Way to Provide Feedback on Writing*. **Forum**. 29 (3) pp.2-5.
- Hairston, M, 1986 . *On Not Being a Composition Slave* in C-W Bridges (ed.) , **Training the New Teacher of College Composition** (pp.117-24). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English
- Hedge, T. 1988. **Writing**. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Henrickson, J. 1980. *The Treatment of Error in Written Work*, **Modern Language Journal** 64/2: 216-221.
- Heyland, K. 1990. *Providing Productive Feedback*. **ELT Journal**. 44/4: 279 - 285
- Kamla, K. 1992. *Teaching EFL to Adults: Between Must and Must Not*. **English Teaching Forum**, July 1992

- Keh, C. 1990. *Feedback in the Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implications*, **ELT Journal** 44/4, 239 -304
- Klassen, J. 1991. *Using Student Errors for Teaching*. **Forum** , 29 (1), pp. 10-16.
- Kroll, B. (ed.) 1990. **Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lalande, J. 1982. *Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment*. **Modern Language Journal**, 66(2), pp.140 - 149
- Leki, I. 1990. *Coaching from the Margins: Issues in Written Response* In B. Kroll (ed.), **Second Language Writing : Research Insights for the Classroom**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp-57-68.
- Mangelsdorf, K. 1992. *Peer Reviews in the ESL Composition Classroom: What Do the Students Think?* **ELT Journal**, 46/3:274-284.
- Moxley, J. 1989. *Responding to Student Writing: Goals, Methods, Alternatives*. **Freshman English News**. 17, pp. 3-11.
- Norrish, J. 1983. **Language Learners and their Error**. Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Qiyi, L. 1993. *Peer Editing in My Writing Class*. **Forum**. 31 (3).
- Raimes, A.1983. **Techniques in Teaching Writing**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 1985. *What Unskilled ESL Students Do as They Write: A Classroom Study of Composing*. **TESOL Quarterly**, 19 (2) 229-258
- _____. 1987. **Exploring Through Writing : A Process Approach to ESL Composition**. New York: St. Martins Press.
- Robb, T. et al 1986. *Saliency of Feedback on Error and Its Effect on EFL Writing Quality*. **TESOL Quarterly**, 20 (1), pp. 83-93.
- Semke, H.D. 1984. *The Effects of the Red Pen*. **Foreign Language Annals** 17 (3), pp. 195-202.
- Wood, N. M. 1993. *Self-correction and Rewriting of Student Composition: The Correct Code*. **Forum**, 31 (3).
- Zamel, V. 1985. *Responding to Student Writing*. **TESOL Quarterly**, 19 (1), pp. 79-101
- Zamel, V. 1983. *The Composing Process of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Students*. **TESOL Quarterly**, 17(2), pp. 165-187.

Ziv, N. 1984. *The Effect of Teacher Comments on the Writing of Four College Freshmen*. In R. Reach and S. Bridwell (ed.), **New Directions in Composition Research**. New York: Guilfore Press, pp 362-380.

Appendix A: Pre-test and Post-test Raw Scores and Their Summary

	Pretest Results	Post test Results
CG	12 8 9 9 6 8 7 5 6 8 6 6 12 9 12 8 6 7 5 11 13 8 9 4 5 5 4 8 12 7 9 17 5 10 6 6 10 13 12 12 10 5 5 5 10 10 11 6 17 11 5 9 12 12 5 11 11 5	16 12 14 14.5 10 13 13 8 10 12 10 12 15 14 15 10 10 9 15 17 12 15 8 7 9 7 11 15 9 12 19 7 13 9 9 13 16 16 15 14 9 6 14 15 15 8 19 15 9 12 16 15 8 15 15 8
CG	6 15 18 15 15 8 12 13 9 10 5 10 10 13 14 10 13 8 6 12 4 6 6 9 15 11 6 15 13 6 15 10 7 5 8 8 8 7 9 7 8 6 6 8 6 7 8 12 12 10 6 8 6 9 8 7 6 5 5 6 8 5 11 9	8 16 19 16.5 15 10 14 14 9 12 5 11 12 16 15 15 14 10 7 12 5 6 6 14 16 14 7 17 14 8 15 12 8 6 12 12 9 10 12 13 11 6 8 10 6 8 10 14 13 11 8 10 7 11 10 8 6 7 7 12 8 13 13

Summary

EG				EG			
Total Score	n	M	SD	Total Score	n	M	SD
Pretest 574.5	63	9.1	3.28	486	56	8.7	3.10
Posttest 683.5	63	10.8	3.46	684.5	56	12.2	3.28