LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 24, No. 2, October 2021

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

AN ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH TEACHERS' WRITTEN FEEDBACK IN PRIMARY STUDENTS' REPORT CARDS

Pauline Widyastuti and Y. G. Harto Pramono
Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, Indonesia
pauline.widy@gmail.com; harto@ukwms.ac.id
correspondence: pauline.widy@gmail.com
DOI: 10.24071/llt.v24i2.3880
received 29 September 2020; accepted 29 October 2021

Abstract
This study analyzed teachers' written feedback to explore how well the teachers' written feedback corresponded to the principles of evaluation and the extent to which their written feedback was aligned with the students' numerical scores in the report cards. This study collected 112 written feedback from 5 teachers and the corresponding numerical scores in the students' report cards from one of the private Primary Schools in Surabaya. The teachers' written feedback was analyzed based on the principles of evaluation. The results of the analysis indicated that none of the teachers wrote feedback which met the criteria of an ideal feedback covering praise, criticism, and suggestion equally at the same time. All teachers only gave praise mostly to very good and excellent students; they almost never gave criticism and suggestion to them. To the low achieving students, the teachers mostly gave criticism and suggestion, and almost never gave any praise. In regard to the alignment between the teachers' written feedback and the students' numerical scores in the report cards, the finding indicated that the teachers' written feedback was well aligned with the students' numerical scores.

Keywords: teachers' comments, teachers' feedback, students' numerical scores, students' report cards

Introduction
In every semester of a school year, students, especially in elementary schools, receive progress and final report cards that present their progress of learning activities from their schools. The goal of the report card is to inform the students and parents regarding the students' academic and behavior achievements, social performances, and progress in the school (Brualdi, 1998). Every school has its own rules with respect to the format and the content of the report card, which often include comments/feedback in every progress and final report card. In both progress and final report cards, the students will get the record of their academic achievements written in a numerical format for each subject and written feedback for general or specific areas of learning. Written feedback in the students' report card is seen as an informational device for the students to facilitate their improvements. Hyland & Hyland (2006) suggest that written feedback should

include a lot of information which will help the students to improve their learning. Teachers must be aware that effective feedback may increase the students' motivation and self-confidence as learners. On the contrary, feedback which gives too much criticism will make the students lose their motivation and self-confidence as learners. In addition, it is essential to take a careful action in composing comments and feedback for report cards since it will reflect the numerical scores written in the report cards.

This study was intended to analyze the English teachers' feedback written in their students' report cards. The analysis was to investigate (i) how well the teachers' written feedback in the students' report card correspond to the principles of evaluation, and (ii) the extent to which the teachers' written feedback is aligned with the students' scores in the report cards.

The written feedback analyzed in this study was limited to those found in the report cards of the students in grade 1 to 5 of a private Primary School in Surabaya applying Cambridge Curriculum for their English lessons. The feedback was analyzed based on the principles of constructing ideal feedback.

Assessments

Assessment is a learning process and it covers a broad aspect in the teaching and learning processes (Brown, 2006). More specifically, assessment is the action of gathering the information of a student or group of students to know them better (Buttler & McMunn, 2006).

It may include tests which measure the students' knowledge or competencies. It may be categorized as informal and formal assessment, formative and summative assessment. Informal assessment occurs during the teaching and learning process. Informal assessment can vary in forms. These can include unintended comments, responses, and feedback. It can also include tasks or projects, which were not recorded as a fixed result. A teacher can also include judgements about the students' competences observed during the teaching and learning process. While formal assessments are systematically-designed to measure the students' repository of skill and knowledge of certain subjects.

Formative assessment is aimed for assessing or evaluating the students' learning progress in forming or building their competencies and skills and helping students' growth. This formative assessment is not only for individual assessment but can also be used for group assessment (Tamah and Wirjawan, 2019). Group-oriented formative test is related to a way to develop the students' learning and assessing the students by shifting from individual test to group assessment. Brown (2006) states that all types of informal assessment are formative. It is expected that the teachers' feedback aims to develop the students' competences, skills, and abilities, whereas summative assessment is meant to measure and summarize what the students have learned during the teaching and learning process. Summative assessment is used to see how well the learners have met the objectives.

Functions of Report Cards

According to Shafer (1996, pp. 9-10) the importance of writing a report card for the students may include:

1. Building home-school connections

Report cards are a tool to build communication between the teachers and the parents regarding the students' development and achievement. Through report cards, parents are able to analyze their children's growth through the scores and comments. Report cards also help the parents to determine the weaknesses and strengths of their children, in specific areas of learning.

2. Document growth through childhood

Report cards will be kept by parents until their children grow up. The documents they keep will be opened by them and they are going to see their grades and also comments given from their past teachers.

3. Inform families about children's learning

Report cards are written based on the students' learning processes inside the classroom. It reports the learners' achievement during the lesson and learning activities. Comments in the report card can help the parents understand the students' strengths and weaknesses in certain areas of learning.

4. Help the children grow as learners

Report cards also help the children reflect on their achievements that they have made. The learners can also improve in some areas that he/she has not excelled.

5. Reach shy, quieter children

Quiet learners usually get less attention than the active learners. Reports can be a tool to reach out to shy or quiet children. Through teachers' comments, the parents will be able to pay attention to the weaknesses and strengths of their children.

6. Recognize each child's unique qualities

Some learners excel only in non-academic subjects, which are not covered by numerical scores. Report card comments assist the parents and the children to feel appreciated.

Feedback

According to Heritage (2010), feedback is a form of assessment which is aimed for developing the students' learning. Feedback can vary and come from a lot of different sources. In this study, feedback and comments are used in the same way. Referring to Hattie and Timperley (2007), feedback is considered as information provided by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience). A teacher can provide corrective information, a peer can provide an alternative strategy, a book can provide information to clarify ideas, a parent can provide corrective information and encouragement, and a learner can see the answer to evaluate the correctness of a response. Feedback is also a tool to build a home-school connection for reporting the students' growth during teaching and learning (Dickinson & Law, 2016). Teacher's feedback might negatively impact the students' confidence throughout their learning if the teacher is not aware on how to give the feedback effectively (Burke & Pieterick, 2010); but according to Kluger and DeNisi (1996) both positive or negative feedback is beneficial in the students' learning. Feedback has various functions such as: advice for improving the recent tasks, reporting grades, the teacher's action to describe expertise, diligence, etc. (Carless, 2006).

Written feedback style of the teachers can be influenced by some factors (Hyland & Hyland, 2001). The ways teachers construct feedback can be influenced by their belief systems, social context where the teachers are working, other factors which include the students' ability, type of tasks, and in what phase the feedback is given. There are some considerations to be made in writing comments or feedback which are collected from several sources (Heritage, 2010):

1. Feedback should assist the students' information about their performance during the lesson and describe what the students can achieve and cannot achieve.
2. Feedback informs the students about the quality of the students' work along with advice on how to improve their performance.
3. Feedback should be precise and connected to the learning goals.
4. Feedback should include suggestions to improve the performance rather than showing the correct answer.
5. Feedback should correspond with the students' cognitive needs.
6. Feedback should cover verification and elaboration. Verification is the judgment of whether the answer is correct and elaboration is the informational aspect or message which gives the clues to the students and will direct them to the right answer.
7. Feedback should be given after the students finish the tasks given.

In addition, Nicol (2009) states that written feedback should be:

1. Understandable: Expressed in a language that suitable for students.
2. Selective: Commenting on two or three things that the student can do something about.
3. Specific: Pointing to examples in the student's submission where the feedback applies
4. Timely: Provided in time to inform the next piece of work
5. Contextualized: Framed with reference to the learning outcomes and/or assessment criteria
6. Non-judgmental: Descriptive rather than evaluative, focused on learning goals not just performance goals.
7. Balanced: Pointing out the positive as well as areas which need improvement.
8. Looking Forward: Suggesting how students might improve subsequent assignments.
9. Transferable: Focused on processes, skills and self-regulatory abilities.

Some feedback can impact the students negatively, and therefore, teachers should avoid feedback which may lead the students negatively (Heritage, 2010). General feedback such as "good girl" or "great effort" were less effective for self-improvement of the students (Burnett & Mandel, 2010).

Praise, Criticism and Suggestion in Written Feedback

Written feedback has three main functions: praise, criticism, and suggestion; when given effectively, feedback will build an excellent teaching atmosphere (Hyland and Hyland, 2001). There are some functions of praise: (a) praising the students' achievements or work might reinforce students' self-esteem (Hyland and Hyland, 2001), (b) praise shows a positive acknowledgement to someone for some aspects such as characteristics, attribute, skill, etc., and thus, praise should

not only give simple agreement but also deep or specific responses (Holmes, cited in Hyland and Hyland, 2001), (c) praise statements express positive teacher affect (surprise, delight, and excitement) and are essential for those students who need more encouragement and reinforcement (Daiker, 1989), and (d) praise will compliment the quality of or convey appreciation to the students' achievements (Daiker, 1989).

According to Brophy (cited in O'Leary and O'Leary, 1977) quality praise should have contingency, specificity, and sincerity/variety/credibility. Contingency includes how the teacher reinforces on the students' achievements or behavior. Contingency leads the students to interpret that they have done something which deserves to be praised. In addition, the quality of teacher praise should have specificity which points out precise achievements the students achieve both in academic achievement and behavior. Specific praise will encourage the students more than general praise such as 'good job! etc. The last aspect of quality teacher praise is sincerity/variety/credibility. Teachers' praise should sound sincere and the content should depend on the situation and the preference of the students being praised. Elbow (2007) states that sincerity is one style or voice. Sincerity is needed in praise to convince the students of their achievements during the lesson and encourage them.

Criticism is defined as an expression of dissatisfaction or negative comment. Criticism refers to negative teachers' feedback on students' achievements or behavior (Brophy, 1981). Criticism will mainly focus on the failure of achievements expected. An example of criticism that occurs in the teachers' written feedback on the students' writing:

> "This is actually a little bit too long. Your conclusion was a bit weak. The essay is rather middle-heavy. There is possibly too much information here." (Hyland & Hyland, 2001, p. 197)

In the above example it is clear that a criticism focuses on the unachieved expectations without giving further advice for accomplishing the goal of the lesson. Praise and criticism, according to Herbert (cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2001), could not be separated since these two aspects form a politeness structure in a conversational routine. These aspects avoid the conversational from intimidating.

Hyland and Hyland (2001) state that comments should consist of not only praise and criticism, but also offer suggestions. Written feedback could offer suggestions if they include the modals *need to, could,* and *should,* hypothetical *would* and the verb *try*. Feedback or comments which are lacked of these aspects are generally referred to criticism. They declare that suggestions are different from criticism. Suggestions have positive advice for remediation. They involve a solution for improving the accomplished action, which can also be called "constructive criticism". It is emphasized that good written feedback should have those three elements equally.

Based on the discussion above, it is concluded that there are three specific criteria which teachers need to consider when writing feedback for their students, i.e., praise, criticism, and suggestion and each of the criteria has indicators as presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Indicators of Ideal Written Feedback
(Compiled from: Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Brophy, 1981; Nicol, 2009)

Categories	Indicators
Praise	contingency specificity (academic/behavior achievement) sincerity/variety/credibility
Criticism	dissatisfaction or negative comment specificity (academic/behavior achievement)
Suggestion	advise for remediation (key word: *need to, could*, *should*, *would*, and *try*) specificity (academic/behavior achievement)

Method

The study is a principle-based evaluation that evaluates written feedback made by teachers in students' report cards to investigate how well they correspond to the principles of ideal feedback and compare the written feedback with the numeric scores given in the students' report card to see the extent to which the written feedback is aligned with the students' scores. The teachers' written feedback was analyzed based on the instrument as presented in Table 2. The instrument was adapted from Table 1.

Table 2. Indicators of Ideal Written Feedback
(adapted from: Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Brophy, 1981; Nicol, 2009)

Categories	**Indicators**
Praise	specificity (academic/behavior achievement) sincerity/variety
Criticism	dissatisfaction or negative comment specificity (academic/behavior achievement)
Suggestion	advise for remediation (key word: *need to, could*, *should*, *would*, and *try*) specificity (academic/behavior achievement)

The adaptation was by removing the indicators contingency and credibility. The reason why these two indicators were removed was due to the limited access to interview the students to confirm the contingency of the teachers' written feedback. While credibility needed the researchers' daily observation of the teachers inside the class that could not be done during the study.

Then, two additional instruments were developed by the writer for analyzing the written feedback as seen in Table 3 and Table 4. The instruments were made in accordance with the related literature previously discussed. Table 3 was made based on Hyland and Hyland's suggestion (2001), i.e., the teachers' written feedback can be classified into praise, criticism, and suggestion. Furthermore, Heritage (2010) states that the feedback should be commenting on the students' achievements, for instance behavior and academic achievements. Some feedback might give general appraisal which belongs to miscellaneous. Table 4 shows the

school standard score rate that was used to compare the teachers' feedback with the score rate the students had to see the alignment between the teachers' feedback and the students' numerical scores in their report cards.

Table 3. Teachers' Comment Classification

Teachers' code	Rate of score	Range of Score	Students' code	Teachers' comment	Written Feedback Category								
					Praise			Suggestions			Criticisms		
					Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious
Teacher A (TA)	E	92-100	A1										
			A2										
			A3										
			A4 ...										
	VG	86-91	A5										
			A6										
			A7										
			A8...										
	G	77-85	A9...										
	P	76	A10 ...										
	NI	<76	A11-A24										
Total													
Total per Category													
Teacher B (TB)			B1-B24										
... Teacher E (TE)			... E1-E24										

Code description:

TA-TE	: Teacher A-E
E	: Excellent
VG	: Very Good
G	: Good
P	: Pass
NI	: Need improvement
A1 – A24	: Students 1-24 from teacher A
B1 – B24	: Students 1-24 from teacher B
C1 – C24	: Students 1-24 from teacher C
D1 – D24	: Students 1-24 from teacher D
E1 – E24	: Students 1-24 from teacher E

Table 4. Scoring Rate
(School's Rate Score Standard)

Rate of score	Range of score
Excellent	92-100
Very good	86-91
good	77-85
pass	76
need improvement	< 76

The data include teachers' written feedback and students' numerical scores found in students' report cards collected from a primary school in Surabaya, which is implementing Cambridge curriculum, especially for English lessons. The data were collected from 5 English teachers teaching grades 1- 5 in that school. Each teacher was represented by one class per grade which consisted of more or less 25 students. In total, the data covered 125 students' scores and written feedback from 5 English teachers.

Findings and Discussion

How well teachers' written feedback in the students' report card corresponds to the principles of evaluation

Referring to the principles of ideal feedback suggested by Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Brophy, 1981; Nicol, 2009 as seen in Table 2 an ideal written feedback covers praise, criticism, and suggestion equally. The distribution of praise, criticism, and suggestion from each teacher can be seen through in Table 5.

Table 5. Teachers' Written Feedback Distribution

Teachers' Code	Total of Students	Praise	Criticism	Suggestion	Praise, Criticism, Suggestion,
TA	23	23 (100%)	7 (30.4%)	14 (60.8%)	6 (26.08%)
TB	21	21 (100%)	0	21 (100%)	0
TC	23	23 (100%)	2 (8.6%)	16 (69.5%)	2 (8.69%)
TD	24	21 (87.5%)	5 (20.83%)	17 (70.83%)	3 (12.5%)
TE	21	21 (100%)	3 (14.2%)	18 (87.5%)	1 (4.76%)

From Table 5, it can be seen that all teachers were concerned with giving the students more praise rather than criticism or suggestion in their report cards. Most students got praise from the teachers, then followed by suggestion and criticism. It also means that the teachers' written feedback did not have three aspects (praise, criticism, and suggestion) equally. Therefore, the result of the study can be concluded that all teachers' written feedback was not aligned with the principles of ideal feedback as suggested by Hyland & Hyland, 2001; Brophy, 1981; Nicol, 2009 (see Table 2).

Praise

Concerning "praise", there are some characteristics to consider, i. e., specificity, sincerity, variety, etc. as presented in Table 2. Table 6 classifies "specificity" included in all teachers' praise into "academic", "behavior", and "miscellaneous" aspects.

Table 6. Specificity Distribution of Teachers' Praise

Teachers' Code	Total of Students	Praise	Specificity		
			Academic	Behavior	Miscellaneous
TA	23	23 (100%)	13 (56.5%)	19 82.6%	15 (65.2%)
TB	21	21 (100%)	1 (4.7%)	21 (100%)	0
TC	23	23 (100%)	19 (82.6%)	20 (86.9%)	5 (32.7%)
TD	24	21 (87.5%)	11 (45.83%)	17 (70.83%)	1 (4.17%)
TE	21	21 (100%)	17 (80.9%)	4 (19.04%)	0

Table 6 indicates that the majority of teachers' praise was more concerned with "behavior" aspect and only two teachers were concerned with "academic" aspect. Below are examples of each teacher's "praise" which shows "specificity" in "academic", "behavior", and "miscellaneous" aspects.

Teacher A

Academic

Long and short vowel mastery:

"…comprehends long and short vowel o sound very well…"

Reading with expression:

"…she reads with expression…"

"…read a story with expression…"

Behavior

Participation:

"…participates well in class discussion …"

"…always participates in class discussion…"

"…willing to participate in class discussion…"

Performance:

"…has nice handwriting…"

"…speaks confidently…"

"…She is a cheerful and an active student…"

Manner:

"…he is courteous and shows good manners in the classroom…"

"…well-mannered, highly motivated and strives to achieve the best result…"

"…accepts the recommendations of peers and acts on them appropriately…"

Miscellaneous:

"…keep on trying…"

"…I'm proud of having you in my class…"

"…you can do it…"

"…keep up your good work…"

"…keep it up…"

"…it's a pleasure to have you in the class…"
"…keep your great effort…"
"…keep on trying. You can do it…"

Teacher B

Academic

English skill:
"…has the ability in most English skill…"

Behavior

Participation:
"…actively joins in oral work and listens attentively…"
"…has shown progress to actively participate in class discussions…"
"…is listening more carefully to the instructions…"
Performance:
"…works well in programs that are structured to her level of ability…"
"...is a capable student who can produce some pleasing work..."
Manner:
"…is eager and enthusiastic…"
"...tries to listen carefully to the teacher's instructions..."
"…works well and can be trusted to carry out a given task competently…"

Teacher C

Academic

Reading comprehension:
"…has good reading comprehension skills…"
Writing skill:
"…writes well-structured stories…"
"…his writing is very well organized…"

Behavior

Participation:
"…participates actively in class…"
"…responds well to the ideas of others and reports back clearly…"
Performance:
"…is confident when he has to present in front of class…"
"…is also a confident speaker…"
Manner:
"…listens attentively in class…"
"…can express her ideas clearly to the class…"
Miscellaneous:
"…keep it up…"

Teacher D

Academic

Four English skills (speaking, writing, reading, and listening):
"…her writing task is her best achievement…"
"…speaks English very well and uses it very often, his/her writing and reading comprehension are good…"

Behavior

Participation:

"…shows great effort in class activity…"

"…can be very attentive when it comes to getting the information about the lesson…."

Performance:

"…I hardly ever seen her/him has any problems in English lesson nowadays…"

"…has done very good job in English…"

Manner:

"…has proved herself to be an independent and a responsible girl/boy…"

"…is attentive and independent student in class…"

Teacher E

Academic

Grammar mastery:

"…comprehends grammar…"

"…comprehends figurative language…"

Writing skill:

"…always displays her best writing results throughout the year…"

Reading comprehension:

"…did reading comprehension excellently …"

"…comprehends passages…"

Listening skill:

"…is able to fill in the blanks during listening comprehension activities…"

"…can answer questions during listening comprehension activities…"

Behavior

Participation:

"…always gets involved in class discussions and his opinions toward a problem brought up in the class…"

"…actively participates in class discussions by answering the teacher's question…"

Performance:

"...is a good listener and quick learner..."

"...can use the allocated time wisely..."

From the examples above, each teacher considered "specificity" in writing "praise" in their written feedback as suggested in Table 2.

Another criteria of praise is "variety". "Variety" in teachers' praise occurs when the teacher combines two or more specific skills for one student in their comment. "Variety" also includes the variation of specific skills being commented from one to another student. The result of the study showed that most teachers' praise was concerned with the students' behavior achievement but only some of them included "variety" as one of the characteristics of praise. Below are examples of each teacher's praise which included "variety".

Teacher A

"…and enjoys reading with expression. He also has a good knowledge of the basic elements of grammar…"
"…has a nice handwriting. She participates well in class discussion…"
"…always participates in class discussion… speaks confidently in a variety of situations…"

Teacher B

"…actively joins in oral work and listens attentively. She tries to listen well and follow the instructions carefully…"
"…is eager to contribute and participate in all activities. She is a capable student who can produce some pleasing work..."

Teacher C

"…has good reading comprehension skills and writes well-structured stories…"
"…writes well-structured stories and…responds well to the ideas of others and reports back clearly…"
"…listens attentively in class… is also very confident when he/she has to present in front of class…"
"…listens attentively during English… is also a confident speaker, and has shown great improvement and willingness to speak louder…"

Teacher D

"…his/her spelling is getting better and he tries to speak English in class…"
"…his/her involvement in speaking is always very good and his/her assignments receive good scores…"
"...has proved herself to be an independent and a responsible girl/boy, ... shows great effort in class activity..."

Teacher E

"…comprehends grammar and figurative language and always displays her best writing results throughout the year.…"
"…wrote an interesting paragraph and did reading comprehension excellently throughout the year…"

Eventhough the teachers fulfilled the requirement of "variety" in "praise", some teachers used the same expressions over and over to praise several students. From the data collected, Teacher A's praise varied from one student to another and was not monotonous. Teacher B's praise was moderately various. Some of her feedback was the same for one student and another. Teacher B's behavioral praise was monotonous since the same praise was given to several students although she sometimes combined 2 or more behavior praise in one feedback. Teacher C's praise was lack of variation. She tended to repeat the same praise for some students. Teacher D's praise had some variations. She gave variation in praising the students. While most of Teacher E's praise was concerned with

students' academic achievements, and the majority of them combined 2 or more skills.

Regarding "sincerity, based on the interview with the teachers, Teacher A stated that her written feedback was sincere to all students because she tried to be neutral in commenting each student in their report cards, while Teacher B stated that her written feedback was sincere although there was some similar written feedback found in the students' report cards. The similarity of the written feedback was to make it easy for the teacher in giving written feedback to some similar students' achievements. Teacher C stated that her written feedback was sincere. She gave similar written feedback to some students because she classified the students' achievements based on similar achievements and progress in the class. Classifying the students' achievements made it easier for her to give written feedback. Teacher D said that her written feedback was sincere to all students. She gave the written feedback based on what happened in the class and based on her daily observation. Teacher E said that her written feedback was sincere by giving each student different written feedback although sometimes she gave similar praise to some students.

In conclusion, most teachers' praise was specific in pointing out the students' achievements. Another criteria of good "praise" is "variety" which was only fulfilled by three teachers. The other two teachers' praise did not vary and mostly repeated the same expression for most students. "Sincerity" of the "praise" was asked to each teacher since it was personal. All teachers varied the praise by combining two or more skills in one comment. Two teachers did not give a lot of "variety" to their praise. The students from these two teachers tended to receive the same expression from one to another student, while three teachers met the criteria of "variety" in "praise". In conclusion, only three teachers met the criteria of good "praise" while two other teachers failed to meet those criteria.

Suggestion

Concerning "suggestion", it should consider such characteristics as advise for remediation (key word: *need to, could, should, would,* and *try*) and specificity. Regarding specificity, it can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Specificity Distribution of Teachers' Suggestion

Teachers' Code	Total of Students	Suggestion	Specificity		
			Academic	Behavior	Miscellaneous
TA	23	14 (60.8%)	3 (13%)	9 (39.1%)	3 (13%)
TB	21	21 (100%)	4 (19%)	19 (90.4%)	2 (9.5%)
TC	23	16 (69.5%)	1 (4.3%)	15 (65.2%)	1 (4.3%)
TD	24	17 (70.83%)	3 (12.5%)	15 (62.5%)	3 (8.3%)
TE	21	18 (87.5%)	6 (28.5%)	12 (57.1%)	0

From Table 6, most of the suggestions were more on "behavior" aspect rather than "academic" aspect. All teachers' suggestions met the criteria of good suggestions in terms of specificity. The second criteria of good suggestion is advise for remediation (key word: *need to, could, should, would,* and *try*). All teachers had used the advise for remediation by using the keyword mentioned, as follows.

Teacher A

"…**need to** speak more loudly and confidently …"
"…**need to** listen more carefully to the teacher's explanation…"
"…**needs to** develop a louder and more expressive voice…"
"…**needs to** read a lot in order to improve her vocabularies…"
"…**needs to** have more courage when presenting in front of the class…"
"…**needs to** show greater determination and speed when doing his tasks…"

Teacher B

"…**need to** recheck her work carefully …"
"…**need to** take more care her written work to present her best effort.…"
"…**need to** share ideas confidently…"
"...**need to** check the spelling..."
"...**need to** apply capital letter and punctuation knowledge ..."
"...**should** check her work more carefully..."
"...**should** listen attentively..."
"...**should** remember not to rush,"
"...**should** use capital letters..."

Teacher C

"…**need to** double check her answer before submit…"
"…**need to** always keep her focus and apply herself fully to achieve her true potential…"
"…**need to** be more confident when she produces any kind of work…"
"…**need to** manage her time wisely, so she can finish her task on time…".

Teacher D

"…**need to** be more involved in class discussion …"
"…**need to** work on is to be more involved in a class discussion.…"
"…**needs to** practice more in his writing skill.…"
"…**needs to** lessen his talking habit in class…"
"…**needs to** put more effort in speaking…"
"…**needs to** encouraged to listen and pay attention in class…"
"**need to** lessen some careless mistakes on his works…"
"**need to** encouraged to listen and pay attention in class…"
"…**should** believe on herself and her ability…"
"…**should** start to pay more attention to teacher's explanation…"
"…**should** be more open about something that he doesn't understand…".

Teacher E

"…**need to** learn to lead her group members and make sure that all members work …"
"…**need to** learn how to deal with friends when an issue comes up …"
"…**needs to** follow the English class rules …"
"…**needs to** read instructions before completing her worksheets …"
"…**needs to** give her presentations in front of the class confidently…"
"…**needs to** do her work seriously, so that she can finish on time…"
"…**needs to** be brave when sharing her ideas to her peers…"
"…**needs to** do his tasks seriously, so he can submit them on time…"
"…**needs to** listen to the teacher's explanation and carefully read instructions…"
"…**needs to** carefully read paragraphs…"
"…**needs to** do his worksheets and projects seriously…"

From the example above, all teachers had used the proper keyword for showing the advise for remediation to their students. In the suggestions, it was found that Teacher B and Teacher C were not spesific enough in pointing out what aspect the students need to improve. It can be concluded that Teacher B's and Teacher C's suggestions did not meet the criteria of ideal suggestion while the other teachers' met the criteria of ideal suggestion.

Criticism

Concerning "criticism", it should consider such characteristics as dissatisfaction or negative comment and specificity as presented in Table 2. Regarding of "specificity", it can be presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Specificity Distribution of Teachers' Criticism

Teachers' Code	Total of Students	Criticism	Specificity		
			Academic	Behavior	Miscellaneous
TA	23	7 (30.4%)	1 (4.3%)	7 (30.4%)	0
TB	21	0	0	0	0
TC	23	2 (8.6%)	1 (4.3%)	1 (4.3%)	0
TD	24	5 (20.83%)	3 (12.5%)	4 (16.67%)	0
TE	21	3 (14.2%)	2 (9.5%)	1 (4.3%)	0

From the distribution in Table 7, it can be seen that most teachers seemed to avoid using "criticism" as one aspect of the written feedback for the students. Even one teacher did not include criticism in her written feedback. The total number of criticism was not more than 7 students and most of the criticism was concerned with the behavior achievement. Another criteria of ideal criticism is dissatisfaction or negative comment. For example:

Teacher A

Academic

"…read slowly…"

Behavior

"…sometimes daydream instead of staying on task…"
"…do something unnecessary thing or play by himself…"
"…takes a long time to finish his work…"
"…daydream and lose concentration on what he is supposed to be doing…"
"…has trouble focusing on the teacher's instruction…"

Teacher C

"…always feels nervous when he has to present in front of class..." (behavior)
"…often he forgets capital letters and punctuation..." (academic: writing skill).

Teacher D

Academic

"…her lack of confidence often get in her way in improving her speaking skill…"
"…He rarely joins the English conversation in class …".

Behavior

"…sometimes she hesitates to share her opinion…"
"…can be easily distracted by everything that is happening around him. This cause him losing his focus on doing his works well.…"
"…He can do better as long as he stays focused on his worksheets…"
"…he has so much to keep up in this semester…"

Teacher E

"…sometimes she is hesitant with her own ability. …"
"…struggles to understand English lesson this academic year…",

This can be concluded that all teachers' criticism met the criteria of ideal criticism. It contained negative comment but not intimidating the students since the criticism was attached to suggestion. According to the teachers, they gave more "praise" to "excellent" students because they had mastered the skills learned in the classroom. Those "excellent" students did not deserve any "criticism" as they had mastered the material given very well. Another reason why the teachers gave more "praise" to the "excellent and better" students was that the space available in the report card was limited for the teachers to write their comments. The space was enough to write only 3 sentences at the most. This is why most teachers focused on giving "praise" to the "excellent and better" students. Likewise, the students with "need improvement" received less "praise" but more "criticism" since the teachers only focused children's weakness that their parents needed to understand what to improve. The teachers also stated that they changed the "praise" into motivational or encouraging words/phrases for the "need improvement" students, since the "need improvement" students did not have good

achievements to be praised. For the "need improvement" students, it was easier for the teachers to point out the students' weaknesses rather than their strengths.

As mentioned before, an ideal feedback covers "praise", "suggestion", and "criticism" equally in each of the feedback for each student as suggested by Herbert (cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2001) that praise and criticism could not be separated since these two aspects form a politeness and avoid intimidation. The finding of this study indicated that none of the written feedback fulfilled the criteria of ideal feedback. A similar result was found in the previous studies, for example the study conducted by Glover and Brown (2006).

Another good criteria of ideal feedback is that the teachers' "praise", "suggestion", and "criticism" should consider "specificity" which points out precise achievements the students achieve both in academic and behavior aspects. In regard with "praise", four teachers mostly gave "praise" relating to the "behavior" aspect, except only one teacher was concerned with the "academic" aspect. Based on this result, it showed that the teachers' feedback was still lacking in relating to the feedback in terms of the academic aspect. It implies that the teachers were not aware of this aspect and that, as a result, their feedback was mostly related to "behavior" aspect. Specifying feedback relating to "academic" aspect could make the feedback effective, as suggested by Heritage (2010) that feedback should assist the students' information about their performance during the lesson and describe what the students can achieve and cannot achieve. Furthermore, Hyland and Hyland (2001) suggest that praise should not only give simple agreement but also deep or specific responses. By specifying the feedback, it is easier for parents in getting the information of their children's strength and weakness in English Lesson. Written feedback also helps teachers to deliver specific message which cannot be represented by students' numerical scores to parents as Safer (1996) states that comments in the report card can help the parents understand their children's strengths and weaknesses in certain areas of learning.

Concerning "praise", good praise should also have specificity, sincerity and variety. The result this study showed that all teachers were specific in praising the students. They pointed out academic or behavior achiements of the students in their written feedback. The result also showed that the teachers were sincere in giving their comments. Even though some teachers gave similar expressions in their comments, they still gave comments sincerely. According to the result of the interview with the teachers, the reason why some students received similar comments from the teachers was that they had the same achievements. By so doing it was easier for the teachers to give comments because the teachers classified and categorized the students based on their achievements. Some teachers also stated that they had quite alot of students to be commented. Using the comments format made it easier for them to give their students comments. Related to "variety", the result showed that two teachers failed to fullfil this aspect. Their written feedback did not vary from one student to another even though they combined the two academic/behavior aspects in one written feedback. These two teachers' written feedback was monotonous since they classified the same students' achievements.

Regarding "suggestion", based on the result, all teachers' "suggestions" met the the principles of ideal feedback as stated by Hyland and Hyland (2001) that

the written feedback could offer suggestions if they include the modals *need to, could,* and *should*, hypothetical *would* and the verb *try*. Suggestions have positive advice for remediation. All teachers in this study used most of the keywords stated above, some suggestions were directly stated without any keywords. They also gave positive advise for remediation in their "suggestions" and gave alternatives for the parents/students to improve the unachieved goals.

Concerning "criticism", the result showed that teachers seemed to give very minimum criticism in their feedback. None of those teachers gave more than 7 criticism in their feedback, one out of four teachers even did not give any "criticism" in her feedback. Praise and criticism, according to Herbert (1990) as cited in Hyland & Hyland (2001), could not be separated since these two aspects form a politeness structure in a conversational routine, meaning that "criticism" without "praise" are considered as intimidating.

The extent to which the teachers' written feedback is aligned with the students' scores in the report cards

Teacher A

Referring to Table 3 about the scoring rate presented in Chapter III, there are 5 scales of scores used by the school, i.e., (i) excellent, (ii) very good, (iii) good, (iv) pass, and (v) needs improvement. Based on these scales of scores, it was found that the majority of the students in Class A got excellent scores (65.22%) and only 1 student (4.35%) needs improvement (did not pass) (see Table 8). So this class was an excellent one.

Table 8. Percentage of Class A's Scores in Each Scale

Scale of score	**Range of score**	**Number of students**	**%**
Excellent	92-100	15	65.22
Very good	86-91	5	21.74
good	77-85	2	8.70
pass	76	-	-
needs improvement	< 76	1	4.35
Total of the students		**23**	**100**

In regard with the alignment of Teacher A's feedback with the students' scores, it is presented in the form of percentage (see Table 9).

Table 9. Percentage of Class A's Scale of Scores in Each Type of Teacher's Feedback

Scales of scores	Praise					Suggestions				
	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of comments	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of Comments
Excellent	15	11 (30.55 %)	15 (41.66%)	10 (27.77%)	36 (80%)	6 (40%)	1 (14.28%)	4 (57.14%)	2 (28.57%)	7 (15.55%)
Very Good	5	2 (28.57 %)	2 (28.57%)	3 (42.85%)	7 (50%)	5 (100%)	1 (20%)	4 (80%)	0	5 (35.71%)
Good	2	0	2 (66.6%)	1 (33.33%)	3 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	0	1 (50%)	2 (33.33%)
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Needs Improvement	1	0	0	1 (100%)	1 (33.33%)	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (33.33%)

Scales of scores	Criticism					Total of Students	Total of Comments
	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of Comments		
Excellent	3 (20%)	1 (50%)	2 (66.7%)	0	3 (6.52%)	15	46 (100%)
Very Good	2 (40%)	0	2 (100%)	0	2 (14.28%)	5	14 (100%)
Good	1 (50%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (16.66)	2	6 (100%)
Pass		-	-	-	-	-	-
Needs Improvement	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (33.33%)	1	3 (100)

Based on Table 8 and Table 9, all students who scored "excellent" (15), "very good" (5), and "good" (2) in their report cards got "praise" in their feedback from Teacher A. It means that for those students Teacher A's feedback was very well aligned with their scores in their report cards. Because the students' scores were very good, they got "praise". Those students also got "suggestions" and "criticism" but very few. For the student who scored "needs improvement" in his/her report card also got "praise", "suggestion", and "criticism" in his/her feedback from Teacher A. In this case, "praise" for poor students was meant to encourage him/her, while "suggestion" and "criticism" were more essential to be given for his/her special attention. Overall, it can be said that Teacher A's feedback was very well aligned with their students' scores in their report cards.

Based on these scales of scores, it was found that the students in Class B who got excellent scores (42.85%) and very good (47.61%) were almost equal, no one in this class got needs improvement (did not pass) (see Table 10). So this class was a very good class.

Table 10. Percentage of Class B's Scores in Each Scale

Scale of score	Range of score	Number of students	%
Excellent	92-100	9	42.85
Very good	86-91	10	47.61
good	77-85	2	9.52
pass	76	-	-
needs improvement	< 76	-	-
Total of the students		21	100

In regard with the alignment of Teacher B's feedback with the students' scores, it is presented in the form of percentage (see Table 11).

Table 11. Percentage of Class B's Scale of Scores in Each Type of Teacher's Feedback

Scales of scores	Number of Students	Praise			Number of comments	Number of Students	Suggestions			Number of Comments
		Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious			Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	
Excellent	9	0	9 (100%)	0	9 (47.36%)	9 (100%)	1 (10%)	9 (90%)	0	10 (52,63%)
Very Good	10	1 (9.09%)	10 (90.9%)	0	11 (50%)	10	1 (9.09%)	9 (81.81%)	1 (9.09%)	11 (50%)
Good	2	0	2 (100%)	0	2 (33.33%)	2 (100%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	4 (66.67%)
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Needs Improvement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Scales of scores	Number of Students	Criticism			Number of Comments	Total of Students	Total of Comments
		Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious			
Excellent	0	0	0	0	0	9	19 (100%)
Very Good	0	0	0	0	0	10	22 (100%)
Good	0	0	0	0	0	2	6 (100%)
Pass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Needs Improvement		-	-	-	-	-	-

Based on Table 10 and Table 11, all students who scored "excellent" (9), "very good" (10), and "good" (2) in their report cards got "praise" in their feedback from Teacher B. It means that for those students Teacher B's feedback was very well aligned with their scores in their report cards. Because the students' scores were very good, they got "praise". Those all students also got "suggestions" but not "criticism". Teacher B did not have students with "pass" or "need improvement" scores in their report cards.

Teacher C

Based on the scales of scores, it was found that the majority of the students in Class C got very good (69.56%) and only 2 students got excellent scores (8.69%) (see Table 12). No one from this class got need improvement (did not pass). So this class was a very good class.

Table 12. Percentage of Class C's Scores in Each Scale

Scale of score	Range of score	Number of students	%
Excellent	92-100	2	8.69
Very good	86-91	16	69.56
good	77-85	4	17.39
pass	76	1	4.34
needs improvement	< 76	-	-
Total of the students		23	100

In regard with the alignment of Teacher C's feedback with the students' scores, the finding is presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Percentage of Class C's Scale of Scores in Each Type of Teacher's Feedback

Scales of scores	Number of Students	Praise			Number of comments	Number of Students	Suggestions			Number of Comments
		Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious			Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	
Excellent	2	1 (20%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	5 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Very Good	16	15 (50%)	13 (43.33%)	2 (6.67%%)	30 (68.18)	12 (75%)	0	12 (92.30%)	1 (7.69%)	13 (29.54%)
Good	2	0	2 (100%)	0	2 (33.33%)	2 (100%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	4 (66.67%)
Pass	1	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (50%)
Needs Improvement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Scales of scores	Number of Students	Criticism			Number of Comments	Total of Students	Total of Comments
		Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious			
Excellent	0	0	0	0	0	2	5 (100%)
Very Good	1 (6.25%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (2.27%)	16	44 (100%)
Good	0	0	0	0	0	2	6 (100%)
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	1	2 (100%)
Needs Improvement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Based on Table 12 and Table 13, all students who scored "excellent" (2), "very good" (16), and "good" (2) in their report cards got "praise" in their feedback from Teacher C. It means that for those students Teacher C's feedback was very well aligned with their scores in their report cards. Because the students' scores were very good, they got "praise". Those students who got "excellent" score did not get any "suggestions" or "criticisms" from Teacher C. While "very good" students got all "praise", "suggestions", and "criticisms" although it was not equally addressed. On the other hand, "good" students did not get "criticisms" from Teacher C. Teacher C did not have any students with "need improvement" score. It can be concluded that Teacher C's feedback was also very well aligned with the students' score in their report card although not all students got all three aspects "praise", "suggestions", and "criticism".

Teacher D

Based on these scales of scores, it was found that the majority of the students in Class C got very good (41.67%) and only 3 students got excellent scores (12.5%) (see Table 14). Only one student from this class got need improvement (not pass). So this class wa a very good class.

Table 14. Percentage of Class D's Scores in Each Scale

Scale of score	Range of score	Number of students	%
Excellent	92-100	3	12.5
Very good	86-91	10	41.67
good	77-85	9	37.50
pass	76	1	4.17
needs improvement	< 76	1	4.17
Total of the students		24	100

In regard with the alignment of Teacher D's feedback with the students' scores, it is presented in the form of percentage (see Table 15).

Table 15. Percentage of Class D's Scale of Scores in Each Type of Teacher's Feedback

Scales of scores	Praise					Suggestions				
	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of comments	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of Comments
Excellent	3	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	5 (83.33%)	1 (33.33%)	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (16.67%)
Very Good	10	7 (58.33%)	5 (41.67%)	0	12 (48%)	7 (70%)	1 (12.5%)	5 (62.5%)	2 (25%)	8 (32%)
Good	9	1 (11.11%)	7 (77.78%)	1 (11.11%)	9 (47.36%)	8 (88.89%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	0	10 (52.63%)
Pass	1	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	2 (100%)	0	0	0	0	0
Needs Improvement	1	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (25%)

Scales of scores	Criticisms					Total of Students	Total of Comments
	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of Comments		
Excellent	0	0	0	0	0	3	6 (100%)
Very Good	5 (50%)	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	0	5 (20%)	10	25 (100%)
Good	0	0	0	0	0	9	19 (100%)
Pass	0	0	0	0	0	1	2 (100%)
Needs Improvement	1 (100%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	0	2 (50%)	1	4 (100%)

Based on Table 14 and Table 15, all students who scored "excellent" (3), "very good" (10), and "good" (9) in their report cards got "praise" in their feedback from Teacher D. It means that for those students Teacher D's feedback was very well aligned with their scores in their report cards. Because the students' scores were very good, they got "praise". Those students with "excellent" and "good" scores did not get any criticism from Teacher D. On the other hand, those students with "very good" scores got all three "praise", "suggestions", and "criticism". For student who scored "needs improvement" in his/her report card also got "praise", "suggestion", and "criticism" in his/her feedback from Teacher D. In this case, "praise" for poor students was meant to encourage him/her, while "suggestion" and "criticism" were more essential to be given for his/her special attention. Overall, it can be said that Teacher D's feedback was very well aligned with their students' scores in their report cards.

Teacher E

Based on these scales of scores, it was found that the students in Class E got very good (28.57%) and good (28.57%) equally, only 3 students got excellent

scores (14.28%) (see Table 16). In addition, two students (9.52%) from this class got need improvement (not pass).

Table 16. Percentage of Class E's Scores in Each Scale

Scale of score	Range of score	Number of students	%
Excellent	92-100	3	14.28
Very good	86-91	6	28.57
good	77-85	6	28.57
pass	76	4	19.05
needs improvement	< 76	2	9.52
Total of the students		21	100

In regard with the alignment of Teacher E's feedback with the students' scores, it is presented in the form of percentage (see Table 17).

Table 17. Percentage of Class E's Scale of Scores in Each Type of Teacher's Feedback

Scales of scores	Praise					Suggestion				
	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of comments	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of Comments
Excellent	3	2 (66.67%)	1 (33.33%)	0	3 (50%)	3 (100%)	0	3 (100%)	0	3 (50%)
Very Good	6	5 (83.33%)	1 (16.67%)	0	6 (50%)	6 (100%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	0	6 (50%)
Good	6	4 (66.67%)	2 (33.33%)	0	6 (42.85%)	5 (83.33%)	3 (42.85%)	4 (57.14%)	0	7 (50%)
Pass	4	4 (100%)	0	0	4 (50%)	3 (75%)	2 (66.67%)	1 (33.33%)	0	3 (37.5%)
Needs Improvement	2	2 (66.67%)	1 (33.33%)	0	3 (60%)	1 (50%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (20%)

Scales of scores	Criticism					Total of Students	Total of Comments
	Number of Students	Academic	Behavior	Miscellanious	Number of Comments		
Excellent	0	0	0	0	0	3	6 (100%)
Very Good	0	0	0	0	0	6	12 (100%)
Good	1 (16.67%)	0	1 (100%)	0	1 (7.14%)	6	14 (100%)
Pass	1 (25%)	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (12.5%)	4	8 (100%)
Needs Improvement	1 (50%)	1 (100%)	0	0	1 (20%)	1	5 (100%)

Based on Table 16 and Table 17, all students who scored "excellent" (3), "very good" (6), and "good" (6) in their report cards got "praise" in their feedback from Teacher E. It means that for those students Teacher E's feedback was very well aligned with their scores in their report cards. Because the students' scores were very good, they got "praise". Those students who got "excellent" and "very good" scores got "suggestion" too but not "criticism" from Teacher E, but for "good" scores students, they got "praise", "suggestions" and "criticism". For student who scored "needs improvement" in his/her report card also got "praise", "suggestion", and "criticism" in his/her feedback from Teacher E. In this case, "praise" for poor students was meant to encourage him/her, while "suggestion" and "criticism" were more essential to be given for his/her special attention. Overall, it can be said that Teacher E's feedback was very well aligned with their students' scores in their report cards.

In conclusion, all teachers' feedback in the students' report cards was very well aligned with the numerical scores given. The teachers were aware with the feedback they wrote for describing their students' actual performance that the students who performed very well deserved praise from their teachers and, on the contrary, the students who did not perform well had to be given relevant feedback. Especially regarding the weak aspects the students were having had to be addressed accordingly in order that the students concerned were aware of their weaknesses and that they were expected to pay a special attention for improving their particular aspect of performance.

Students' numerical scores in their report cards represented their actual performance as well. Therefore, students' written feedback had to be aligned with their numerical scores. The alignment between these two aspects had been shown by all the teachers, as the subjects of this study. Even though some of the students did not get three complete aspects of feedback, "praise", "criticism", and "suggestion" equally, the alignment between the students' numerical score and written feedback was maintained. All the "excellent" and "very good" students got "praise" from each teacher as a reward for their best performance and achievements during the semester and some "suggestions" to improve more for the next academic year. Few of the "excellent" and "very good" students got "criticism" from the teachers as they did not deserve any criticism.

Likewise, the alignment between students' numerical scores and their written feedback from their teachers among the "need improvement" students were also very well shown by the teachers. All of them got "criticism" and "suggestion" as they deserved them. They also got "praise" that made the feedback an ideal one because the feedback contained all three aspects ("praise", "criticism", and "suggestion") equally. The "praise" for the "need improvement" students aimed at giving motivation and encouraging them to do better in the next semester/academic year. The "criticism" and "suggestion" are essential for the "need improvement" students since "criticism" points out their weakness, and "suggestion" gives them advice to improve the unachieved specific skills.

The second objective of this study was to find out the extent to which the teachers' written feedback was aligned with the students' score in the report card. Based on the findings of the present study, all the excellent and better students who had 'excellent' and 'better' scores in their report card got "praise". It showed that the students' numerical scores and the written feedback/comments

from the teachers were well aligned. The excellent and better students' scores deserved "praise" on the written feedback/comments from their teachers. However, it is suggested that the excellent and the better score achievers also be given "suggestion" and "criticism" although as minor ones. The findings indicated that among five classes, there was only one student, the 'excellent' score achiever, who was given "criticism" as if the excellent students were all perfect. Ideally they were not only given praise because praise and criticism could not be separated since these two aspects form politeness and avoid intimidation. Concerning the "need improvement" students, they received more "suggestion" and "criticism" than "praise". In this respect, a similar result with the "excellent and better" students was also found in the "need improvement" students, i.e., the teachers' written feedback was well aligned with the "need improvement" students. In this regard, the "need improvement" students received more "suggestion" and "criticism" than "praise" as the essential points the students had to be concerned with. However, "praise" should be given to the "need improvement" students as well which is aimed to make them feel happy and encouraged to learn. There must be a particular positive aspect in the "need improvement" students that can be recognized and appreciated by teachers to maintain their motivation in learning.

Conclusion

Written feedback in student report cards is to inform the students and their parents about their strength and weakness in the subject. For teachers writing feedback in their students' report cards is not an easy task to do. In order to make an ideal feedback, teachers need to consider the principles of ideal feedback in making their written feedback. It is also essential to make feedback aligned with the numerical scores. The teachers in this study failed in implementing some of the principles of ideal feedback. All the teachers' feedback did not meet the principles of ideal feedback which covers praise, criticism, and suggestion equally. However, the second finding of the study showed that the teachers' feedback was well aligned with the students' numerical scores. All the "excellent" students got "praise", while the "need improvement" students got more "criticism" and "suggestion" than "praise". This study is expected to be inspiring for English teachers in Indonesia to see how well they write feedback for their students, especially feedback written in their report cards. Since report cards help parents to determine the weaknesses and strengths of their children in specific areas of learning and will be kept by parents until their children grow up, it is recommended that teachers be able to write feedback based on the principles of ideal feedback.

References

Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research, 51*(1) 5-32.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices.* England: Longman.

Brualdi, A. (1998). Teacher comments on report cards. *Practical Assessment Research and Evaluation*, *6*(5), 1-3.

Burke, D., & Pieterick, J. (2010). *Giving students effective written feedback*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Burnett, C.P., & Mandel, Valerie. (2010). Praise and feedback in the primary classroom: Teachers' and students' perspectives. *Australian Journal of Education & Developmental Psychology*, *10*, 145-154.

Butler, S. M., & Mcmunn, N. D. (2006). *A teacher's guide to classroom assessment: Understand and using assesment to improve student learning*. Callifornia: Jossey-Bass.

Carless, D. (2006). Differing perceptions in the feedback process. *Studies in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 219-233.

Daiker, D. (1989). Learning to praise. In C. Anson (Ed.), *Writing and Response* (pp. 103– 113). Urbana, IL: NCTE.

Dickinson, K., & Law, K. (2016). *Writing effectiive report card comments*. Garden Groove: Teacher Created Resources.

Elbow, P. (2007). Voice in writing again: Embracing contraries. *College English 7*, 68-88.

Firdaus, F., H. (2015). Teacher praises and students' engagement in EFL Classroom: A case study of seventh grade students at one of junior high school in Bandung. *Journal of English and Education*, *3*(2), 28-40.

Glover, C., & Brown, E. (2006). Written feedback for students: Too much, too detailed or too incomprehensible to be effective? *Bioscience Education*, *7*(1), 1-17.

Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77* (1), 81-112.

Herbert, R. (1990). Sex-based differences in compliment behaviour. *Language in Society*, *19*, 201– 224.

Heritage, H. M. (2010). *Formative assessment: Making it happen in the classroom.* London: SAGE Ltd.

Holmes, J. (1988). Doubt and certainty in ESL textbooks. *Applied Linguistics*, *91*, 20– 44.

Hyland, F., & Hyland, k. (2001). sugaring the pill: praise and Criticism in Written Feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *10*, 185-212.

Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). *Interpersonal aspects of response: Constructing and interpreting teacher written feedback.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*(2), 254–284.

Krampen, G. (1987). Differential effects of teacher comments. *Educational Psychology*, *79*(2), 137-146.

Nicol, D. (2009). Good designs for written feedback for students. *Teaching Tips: Strategies, Research, and Theory for College and University Teachers*, *13*, 1-13.

O'Leary, K. D., & O'Leary, S.G. (1977). *Classroom management: The successful use of behavior modification* (2nd ed). Oxford: Pergamon Press

Selig, W. G. (1973). *The effects of contingent praise and token reinforcement on the classroom behavior of emotionally disturbed primary students*. Doctoral Dissertations. University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Shafer, S. (1997). *Writing effective report card comments*. New York: Scholastic

Tamah, S. M., & Wirjawan, J. V. D.(2019) Assessment-oriented formative test. *The International Journal of Innovation and Learning, 26*(1), 66-81.