

**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY  
AĞ UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**TURKISH EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS FEEDBACK ON  
WRITING**

**THESIS BY  
Rabia AKAY**

**SUPERVISOR  
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ**

**MASTER OF ARTS**

**MERSİN/ JUNE - 2015**

REPUCLIC OF TURKEY

ÇAĞ UNIVERSITY

DIRECTORSHIP OF THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

We **certify** that thesis under the title of “**TURKISH EFL TEACHERS’ PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS FEEDBACK ON WRITING**” which was prepared by our student Rabia AKÇAY with number 20138021 is satisfactory for the award of the degree of **Master of Arts** in the Department of **English Language Teaching**.

Supervisor- Head of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ

Member of Examining Committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ  
(Çukurova University)

Member of Examining Committee: Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU

I certify that this thesis conforms to formal standards of the Institute of Social Sciences.



16/ 06 / 2015

Assist. Prof. Dr. Murat KOÇ  
Director of Institute of Social Sciences

**Note: The uncited usage of the reports, charts, figures and photographs in this thesis, whether original or quoted for mother sources is subject to the Law of Works of Arts and Thought. No: 5846.**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ for her support, endless patience, constructive feedback and her valuable academic advices. This thesis could not have been completed without the valuable comments and feedback given by her.

I also would like to thank my precious teachers Assist. Prof. Dr. Hülya YUMRU, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jülide İNÖZÜ and Assist. Prof. Dr. Kim Raymond HUMISTON for their continuous teaching efforts from the beginning to the end of the education process.

Finally, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my family, friends, and students for their understanding and support as I cannot spend enough time with them. I am so deeply thankful to Ömer Faruk GÖKÇE for his endless support and help. I also thank the participants who filled in the survey voluntarily and had a contribution in my study

16<sup>th</sup> June, 2015

Rabia AKÇAY

## DEDICATION

To my beloved father

Mitat AKÇAY

I wish he could see my achievement. Rest in peace...

**ÖZET**  
**TÜRK İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YAZMA ÜZERİNE GERİ**  
**BİLDİRİM ALGILARI**

**Rabia AKÇAY**

**Yüksek Lisans Tezi, İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı**

**Tez Danışmanı: Doç. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ**

**Haziran 2015, 66 sayfa**

Geri bildirim vermenin öğrencinin yazma becerisini geliştirmede ve öğrenmesi üzerinde büyük etkileri vardır. Rea-Dickens (2006), geri bildirimin öğrencilerin güçlü ve zayıf yönlerini tanımlamada ve onları bir sonraki aşamaya yönlendirmede önemli olduğunu belirtiyor. Bu yüzden, Türkiye’deki İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yazılı geri bildirim karşısı algılarını öğrenmek için bu araştırma yürütülmüştür. Verileri toplamak için çevrimiçi anket kullanılmıştır. Türkiye’nin farklı şehirlerinde, farklı okullardan ve farklı eğitim tecrübelerine sahip 157 İngilizce öğretmeni anketi gönüllü olarak doldurmuşlardır. Sonuçlar öğretmenlerin yazılı geri bildirim karşısı olumlu tutumlara sahip olduklarını ortaya koymuştur. Ancak, öğretmenlerin sadece yarısı süreç odaklı yazmayı sınıflarında kullanmaktalar ve ilk ve sonraki taslaklarda aynı odak noktalarına geri bildirim sağlamaktadırlar. Büyük bir kısmı ise değerlendirmeci geri bildirimi kullanmaktadırlar.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Biçimlendirici Değerlendirme, Yazılı Geri Bildirim, Düzeltici Geri Bildirim, Etkili Geri Bildirim, Süreç Odaklı Yazma, Değerlendirmeci Geri Bildirim, Tanımlayıcı Geri Bildirim.

## **ABSTRACT**

### **TURKISH EFL TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS TOWARDS FEEDBACK ON WRITING**

**Rabia AKÇAY**

**Master of Arts, Department of English Language Teaching**

**Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şehnaz ŞAHİNKARAKAŞ**

**June 2015, 66 pages**

Providing written feedback has a vital impact in improving student writing and on student learning. Rea-Dickens (2006) states that feedback is valuable in identifying learners' strengths and weakness and guiding them to the next steps Thus, this study was conducted to find out the perceptions of English language teachers towards written feedback in Turkey. An online survey was used to collect the data. 157 English language teachers who work in different schools and have different teaching experience filled in the survey voluntarily from various cities of Turkey. The results of the study showed that teachers have positive perceptions towards providing written feedback. However, only half of them use process based writing in their class and they provide feedback to same points both in the earlier and later drafts. Majority of them prefer to give evaluative feedback.

**Keywords:** Formative Assessment, Written Feedback, Corrective Feedback, Effective Feedback, Process-based Writing, Evaluative Feedback, Descriptive Feedback

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

**FB** : Feedback

**WFB** : Written feedback

**MoNE** : Ministry of National Education

**EFL** : English as a foreign language

**RQ** : Research question

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                                  |    |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Table 1.</b> A Typology of Options for Correcting Linguistic Errors (Ellis, 2009, p.394)..... | 11 |
| <b>Table 2.</b> Typology of Teacher feedback (Tunstall & Gipps, 1996, p.98).....                 | 12 |
| <b>Table 3.</b> Distribution of the Participants.....                                            | 18 |
| <b>Table 4.</b> Work Place of the Participants.....                                              | 19 |
| <b>Table 5.</b> Participants' Educational Background.....                                        | 19 |
| <b>Table 6.</b> Teaching Experience.....                                                         | 20 |
| <b>Table 7.</b> Source of Personal Experiences about Written Feedback.....                       | 20 |
| <b>Table 8.</b> EFL Teachers' Perception of WFB .....                                            | 26 |
| <b>Table 9.</b> Type of Feedback.....                                                            | 27 |
| <b>Table 10.</b> EFL Teachers' CFB Technique Preference .....                                    | 28 |
| <b>Table 11.</b> Same Feedback to All Students .....                                             | 28 |
| <b>Table 12.</b> Aspect of Students' Writing on Which Respondents Provide FB .....               | 29 |
| <b>Table 13.</b> Comprehensiveness of CFB .....                                                  | 29 |
| <b>Table 14.</b> Prioritization of Grammar Errors for Selective Feedback.....                    | 30 |
| <b>Table 15.</b> Focus of Written Comments.....                                                  | 30 |
| <b>Table 16.</b> Number of Students' Drafts.....                                                 | 31 |
| <b>Table 17.</b> Feedback on Early Drafts .....                                                  | 31 |
| <b>Table 18.</b> Feedback on Later Drafts .....                                                  | 31 |
| <b>Table 19.</b> Comparison of Feedback Focus in earlier and later drafts. ....                  | 32 |
| <b>Table 20.</b> Follow-up Methods .....                                                         | 32 |
| <b>Table 21.</b> Perceptions According to Gender .....                                           | 33 |
| <b>Table 22.</b> Descriptive Results of Perceptions According to Education Level .....           | 33 |
| <b>Table 23.</b> ANOVA for Perceptions According to Education Level.....                         | 33 |
| <b>Table 24.</b> Descriptive Results of Perceptions According to Teaching Experience.....        | 34 |

|                                                                                                 |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| <b>Table 25.</b> ANOVA for Perceptions According to Teaching Experience.....                    | 34 |
| <b>Table 26.</b> Type of Feedback According to Gender .....                                     | 34 |
| <b>Table 27.</b> Descriptive Results of Type of Feedback According to Education Level .....     | 35 |
| <b>Table 28.</b> ANOVA for Type of Feedback According to Education Level .....                  | 35 |
| <b>Table 29.</b> Descriptive Results of Type of Feedback According to Teaching Experience ..... | 35 |
| <b>Table 30.</b> ANOVA for Type of Feedback According to Teaching Experience .....              | 36 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

|                                                                     |   |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| <b>Figure 1.</b> Process of Writing (White & Arndt, 1991, p.4)..... | 8 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---|

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                         |      |
|-------------------------|------|
| COVER.....              | I    |
| APPROVAL PAGE.....      | II   |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....  | III  |
| DEDICATION.....         | IV   |
| ÖZET .....              | V    |
| ABSTRACT.....           | VI   |
| ABBREVIATION .....      | VII  |
| LIST OF TABLES .....    | VIII |
| LIST OF FIGURES.....    | X    |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... | XI   |

## CHAPTER 1

|                                     |   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. INTRODUCTION .....               | 1 |
| 1.1. Background to the Study .....  | 1 |
| 1.2. Statement of the Problem ..... | 2 |
| 1.3. The aim of the Study .....     | 3 |
| 1.4. Research Questions .....       | 3 |
| 1.5. Limitations of the Study.....  | 4 |
| 1.6. Operational Definitions .....  | 4 |

## CHAPTER 2

|                                                     |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2. LITERATURE REVIEW .....                          | 6  |
| 2.1. Introduction .....                             | 6  |
| 2.2. Constructivism and Social Constructivism ..... | 6  |
| 2.3. Approaches to Writing .....                    | 7  |
| 2.3.1. Product-based Writing.....                   | 7  |
| 2.3.2. Process-based Writing.....                   | 7  |
| 2.4. What is Feedback.....                          | 8  |
| 2.5. Feedback Types .....                           | 10 |

|                                                                         |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 2.5.1. Evaluative Feedback.....                                         | 10 |
| 2.5.2. Descriptive Feedback .....                                       | 10 |
| 2.6. Corrective Feedback Types .....                                    | 12 |
| 2.6.1. Direct Feedback (Implicit) vs Indirect Feedback (Expilicit)..... | 12 |
| 2.6.2. Focused Feedback vs Unfocused Feedback .....                     | 13 |
| 2.6.3. Students Responses to Feedback.....                              | 13 |
| 2.7. Feedback on form vs Feedback on Content .....                      | 13 |
| 2.8. Giving Effective Feedback .....                                    | 14 |
| 2.9. Perceptions of Teachers .....                                      | 15 |

### **CHAPTER 3**

|                                    |           |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>3. METHODOLOGY .....</b>        | <b>17</b> |
| 3.1. Introduction .....            | 17        |
| 3.2. Research Design .....         | 17        |
| 3.3. Participants .....            | 18        |
| 3.4. Data Collection Tools .....   | 20        |
| 3.5. Data Analysis Procedure ..... | 21        |

### **CHAPTER 4**

|                                                                                                                                                   |           |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS .....</b>                                                                                                          | <b>22</b> |
| 4.1. Introduction .....                                                                                                                           | 22        |
| 4.2. Findings from the Qualitative Data (Teachers' perception of feedback).....                                                                   | 22        |
| 4.3. Findings from the Quantitative Data.....                                                                                                     | 24        |
| 4.3.1. Teachers' Perceptions of Written Feedback .....                                                                                            | 24        |
| 4.3.2. Type of Feedback Teachers Prefer to Give .....                                                                                             | 26        |
| 4.3.3. Focus of Teachers while giving feedback .....                                                                                              | 29        |
| 4.3.4. Is There Any Significant Difference of Teachers' Giving Feedback in<br>Terms of Gender, Education Level and Teaching Experience?.....      | 32        |
| 4.3.5. Is there any significant difference of type of feedback teachers give in<br>terms of gender, education level and teaching experience?..... | 34        |

## CHAPTER 5

|                                             |               |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>5. CONCLUSIONS.....</b>                  | <b>37</b>     |
| 5.1. Introduction .....                     | 37            |
| 5.2. Summary of the Study.....              | 37            |
| 5.3. Conclusion ans discussions .....       | 38            |
| 5.4. Suggestions for Further Research ..... | 41            |
| <br><b>6. REFERENCES .....</b>              | <br><b>42</b> |
| <br><b>7. APPENDIX .....</b>                | <br><b>48</b> |
| 7.1. Appendix 1: Questionnaire.....         | 48            |

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

This study investigates the perceptions of Turkish English as a foreign language teachers (EFL) regarding giving written feedback (WFB). This chapter involves background of the study, statement of the problem, research questions, limitations and operational definitions.

#### **1.1. Background Information**

Ministry of national education (MoNE) has made significant changes in the national English language teaching curriculum in Turkey since the last decade. It started in 2006 with primary school curriculum (4-8 grades) and continued gradually with secondary school curriculum (9-10 grades) in 2008, (9-12 grades) in 2011, (2-8 grades) in 2013 and (9-12 grades) in 2015. In all, the principles and descriptors of CEFR (Common European Framework References for languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment) were closely followed. The most remarkable change with CEFR is that English is seen as a means of communication rather than focusing on the language as a topic of study, which has totally different point of view from the old curriculums. Some important characteristics of new curriculum are being performance based and criterion referenced, developing progress and catering individual differences.

Another change with the new curriculum is in the area of assessment. Formative assessment has gained importance and giving feedback (FB) is one of the key aspects of formative assessment. It is very important in supporting learners to improve their language skills. It identifies learners' strengths, weaknesses and areas that need to be developed. Feedback can be given both oral and written by teachers and also peers can give feedback apart from teachers.

Furthermore, new curriculum has also brought a new perspective to teaching writing skills in Turkey. In the old curriculums, product based approach was employed and the importance was on the end product. However, process based approach was adapted in the new curriculums. Writing is not seen only a mechanical process but it

should be regarded and assessed as a skill that includes comprehension, reasoning, development and productive skills. That means there should be planning (pre-writing), gradual product development (drafting) and supporting ideas (editing) stages. Giving feedback has a crucial role in this cycle as it is an ongoing process as well.

In addition to these, writing has a vital place in language classes as it helps learners develop their other language skills. It enables learners to express their ideas, feelings and knowledge. Besides, mistakes in written communication can cause breakdowns during the interaction. Apart from grammar, word choice, coherence and cohesion are other major elements in writing. Therefore, both form and content are essential in the writing process.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problem**

When studies are investigated, it is not much known what the Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions are about written feedback or what they feel about it within the new curriculum in Turkey (MEB, 2011; 2013). Product based approach, which means writing was only one draft, used to be important in writing for years and teachers' main focus was on product. So, the feedback was mainly on form for a product based adapted writing task. However, process based approach is more important with the new curriculum and feedback on content is also important. In process based adapted writing, there is more than one draft and feedback should be given in different areas of language in the earlier and later drafts such as while content is more important in the earlier drafts, grammar is more important in the later drafts. Some teachers may still give main importance to product while others give importance to process and their choices of feedback may differ accordingly. Moreover giving written feedback can be seen laborious as it requires a lot of time and careful planning. Some teachers even may not be in favor of giving feedback. Since feedback is a new priority in teaching writing skills and formative assessment, teachers may have different perceptions and practices about it since the teacher himself/herself decides what or how to give feedback. Furthermore, teachers' perceptions and practices may be different due to some reasons such as time, teachers' focus, their priorities, their goals, their educational level and teaching experience.

### **1.3. Aim of the Study**

This study is based on the assumption that written feedback has a crucial role in the language learning process and the teachers are in favor of giving feedback. The aims of this study are to outline the profile of Turkish EFL teachers' perception of giving written feedback, learn what type of feedback they prefer to give most and to find out what teachers' main focus points are in the text while providing feedback. Then, to see whether there are significant differences of teachers' perceptions and type of feedback in terms of gender, educational level and teaching experience.

### **1.4. Research Questions**

This study aims to find answers to these questions:

1. What are the perceptions of teachers of English towards feedback on writing?
2. What type of feedback do teachers of English prefer to give?
3. What do teachers of English mainly focus while giving feedback?
4. Is there any significant difference of teachers' perceptions of giving feedback regarding
  - a- gender
  - b- education level
  - c- teaching experience
5. Is there any significant difference of type of feedback teachers give in terms of
  - a- gender
  - b- education level
  - c- teaching experience

## **1.5. Limitations**

Although teachers' perception of written feedback influences their classroom practices and students' understanding, the literature on teachers' perception of written feedback is limited. The total view from the teachers' side is not enough. It is more on students' perceptions or comparison of students' and teachers' as Quin and Karabacak (2013) presents in their study. The current study focuses on a target population consisting of limited number of private and state university, private and public secondary and high school English language teachers in Turkey when compared to total number approximately 48.000 and it is not homogeneous in terms of work place and gender. Therefore, this fact should be taken into consideration while generalizing the results of this study.

## **1.6. Operational Definitions**

### **1.6.1. Formative assessment**

It is described by Heritage (2010) as the goal of formative assessment is to monitor student learning by providing ongoing feedback that occurs during teaching and learning. Teachers do not give grades to students but make adjustments to help students identify their strengths and weaknesses and target areas that need work. Rea-Dickens (2006) highlights role of feedback in teacher assessment process and states it is curial in engaging the learners in those processes.

### **1.6.2. Product based approach to writing**

In this approach to writing, the focus is on organization of ideas rather than ideas themselves. Learners imitate a model text individually and write only one draft. The emphasis is on end product (Steele, 2004).

### **1.6.3. Process based approach to writing**

In this approach to writing, the focus is on purpose, content and reader. Learners read a text as a resource for comparison and write more than one draft. They work collaboratively. The emphasis is on creative process (Steele, 2004). Feedback is a key element of process writing (Keh, 1990).

#### **1.6.4. Feedback**

It describes students' performance and it is the teachers' interactions to the learners' writings. Kulhavy (1977) defines it as "any of the numerous procedures that are used to tell a learner if an instructional response is right or wrong" (p. 211). Feedback is generally identified in the literature with "knowledge of results" (Sadler, 1989, p.142). It promotes student learning as Rea-Dickens (2006) highlights feedback is valuable in identifying learners' strengths and weakness and guiding them to the next steps. Moreover, Hyland and Hyland (2006) state feedback is "crucial for encouraging and consolidating learning" (p.83). It should be given both oral and written but in this study, only written feedback was taken into consideration as it should be more specific.

#### **1.6.6. Corrective Feedback**

It refers feedback on language use (Sheen & Ellis, 2011). Chaudron (1988) explains it as "any teacher behaviour following an error that minimally attempts to inform the learner of the fact of error". (p. 150) Russel and Spada (2006) define corrective feedback (CF) as: "any feedback provided to learners, from any source, that contains evidence of learner error of language form" (p. 134). It may be oral or written, implicit or explicit.

#### **1.6.7. Focus of Feedback**

Focus of feedback in this study refers to what aspects teachers focus on while they provide feedback such as comprehensive or selective (grammar, vocabulary, content, organization, mechanics, style), positive or negative sides of the written work.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1. Introduction**

Writing is one of the ways to communicate and it has a vital place in language classes as it is a productive skill. It has to be given importance and addressed carefully. One way of achieving this is giving feedback. Learners' progress can be observed easily and supported effectively with feedback.

Within the scope of this study, constructivism and social constructivism, approaches to writing, definition of feedback, feedback types, corrective feedback types, feedback on form versus feedback on content, giving effective feedback and perceptions of the teachers were studied.

#### **2.2. Constructivism and Social Constructivism**

Constructivism is "a philosophical approach that argues knowledge is socially constructed rather than having its own independent existence" (Nunan 1999, p. 304). In constructivism, learning requires active participation (Vygotsky, 1962; Bruner, 1986), which means adapting learner-centred teaching in the classrooms. Students as active participants construct their own knowledge based on their previous knowledge and experiences. "In a constructivist learning environment, feedback is also an essential part of the process. Feedback provides the learners the opportunity to filter out and obtain additional information necessary to construct knowledge" (Gensburg & Herman, 2009, para.8).

Social constructivism is a variation of cognitive constructivism and emphasizes the collaborative nature of learning. "According to social constructivism, learning requires exchanging, sharing, and negotiation, and it involves both personal inner process and social aspect" (Liu, Lin, Chiu, & Yuan, 2001, p. 247). Social constructivism underpins the principles of communicative language teaching for social interaction (Canale & Swain, 1980; Hymes, 1972). Feedback is a process of communication (Higgins, Harthy & Skelton, 2001) and serves as a tool to foster this process. The focus is on communicative competence and meaning in this approach. As

Han states (2002) “corrective feedback remains an important vehicle for facilitating L2 knowledge construction and enhancing knowledge use in communicative language teaching” (p. 413).

### **2.3. Approaches to Teaching Writing**

There are various approaches to teach writing skills but two of them, product and process based writing, are prominent in the classrooms and have been researched most in the literature as Nunan (1999) states “one of the most controversial aspects of writing pedagogy has been the tension between process and product approaches to the teaching of writing” (p.272). Raimes (1983) states there is not only one correct way to teach writing due to diversity of teachers and teaching styles or learners and learners styles and we use different techniques from different approaches since most teachers and books are eclectic.

#### **2.3.1. Product-based Writing**

Raimes (1983) explains that this approach to writing drives from audio-lingual theory from 1950’s - 1960’s. In this approach, speaking is primary and writing serves to reinforce speaking. It is a kind of habit formation and there is no place for errors. Steele (2004) states organization of ideas is more important than ideas themselves. Hyland (2003) asserts four stages for product writing as *familiarization (pre-teach certain grammar and vocabulary)*, *controlled writing (manipulate fixed patterns)*, *guided writing (imitate model texts)*, *free writing (use the patterns to write a text)*. Students imitate a model text and there is only one draft. “Writing is viewed as an instrument for teaching grammar and general knowledge of language” (Tangkiengsirsim, 2006, p.3). So, the focus is on the final product and texts should be error free. “Ideas in the texts are believed to be transferrable mainly through the language and the interest is not in the quality of ideas or expressions, but in the correct use of linguistics features” (as cited in Tangkiengsirsim, 2006, p.2-3). Therefore, correction is the major type of feedback and teachers are seen as graders or markers.

#### **2.3.2. Process-based Writing**

Raimes (1983) explains that after 1970s, the emphasis moved from end product to process as writing is regarded a cognitive process. Primary focus is on how a text is

written and improving student's writing proficiency rather than the text as a product. Matsuda (2003) asserts that writing is a process of discovering meaning and developing organization. In this approach, teacher is a facilitator helping students to develop writing skills. Writing is collaborative and creativity is important (Steele, 2004). It comprises of some stages such as pre-writing (planning), composing (drafting, redrafting), editing (revising) (Hyland, 2003; Steele, 2004; White,, 1991). At the first stage, students generate or organize their ideas to compose. Then, they write a first draft and revise it according to feedback. This, drafting and revising stage can continue more than once until the writer satisfies with the text (see Figure 1). Feedback has a crucial role in these stages to help students develop writing skills. It is given both on content and form but at the first drafts it should be on content as students need to develop ideas more and after editing stages it can be on form (Tangkiengsirsim, 2006).



**Figure 1. Process of Writing (White & Arndt, 1991, p.4)**

#### **2.4. What is feedback?**

The simplest explanation is that it is the ongoing interaction between learners and teachers during the teaching and learning process. *The gap* is a common term for feedback used in the literature. It is *the gap* between current level and the desired goal and its aim is to make learners be aware of the gap and help them close it (Ramaprasad, 1983; Sadler, 1983; Boston, 2002; Broadfoot, Weeden, & Winter, 2002). Feedback should be *specific and related to need* (Crooks, 1998, p.469), *timely* (Brookheart, 2008, p.60; Mack, 2009, p.38), about *particular qualities of the work with advice on the areas to improve* (Black & Wiliam, 1998, p.9), *thoughtful, reflective and focused* (Black & Wiliam, 1998, p.12), and must have *reasonable principles to follow* (Ferris, 2007, p.168).

Winne and Butler (1994) assert that “feedback is information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta-cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies” (p. 5740). So, the purpose of feedback is:

to cause the learner to think

to develop teaching and learning strategies for individual learners

to promote deeper learning and understanding

to boost self-esteem, motivate and inspire

Erkkila (2013) states teachers have their own opinions about whether the text is good or bad, and it is not easy to determine the amount and type of feedback. According to Hyland (2003) there are seven focuses of second language writing teaching: *language structures, text functions, creative expression, composing process, content and genre*, and she discusses that only one of them can't be a good indicator to determine whether the text is good or not as the text depends on its context. She adds that the text has a certain communicative setting so respond should not only be on accuracy or explicitness of expression but all the divisions of the text.

There can be various goals and ways of providing feedback. Its focus can be either on end product or on writing process. The teacher may just want to grade the text or help learners improve their text with the process. Black and Wiliam (2001) highlight that if teachers give only marks or grades, students do not make use of feedback. The ones who always get low marks will always expect to get low marks and be unhappy and unmotivated. Their teachers will also expect them to get low marks and there will be a *shared belief* of failure.

Hyland (2003) explains that feedback can take different forms taking into consideration of teachers' preferences, students' level, types of writing tasks and the stage of the writing process. He also states while determining different reasons of feedback, it should be based on the learners, learning goals and content of learning. Hyland and Hyland (2006) categorize feedback into two as *summative feedback* and *formative feedback*. The purpose of summative feedback is to evaluate the writing as a

product while the purpose of formative feedback is to help the learners in developing their writing skills. Teachers can write comments or correct the errors. This study is based on two different typologies. One is from Tunstall and Gipps (1996) on feedback types and other is from Ellis (2009) on corrective feedback.

## **2.5. Feedback Types**

Tunstall and Gipps (1996) have created a typology explaining feedback types (see, Table 1). They have identified and coded different feedback types such as verbal or non-verbal, positive or negative, process or product related, implicit or explicit. They have determined broad categories as evaluative feedback and descriptive feedback and grouped the feedback types under those titles. Within these two major categories, there are four types called *assessment feedback* which were termed as A, B, C, and D and each type was subdivided a *dualistic structure*.

### **2.5.1. Evaluative feedback**

The purpose of evaluative (judgemental) feedback is to measure students' achievement with a grade or a score (Ball, 2010). Evaluative feedback is a judgment by the teacher based on implicit or explicit norms and it can be either positive or negative. For example; if it is positive, teachers may give rewards such as smiley face, buy a bar of chocolate, give applause, may approve by a facial expression or give a tick. They are sometimes used as "bribes" for motivation (Tunstall & Gipps, 1996). If it is negative, teachers may punish students by being deprived of something child enjoys, destruction of work, writing it again, they may disapprove by facial expressions, tone of voice, use of threats, expressions of anger, disappointment or annoyance such as it's not good.

### **2.5.2. Descriptive feedback**

The purpose of descriptive (achievement or competence related) feedback tries to improve learning by indicating to the student what needs to be improved (Ball, 2010). If it is positive, teachers specify attainment or construct achievement. Teachers identify specific aspects of writing such as *it is a good introduction paragraph as you gave information about time, place and characters*. If it is negative, teachers specify improvement or construct the way forward. Teachers identify specific aspects what need

to be corrected such as *it is good to see that you have an introduction paragraph but check it again as you need to give information about time, place and characters*. In constructing the way forward, teachers show future possibilities in learning and give student more responsibilities. Instead of telling students what to do to improve, the development can be identified mutually such as *are you satisfied with your text? Write down what improvements you may make*.

**Table 1. Typology of Teacher feedback (Tunstall & Gipps, 1996, p.394)**

| Evaluative Feedback |                    |                                                                                                     | Descriptive Feedback  |                                    |                                                                                                                                                                 |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Positive Feedback   | A1<br>Rewarding    | Rewards                                                                                             | Specifying Feedback   | C1<br>Specifying Attainment        | Mastery-oriented approach<br>Specific acknowledgement of attainment<br>Use of pre-determined criteria<br>Checking and correcting procedures                     |
|                     | B1<br>Approving    | Positive expression<br>Warm expression of feeling<br>General praise<br>Positive non-verbal feedback |                       | C2<br>Specifying Improvement       | Mastery-oriented approach<br>Correction of errors<br>More practice given; training in self-checking                                                             |
| Negative Feedback   | A2<br>Punishing    | Punishments                                                                                         | Constructing Feedback | D1<br>Constructive Achievement     | Constructive approach<br>Mutual articulation of achievement<br>Illustrates teachers' use of sharp and contextualised fuzzy criteria<br>Teacher-child assessment |
|                     | B2<br>Disapproving | Negative expression<br>Reprimands, negative generalisations<br>Negative non-verbal feedback         |                       | D2<br>Constructing the Way Forward | Constructive approach<br>Mutual critical appraisal<br>Provision of strategies for self-regulation                                                               |

## 2.6. Corrective Feedback Types

Ellis (2009) has developed a typology (See, Table 2) of the different types of feedback available to teachers. It has two sets of options relating to strategies for providing feedback and the students' response to feedback.

**Table 2. A Typology of Options for Correcting Linguistic Errors (Ellis, 2009, p.98)**

| <b>A. Strategies for providing CF</b>     | <b>B. Students' response to feedback</b>          |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| <b>1 Direct CF</b>                        | <b>1 Revision required</b>                        |
| <b>2 Indirect CF</b>                      | <b>2 No revisions required</b>                    |
| <i>a. Indicating + locating the error</i> | <i>a. Students asked to study corrections</i>     |
| <i>b. Indication only</i>                 | <i>b. Students just given back corrected text</i> |
| <b>3 Metalinguistic CF</b>                |                                                   |
| <i>a. Use of error code</i>               |                                                   |
| <i>b. Brief grammatical descriptions</i>  |                                                   |
| <b>4 The focus of the Feedback</b>        |                                                   |
| <i>a. Unfocused CF</i>                    |                                                   |
| <i>b. Focused CF</i>                      |                                                   |
| <b>5 Electronic feedback</b>              |                                                   |
| <b>6 Reformulation</b>                    |                                                   |

### 2.6.1. Direct (Implicit) vs Indirect (Explicit) Feedback

There is no correct and only way to provide feedback. As Ellis (2009) explains there are many ways to address students' linguistic errors and it is not being suggested to the teachers have to select one strategy and use only that method to correct all grammatical errors. So, teachers mix and match error correction strategies. It is the teacher who decides how to give it. It can depend on the task, teachers' aims, student or the process of the lesson. If the teachers prefer direct feedback, they provide the correct form on the learner's paper (Ellis, 2009). Learners both see the error and corrected version of it. If the teachers prefer indirect feedback, they indicate that an error exists in various ways but do not provide the correction (Ellis, 2009). They can just indicate

there is an error in the text and locate it by using error codes to show the type of error, writing a grammatical description or even just drawing a question mark.. It is the learner's duty to find and correct the error. It can be used with both direct and indirect feedback. Teachers just give metalinguistic clues either by using error codes or brief grammatical descriptions. If they provide corrected version it is direct feedback, if not it is indirect feedback.

### **2.6.2. Focused vs Unfocused Feedback**

In focused feedback, teachers provide comprehensive feedback, which means feedback is given on all or most of the errors in the text whereas they provide selective feedback in unfocused one, which means it is given only on selective errors in the texts. The focus depends on the teachers' aims (Ellis, 2009). Kulhavy (1985) and Sadler (1998) argue that the amount of feedback does not mean more learning. In other words, feedback quality is much more important than quantity of it. Black and Wiliam (1998) assert that feedback has more potential when it focuses on specific mistakes and Veslin and Veslin (1992) state the amounts of comments may influence the revision process. If too much feedback is given, students can get unmotivated and have difficulty in finding where to start. They also suggest comments should be simple, clear and readable.

### **2.6.3. Students' Response to Feedback**

As Ellis (2009) explains, teachers require students to correct their texts and submit the corrected versions again in a process based writing class. This can be more than once until they have the wanted result. However, in a product based writing class, teachers do not want students to correct their mistakes and rewrite them. They just give the corrected version back and may want to study them.

### **2.7. Feedback on form vs feedback on content**

Feedback on form includes grammar, mechanics, and vocabulary while feedback on content focuses on organization, ideas and amount of detail (as cited in Zaman and Azad, 2012). Both types are important for developing writing but the studies show that teachers have more tendencies to focus on form and it has been discovered that teachers focus more on local issues (grammar, mechanics) than on global issues (content, organization) (Ferris, 2006; Zamel, 1985; Chapin & Terdal 1990)

Giving feedback is not an easy task. It is difficult to determine how much and what to give feedback. It is also time consuming as it requires a great amount of time for each paper. Hattie and Timperley (2007) indicate that feedback is one of the most powerful influences on learning and achievement; however, this impact can be either positive or negative. Literature suggests teachers some ways to provide effective feedback.

## **2.8. Giving Effective Feedback**

Each teacher is unique in terms of backgrounds, expectations, criteria and approaches they use, which means a text can be approached and evaluated very differently by different teachers. Ferris (2007) asserts that teachers should have reasonable principles to follow in order to balance the personality of feedback such as “intervention (helpful) and appropriation (harmful)” (p.167). She also points out that there are a few general principles for the feedback process. She suggests that errors should be responded selectively and teachers should not forget that it is a student work not a professional’s by treating them as individuals.

Johnstun (2008) indicates that to locate and correct errors of students is mainly the teachers’ job and Ferris (2007) recommends that the responder shouldn’t only be the teacher; such as peers. Also, formative feedback employs other feedback sources such as peer-feedback besides teacher feedback.

Teachers make positive and negative comments while giving feedback. If positive feedback given all the time, learners might think that they are very good and do not need any improvement. On the other hand if negative feedback is given more often, they may think that they are not good enough and may give up. Hyland (2003) states there should be a “balance between positive and negative comments” (p.188). It should be both encouraging and constructive. Wen (2013) indicates that providing appropriate written feedback requires the teacher to think it over seriously not only in cognitive way but also in affective way.

According to Erkkila (2013) teachers should also consider what kind of feedback their learners might want. As each individual learner has different needs, levels and pace, the type of feedback is important and can differ according to the students. Some low-level students may need direct feedback.

Hattie and Timperley (2007) point out three questions must be addressed to learners while giving feedback: “Where am I going?, How am I going? and Where to next?” (p. 88). By this way, learners will be aware of the learning goals related to task or performance, their progress and the next expectation. In order to achieve this, Ball’s (2010) feedback types can be taken into consideration. According to Ball (2010), there are four types of feedback: *motivational feedback*, *evaluative feedback*, *descriptive feedback* and *effective feedback*. She states that while evaluative feedback is just measuring learners’ achievement with a grade, motivational feedback encourages and supports learners. On the other hand descriptive feedback tells learners how to correct their reasoning and effective feedback asks learners what to do to move their reasoning to the next level. As Jacobs, Curtis, Braine and Huan (1998) state “feedback should take a middle way on the issue of types of feedback” (p.314).

Timing is another important aspect of feedback. As Brookheart (2008) states in her book, it should be immediate or slightly delayed. It should be given while learners are still questioning and engaged in the task, topic or performance and still think of the learning goals.

To sum up, Mack, (2009) indicates there are five conditions to be able to give effective feedback. Firstly, feedback must be formative and timely. Then, it should draw attention to the error and avoid appropriation and line by line correcting a text. Finally, there should be a criterion for feedback.

## **2.9. Perceptions of Teacher**

The meaning of perception is explained in the dictionary as “the way you think about something and your idea of what it is like” (Mayor, 2009, p.1289). Teachers’ perceptions are very important in the classroom as they shape their classroom practice (Borg, 2003; Burns, 1992). Ferede, Melese and Tefera (2013) argue that “teachers’ beliefs influence their judgments and practices, thereby determine how they behave in the classroom” (p.30). This means, if teachers do not see writing important, their perceptions can affect their practice of teaching writing. They also point out that according to Alamrew’s (2005) study, students do not learn writing effectively because their English language teachers do not give enough attention to writing lessons.

Teachers' perceptions and their practices in the classroom may not always be the same and this influences their teaching. The studies show that there can be differences between teachers' beliefs and practices (Lee, 2009; Montgomery & Baker, 2007). Montgomery and Baker (2007) have studied teachers' perceptions of teacher written feedback and found out that there are discrepancies both in the actual feedback and in teachers' own conceptions about it. Lee's (2009) study reveals that there are ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. They are about accuracy vs. fluency, marking errors comprehensively vs. selectively, locating and correcting errors by teachers vs. by students, using error codes, grading, responding weaknesses vs. strengths, product vs. process, autonomy in learning writing, focusing on errors and continuum of marking.

## CHAPTER 3

### 3. METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1. Introduction

The first aim of this study is to identify Turkish EFL teachers' perception of written feedback. The second aim is to learn what type of feedback they prefer to give. The third aim is to discover teachers' main focus while giving written feedback. Final aims are to reveal whether there are significant differences of teachers' perceptions and type of feedback they give in terms of gender, education level and teaching experience. This chapter describes and explains the research design, the participants, the data collection tool, the data collection procedures, and the methods used for data analysis.

#### 3.2. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive research design. Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) define descriptive research design as the summary of the characteristics of individuals, groups or physical environments done by the researchers. Descriptive research gives meaning to the quality and standing of facts that are going on (Alceso, 2011)

In this study, both quantitative and qualitative methods were used to collect and analyze the data with an attempt to find out the Turkish EFL teachers' perception of written feedback in addition to finding out what type of feedback they prefer to give and whether there are differences in these in terms of gender, educational background and teaching experience. "Qualitative research is an approach that allows you to examine people's experiences in detail" (Hennink, Hutter & Bailey, 2010, p. 8-9) and as Fraenkel et al. (2012) state it is important as it "investigates the quality of relationships, activities, situations, or materials" (p. 426). According to Hopkins (2000), the aim of the quantitative research is to find the relationship between *the dependent variable and the independent variable in a population*.

Survey research method was used to collect data. The questionnaire has both quantitative and qualitative parts. For Wellington and Szczerbinski (2007), survey

method is a ‘fact finding’ issue. As Fraenkel and Wallen (2009) state the subjects answers to the questions by writing or marking an answer sheet. One of the advantages of the surveys is that they can be shared online or given to large numbers of people at the same time and can be completed in a short time. In this study, an online survey was used to collect data. It was shared in the social media and all the subjects completed it willingly.

### 3.3. Participants

The participants in this study were 157 Turkish EFL teachers from different school types and 57 different cities in Turkey (24% from Marmara Region, 21% from Black Sea Region, 18% from Mediterranean Region, 12% from Aegean Region, 12% from Central Anatolia Region, 7% Southeast Anatolia Region and 6% from East Anatolia Region). Random sampling strategy was used to choose the participants of the study since “every population element had an equal and independent chance to participate” (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Otherwise, the data would have been too limited to see the overall perceptions of the teachers in Turkey. The questionnaire was shared on the web without any restriction such as gender, work place and teaching experience and anyone who wanted to have a contribution to the study filled in the survey voluntarily.

Table 3 shows that among 157 participants, 104 teachers were female, while only 53 teachers were male.

**Table 3. Distribution of the Participants**

| Items         | Frequency | Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|
| <b>Female</b> | 104       | 66,2    |
| <b>Male</b>   | 53        | 33,8    |
| <b>Total</b>  | 157       | 100,0   |

Table 4 shows that out of 157 teachers, 124 of them are working in public primary, secondary and high schools. 11 teachers are working at private primary, secondary and high schools and 22 are teaching at private and state universities.

**Table 4. Work Place of the Participants**

| <b>Items</b>          | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>State school</b>   | 124              | 79,0           |
| <b>Private school</b> | 11               | 7,0            |
| <b>University</b>     | 22               | 14,0           |
| <b>Total</b>          | 157              | 100,0          |

As it can be seen from Table 5, more than half of the teachers (54%) had Bachelor's degrees, one third of the teachers (36%) held or are pursuing MA degrees and only 10% teachers held or are pursuing PhD degrees.

**Table 5. Educational Background of the Participants**

| <b>Items</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|
| BA           | 86               | 54,8           |
| MA student   | 35               | 22,3           |
| MA           | 21               | 13,4           |
| PhD student  | 8                | 5,1            |
| PhD          | 7                | 4,5            |
| Total        | 157              | 100,0          |

As indicated in Table 6, the participants of the study were classified into five groups according to their years of teaching experience, as Group 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The participants' experience years in Group 1 ranged between 1 and 3 years, in Group 2 the experience years range was between 4 – 6, in Group 3 it was between 7 – 10 years, in Group 4 it was ranged between 11 – 14 years and in Group 5 it was 15 years and over. Overall, the participants' teaching experience years ranged between 1 to 27 years. As it is shown in Table 6, teaching experience was nearly equally divided. While the first group has the least population with 12.7%, second group has the most population with 22.9%. Other three groups had nearly same population with 21%.

**Table 6. Participants' Teaching Experience**

| <b>Items</b>   | <b>Teaching years</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|----------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Group 1</b> | 1-3 years             | 20               | 12,7           |
| <b>Group 2</b> | 4-6 years             | 36               | 22,9           |
| <b>Group 3</b> | 7-10 years            | 33               | 21,0           |
| <b>Group 4</b> | 11-14                 | 34               | 21,7           |
| <b>Group 5</b> | 15-over years         | 34               | 21,7           |
|                | <b>Total</b>          | <b>157</b>       | <b>100,0</b>   |

Table 7 shows that how teachers had formed their beliefs about written feedback. The most popular choice was personal experience as a teacher by half of the teachers. The second most selected choice was personal experience as a student (27%) and reading literature (24%) was just after it. Teacher preparation course (19%) and reading literature (15%) were other popular choices. Teaching peers (4%) and other (1%) were the least chosen options.

**Table 7. Source of Personal Experiences about Written Feedback**

| <b>Items</b>                             | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> |
|------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Personal experiences as a teacher</b> | 79               | 50,3           |
| <b>Personal experiences as a student</b> | 27               | 17,2           |
| <b>Reading literature</b>                | 24               | 15,3           |
| <b>Teacher peers</b>                     | 6                | 3,8            |
| <b>Other</b>                             | 2                | 1,3            |
| <b>Total</b>                             | <b>157</b>       | <b>100,0</b>   |

### **3.4. Data Collection Tool**

The original data collection tool which had been prepared and used by Ko (2010) in his dissertation study was used in this study. In the original questionnaire, there were five parts and it consisted of 46 items. It was slightly changed by deleting some questions and adding one part from Lee (2008) to find out which error feedback techniques are popular among the teachers.

The questionnaire (see appendix 1) used in this present research consisted of five parts and 38 items. In part I, seven demographic information questions were used and in part two, only one question added to learn about their general understanding of written feedback. In part three, 10 multiple choice questions were asked to learn their feedback preferences. In part four, six statements on a five-point Likert-type rating scale were used to identify frequency of their corrective feedback practices. It ranked between one and five where one was Never and five was Always. Part five consisted of 14 perception statements on a five-point Likert-type rating scale to figure out their perceptions of written feedback. It ranked between one and five where one was Strongly Disagree and five was Strongly Agree.

### **3.5. Data Analysis Procedures**

The quantitative data collected through the web-based survey was coded and analyzed by using SPSS (version 20). Descriptive statistics and content analysis were used to find out RQ1. For RQ2 and RQ3, descriptive statistics were used. For RQ4 and RQ5, t-test was used to find any significance in terms of gender and ANOVA was used to find out any significance in terms of educational level and teaching experience.

The responses given to the open-ended question were evaluated through content analysis. Holsti (1968) explains content analysis as systematical, objective and identifying techniques to make inferences. First, the responses were categorized into general headings and then a common definition was generated.

## CHAPTER 4

### 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the findings and the discussion of the study. The purpose of the study was to identify Turkish EFL teachers' perception of feedback on writing. It also aimed to learn what type of feedback they prefer to give, discover teachers' main focus point in the text while giving written feedback and reveal whether there are significant differences of teachers' perceptions and type of feedback they give in terms of gender, education level and teaching experience. The data of the study were gathered through an online survey (see Appendix 1), which consisted of five main sections.

#### 4.2. Findings from the Qualitative Data

There is one open-ended question to learn the perceptions of teachers regarding written feedback in the survey. There are various answers and point of views to this question which means there are different perceptions.

When the responses were analyzed, it was seen that a great number of teachers see feedback as a guiding method. They think it is a guide both for learning and teaching and helps learners to identify their errors and to construct right information on the way of development. It makes students aware of their mistakes and points out achievement.

*T2: "providing guidance for improving a written or spoken output in terms of context, organization and language use."*

*T3: "It's a kind of guidance which lets students know if they should go on the way they already do or change their style."*

*T4: "Well it's a good way to guide our students for better learning. But it shouldn't make them discouraged. So it's really important when and where to use it."*

Majority of the teachers think feedback is critical assessment on production in process based learning and helps evaluate result of teaching.

*T5: "a kind of assessment tool which students need to make something better. Also for myself a tool to teach better."*

*T6: "Evaluating"*

Another belief is on motivation. More than half of the teachers believe that feedback motivates students for further tasks.

*T7: "Feedback is an immediate written or oral evaluation of a student so that s/he understands his/her strong and weak points, gets motivated and takes necessary actions."*

A great deal of the teachers described feedback as any response that teachers give to learners and stated it should be immediate.

*T8: "Feedback is the information provided for the learner on his/her performance to improve the performance."*

Another point of view of teachers is feedback as a reflection tool. Not only teachers but also learners have a chance to reflect on what can be done or should be done.

*T9: "It helps raise awareness of students to see what they are or are not."*

*T10: "The way to make your students understand what you think about their learning and help them to enhance their learning. Also it helps teachers to keep records of their students' progress."*

Most of the teachers believe feedback helps self-development in the learning process and makes students stronger on the way. Teachers can also change their teaching teaching practice in this improvement process.

*T11: "It is critical for me to adjust my teaching practice and instruction and to have a clear idea about my student's progress. Besides, it is important to give immediate feedback and follow up students' improvement afterwards."*

*T12: “giving your opinion about a task or work whether it’s successful or not and how it can be improved.”*

The most popular definition for feedback by the teachers is that feedback is a type of correction to support for a better work.

*T13: “feedback means paving new ways for my students in which they have the chance to discover their errors.”*

*T14: “It is error correction for perfection.”*

We can create a general definition among the responses as feedback is a way to guide students for better learning by focusing on strong and weak points and giving advice/clues on them in a constructive and positive way, which is a close definition found in literature. (See, Chapter 2)

*T1: “Feedback must be in sequences, I mean it should be a process (formative). Students should get the way to good writing from the teacher but do the corrections by himself or get some peer-help. Teachers should have a writing scoring guide for the students.”*

### **4.3. Findings from the Quantitative Data**

A questionnaire was used to get the data about EFL teachers’ perception of written feedback. The findings through this data gave answers to the five research questions in sub-sections 4.3.1., 4.3.2., 4.3.3., 4.3.4. and 4.3.5. respectively.

#### **4.3.1. Teachers’ Perceptions of Written Feedback**

In order to learn teachers’ perceptions regarding WFB, 14 agreement perception statements were asked in the survey (see appendix 1). Although it was five-point likert type, the results were generalized here as three-point type. In general, teachers have positive perceptions about WFB (See, Table 8).

First two items show that 93% teachers believe providing feedback on student writing is an important part of being a foreign language teacher and it helps students improve their writing. Findings from the qualitative data support these statements. The

teachers highlighted that their main aim is to create changes and make improvements to students

*T15: "Letting the learner have the opportunity to improve under a professional supervision and building up good relationships for further collaboration in the learning process with the learners."*

*T16: "Information about a specific work returned to the owner of the work for his further self-development"*

*T17: "Feedback is guiding students showing them their errors."*

*T18: "feedback is to make something strong"*

*T19: "Improvement of the students"*

*T20: "It is a must for improvement"*

Surprisingly, 70% teachers do not see WFB as time-consuming or 41% of them do not see it as tedious unlike the other researches in the literature (Sirigiri, 2013; Bamkin, 2013; Arora, 2015; Taryy, 2013). Item five, six, ten and eleven are about teachers' ideas from the point view of students. 77% teachers indicated that their students like to receive teachers' written commentary on their papers and half of them stated that their students want more feedback on their writing. This can be explained from the qualitative data as feedback was seen a source for motivation and getting better.

*T21: "Helping students to construct right information."*

*T22: "The information you need about your work"*

*T23: "It is correcting yourself and getting better."*

*T24: "Helping to get better"*

*T25: "It means learning from mistakes."*

*T26: "my students' efforts to understand and speak English"*

The research shows that half of the teachers believe that students are discouraged when their written feedback on their writing is negative and when students revise according to

the teacher feedback their main interest is in getting a better grade, not improving their writing. Mack (2009) indicates every teacher has a different style of giving feedback and Ferris (2009) states teachers must have principles to follow. In the study, 70% teachers indicated that use different types of feedback from situation to situation, have guiding principles or personal philosophies and 62% teachers explain their approaches to providing written feedback in advance (Item 7-8-13). Item nine, twelve and fourteen are related to the ability of teachers' giving feedback. 74% teachers believe that they can provide accurate feedback on any problem in their students' writing and 85% of them respond to student writing more effectively with more teaching experience. Half of them stated that they do not need some training on teacher feedback while other half is undecided or need some training (see Table 8).

**Table 8. EFL Teachers' Perception of WFB**

| <b>Items</b> | <b>Disagree (%)</b> | <b>Neutral (%)</b> | <b>Agree (%)</b> |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| <b>1</b>     | 3.2                 | 3.8                | 93.0             |
| <b>2</b>     | 2.6                 | 4.5                | 83.0             |
| <b>3</b>     | 69.4                | 11.5               | 19.2             |
| <b>4</b>     | 41.4                | 29.3               | 29.3             |
| <b>5</b>     | 8.9                 | 14.6               | 76.4             |
| <b>6</b>     | 17.2                | 30.6               | 52.3             |
| <b>7</b>     | 14.7                | 15.9               | 69.4             |
| <b>8</b>     | 9.6                 | 18.5               | 72.0             |
| <b>9</b>     | 8.9                 | 17.2               | 73.9             |
| <b>10</b>    | 26.7                | 24.8               | 48.4             |
| <b>11</b>    | 22.3                | 24.8               | 52.9             |
| <b>12</b>    | 4.4                 | 10.8               | 84.7             |
| <b>13</b>    | 71.3                | 12.7               | 15.9             |
| <b>14</b>    | 49.7                | 23.6               | 26.8             |

#### **4.3.2. Type of Feedback Teachers Prefer to Give**

Feedback types are categorized as grades/marks, error correction, written comments and their various combinations in the questionnaire (See appendix 1). Table 9 presents nearly half of the teachers prefer to use all types together. Second popular answer is the combination of error correction and written comments together with 22%

and grade/marks and error correction is the third popular choice with 16%. As explained in chapter 2, evaluative feedback includes grades/marks. Item1, 4, 5 and 7 include giving grades, which means they are evaluative feedback. So, 70% teachers tend to give evaluative feedback rather than descriptive feedback.

**Table 9. Type of Feedback**

| <b>Items</b>                                    | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> | <b>Valid Percent</b> | <b>Cumulative Percent</b> |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>1. Only grades/marks</b>                     | 2                | 1,3            | 1,3                  | 1,3                       |
| <b>2. Only error correction</b>                 | 6                | 3,8            | 3,8                  | 5,1                       |
| <b>3. Only written comments</b>                 | 4                | 2,5            | 2,5                  | 7,6                       |
| <b>4. Grade/mark and error correction</b>       | 26               | 16,6           | 16,6                 | 24,2                      |
| <b>5. Grade/mark and written comments</b>       | 13               | 8,3            | 8,3                  | 32,5                      |
| <b>6. Error correction and written comments</b> | 35               | 22,3           | 22,3                 | 54,8                      |
| <b>7. All above</b>                             | 70               | 44,6           | 44,6                 | 99,4                      |
| <b>8. None above</b>                            | 1                | ,6             | ,6                   | 100,0                     |
| <b>Total</b>                                    | 157              | 100,0          | 100,0                |                           |

Table 10 shows the teachers' preference of corrective feedback type. Item 1 and 2 are direct feedback while 3, 4, 5, and 6 are indirect feedback. In item 2, 4, and 6 teachers use marking codes to indicate or hint errors while in item 1, 3 and 5 they do not use codes. The first item is preferred by 68% teachers as generally and by %28 as sometimes. The next popular item was chosen by 33% teachers as generally and by 39% as sometimes. So, the majority of the teachers prefer to give direct feedback as they provide correction. Item 3 was preferred by 30 %teachers as generally and by 33% as sometimes, which shows more than half of the teachers use indirect feedback as well. Half of the teachers are not in favour of using item 4 and two third of the teachers did not opt for item 5 or item 6. When we examine the table in terms of coded and uncoded feedback, among the top three choices, only item 2 includes coded feedback. That is, two third of the teachers use coded feedback.

**Table 10. EFL Teachers' CFB Technique Preference**

| <b>Items</b>                                                             | <b>Never or Rarely</b> | <b>Sometimes</b> | <b>Generally</b> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| <b>1</b> I indicate errors and correct them.                             | 3.8                    | 28.0             | 68.1             |
| <b>2</b> I indicate errors, correct them and categorize them             | 28.6                   | 38.9             | 32.5             |
| <b>3</b> I hint at the location of errors.                               | 36.6                   | 33.1             | 29.3             |
| <b>4</b> I hint at the location of errors and categorize them            | 52.8                   | 22.5             | 21.6             |
| <b>5</b> I indicate errors, but I don't correct them                     | 61.8                   | 22.3             | 15.9             |
| <b>6</b> I indicate errors and categorize them, but I don't correct them | 63.0                   | 22.3             | 14.6             |

Table 11 shows that two third of the teachers provides individualized feedback to each student while only one third of the teachers provide the same types of feedback to all students. Only two teachers chose other option stating that it depends on the situation. Every student is different from each other in terms of intellectual and emotional state, capability, level, interest and experience. So, their works will be different from each other and we cannot expect them to have same needs while receiving feedback. As Black and Wiliam (1989) assert comparisons with other pupils should be avoided and teachers should provide feedback about particular qualities of each students' work

**Table 11. Same Feedback to All Students**

| <b>Items</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> | <b>Valid Percent</b> | <b>Cumulative Percent</b> |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>No</b>    | 104              | 66,2           | 66,2                 | 98,7                      |
| <b>Yes</b>   | 51               | 32,5           | 32,5                 | 32,5                      |
| <b>Other</b> | 2                | 1,3            | 1,3                  | 100,0                     |
| <b>Total</b> | 157              | 100,0          | 100,0                |                           |

#### 4.3.3. Focus of teachers while giving feedback

The teachers chose their top three focus point while providing feedback. Table 12 shows that the top three aspects are grammar 63%, vocabulary 62%, content 54% and organization closely follows them with 49%. The least popular aspects are style and mechanics. Two third of the teachers prefer to provide feedback on local aspects (vocabulary, grammar and mechanics) while only half of them prefer to give feedback on global aspects (content, organization and style).

**Table 12. Aspect of Students' Writing on Which Respondents Provide FB**

| Items               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| <b>Grammar</b>      | 100       | 63,7    | 57            | 36,3               |
| <b>Vocabulary</b>   | 98        | 62,4    | 59            | 37,6               |
| <b>Content</b>      | 85        | 54,1    | 72            | 45,9               |
| <b>Organization</b> | 77        | 49,0    | 80            | 51,0               |
| <b>Style</b>        | 23        | 14,6    | 134           | 85,4               |
| <b>Mechanics</b>    | 39        | 24,8    | 118           | 75,2               |

Table 13 shows that nearly two third of the teachers provide selective feedback as the literature suggests (Ferris, 2007; Kulhavy, 1985, Black & Wiliam, 1998) and one third of the teachers provide comprehensive feedback while only three teachers do not provide any feedback.

**Table 13. Comprehensiveness of CFB**

| Items                                                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| <b>Significant grammar errors (selective feedback)</b> | 108       | 68,8    | 68,8          | 98,1               |
| <b>All grammar errors (comprehensive feedback)</b>     | 46        | 29,3    | 29,3          | 29,3               |
| <b>Don't provide grammar FB</b>                        | 3         | 1,9     | 1,9           | 100,0              |
| <b>Total</b>                                           | 157       | 100,0   | 100,0         |                    |

Table 14 shows the prioritization of grammar errors for selective feedback. Top three options are nearly equally chosen 63% - 69% and they are the task, students' needs and recently given lessons. The least chosen option is rubric. It is surprising that teachers stated that they have guiding principles in the perception part (see 4.3.1) but

using rubrics is not one of their priorities while providing feedback. Only one teacher chose other stating that it depends on the situation.

**Table 14. Prioritization of Grammar Errors for Selective Feedback**

|                       | <b>Yes<br/>F</b> | <b>Yes<br/>%</b> | <b>No<br/>F</b> | <b>No<br/>%</b> |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <b>Task</b>           | 69               | 43,9             | 88              | 56,1            |
| <b>Needs</b>          | 68               | 43,3             | 89              | 56,7            |
| <b>Recent lessons</b> | 63               | 40,1             | 94              | 59,9            |
| <b>Rubric</b>         | 21               | 13,4             | 136             | 86,6            |
| <b>Other</b>          | 1                | ,6               | 156             | 99,4            |

Table 15 indicates that nearly two third of the teachers prefer to focus on both strong and weak aspects of students' papers and provide both encouragement and constructive criticism equally as the literature suggests (Hyland, 2003).

**Table 15. Focus of Written Comments**

|                                     | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> | <b>Valid<br/>Percent</b> | <b>Cumulative<br/>Percent</b> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Both strong and weak aspects</b> | 98               | 62,4           | 62,4                     | 98,1                          |
| <b>Positive sides</b>               | 35               | 22,3           | 22,3                     | 22,3                          |
| <b>Room for improvement</b>         | 21               | 13,4           | 13,4                     | 35,7                          |
| <b>Other</b>                        | 2                | 1,3            | 1,3                      | 99,4                          |
| <b>Total</b>                        | 157              | 100,0          | 100,0                    | 100,0                         |

Table 16 reveals that only half of the teachers require students to review the teacher feedback and write revised versions of their papers. This shows that half of the teachers do not prefer to use process based approach in writing. However, the new curriculums in Turkey require teachers to use process writing (MEB, 2011; 2013). Only 3.8% teachers chose other option stating it depends on the situation.

**Table 16. Number of Students' Drafts**

| <b>Items</b> | <b>Frequency</b> | <b>Percent</b> | <b>Valid<br/>Percent</b> | <b>Cumulative<br/>Percent</b> |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Yes</b>   | 80               | 51,0           | 51,0                     | 51,0                          |
| <b>No</b>    | 71               | 45,2           | 45,2                     | 96,2                          |
| <b>Other</b> | 6                | 3,8            | 3,8                      | 100,0                         |
| <b>Total</b> | 157              | 100,0          | 100,0                    |                               |

Table 17 shows the focus points of the teachers who require multiple drafts in the earlier drafts. Teachers were required to choose top three aspects. They prefer to give feedback mostly on grammar 43%, vocabulary 38%, organization 36% and content 35%.

**Table 17. Feedback on Early Drafts**

|                        | <b>Yes F</b> | <b>YES %</b> | <b>No F</b> | <b>No %</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Grammar</b>         | 67           | 42,7         | 90          | 57,3        |
| <b>Vocabulary</b>      | 59           | 37,6         | 98          | 62,4        |
| <b>Organization</b>    | 57           | 36,3         | 100         | 63,7        |
| <b>Content</b>         | 54           | 34,4         | 103         | 65,6        |
| <b>Mechanics Style</b> | 25           | 15,9         | 132         | 84,1        |
|                        | 14           | 8,9          | 143         | 91,1        |

Table 18 shows the focus points of the teachers in later drafts. Teachers were required to choose top three aspects. They prefer to give feedback mostly on grammar 40%, vocabulary 40%, organization 34% and content 30% later drafts.

**Table 18. Feedback on Later Drafts**

| <b>Items</b>        | <b>Yes F</b> | <b>YES %</b> | <b>No F</b> | <b>No %</b> |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| <b>Vocabulary</b>   | 64           | 40,8         | 93          | 59,2        |
| <b>Grammar</b>      | 63           | 40,1         | 94          | 59,9        |
| <b>Organization</b> | 53           | 33,8         | 104         | 66,2        |
| <b>Content</b>      | 48           | 30,6         | 109         | 69,4        |
| <b>Mechanics</b>    | 33           | 21,0         | 124         | 79,0        |
| <b>Style</b>        | 20           | 12,7         | 137         | 87,3        |

Table 19 shows the comparison of the focus point in the first and later drafts. On the contrary to literature, the teachers prefer to give feedback on the same aspects both in the first and later drafts. Literature recommends giving feedback on content, style and organization in the earlier drafts and grammar for the later drafts (Peterson, 2010; Keh, 1990)

**Table 19. Comparison of Feedback Focus in earlier and later drafts.**

|                     | First Draft |      |     |      | Later Drafts |      |     |      |
|---------------------|-------------|------|-----|------|--------------|------|-----|------|
|                     | YES         |      | NO  |      | YES          |      | NO  |      |
|                     | F           | %    | F   | %    | F            | %    | F   | %    |
| <b>Grammar</b>      | 67          | 42,7 | 90  | 57,3 | 63           | 40,1 | 94  | 59,9 |
| <b>Vocabulary</b>   | 59          | 37,6 | 98  | 62,4 | 64           | 40,8 | 93  | 59,2 |
| <b>Organization</b> | 57          | 36,3 | 100 | 63,7 | 53           | 33,8 | 104 | 66,2 |
| <b>Content</b>      | 54          | 34,4 | 103 | 65,6 | 48           | 30,6 | 109 | 69,4 |
| <b>Mechanics</b>    | 25          | 15,9 | 132 | 84,1 | 33           | 21,0 | 124 | 79,0 |
| <b>Style</b>        | 14          | 8,9  | 143 | 91,1 | 20           | 12,7 | 137 | 87,3 |

Table 20 indicates what teachers do when their students are not responding to teacher feedback or respond poorly. 50% teachers stated that they use some follow-up methods while the rest chose to ignore them 22% or make them write another draft 27%.

**Table 20. Follow-up Methods**

| Items                                  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| <b>I ignore them</b>                   | 35        | 22,3    | 22,3          | 22,3               |
| <b>I have them write another draft</b> | 43        | 27,4    | 27,4          | 49,7               |
| <b>I use follow-up methods</b>         | 78        | 49,7    | 49,7          | 99,4               |
| <b>Total</b>                           | 157       | 100,0   | 100,0         | 157                |

#### **4.3.4. Is There Any Significant Difference of Teachers' Perceptions of Giving Feedback Regarding Gender, Education Level and Teaching Experience?**

We used t-test to find an answer to this research question. The sig. value in our example is 0.48 (Table 21). This value is less than .05. Because of this, we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between female and male teachers in terms of giving feedback.

**Table 21. Perceptions According to Gender**

| Items  | N   | m    | s.d | t   | p   |
|--------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Female | 104 | 3.47 | .31 | .70 | .48 |
| Male   | 53  | 3.43 | .37 |     |     |

When we examine Table 22, we see that means are very close to each other. The mean of teachers having BA degree is 3.45, MA degree is 3.44 and PhD degree is 3.57. ANOVA was used to compare the means. The sig. value is in Table 23 is 0.40. This value is less than .05. Because of this, we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference among different educational backgrounds in terms of giving feedback.

**Table 22. Descriptive Results of Perceptions According to Education Level**

| Items | M    | Std D | N  |
|-------|------|-------|----|
| BA    | 3.45 | .29   | 86 |
| MA    | 3.44 | .35   | 56 |
| PhD   | 3.57 | .46   | 15 |

**Table 23. ANOVA for Perceptions According to Education Level**

| Items          | Sum of squares | M. square | F   | P   |
|----------------|----------------|-----------|-----|-----|
| Between groups | 0.24           | .10       | .92 | .40 |
| Within groups  | 17.05          | .11       |     |     |
| Total          | 17.26          |           |     |     |

When we examine Table 24, we see that item 3 has the highest mean (4.44) and the mean of the other items are closely similar (between 3.42 and 3.51). We used ANOVA in order to explore whether there is a statistically significance. The sig. value is 0.61 (Table 25). This value is less than .05. Because of this, we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference in giving feedback among the teachers having different teaching experience years.

**Table 24. Descriptive Results of Perceptions According to Teaching Experience**

| Items              | M    | Std D | N   |
|--------------------|------|-------|-----|
| 1. 1-3 years       | 3.51 | .34   | 20  |
| 2. 4-6 years       | 3.52 | .34   | 36  |
| 3. 7-10 years      | 4.44 | .30   | 33  |
| 4. 11-14 years     | 3.42 | .37   | 34  |
| 5. 15 years - over | 3.42 | .29   | 34  |
| Total              | 3.46 | .33   | 157 |

**Table 25. ANOVA for Perceptions According to Teaching Experience**

| Items          | Sum of squares | M. square | F    | P   |
|----------------|----------------|-----------|------|-----|
| Between groups | .300           | .075      | .673 | .61 |
| Within groups  | 16.96          |           |      |     |
| Total          | 17.76          |           |      |     |

#### 4.3.5. Is there any significant difference of type of feedback teachers give in terms of gender, education level and teaching experience?

We used t-test to find an answer to this research question. The sig. value in our example is 0.82 (Table 26). This value is less than .05 and because of this, we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference between female and male teachers in the type of feedback teachers give.

**Table 26. Type of Feedback According to Gender**

| Items  | N   | m    | s.d | t   | p   |
|--------|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|
| Female | 104 | 2.77 | .64 | .22 | .82 |
| Male   | 53  | 2.79 | .71 |     |     |

The means in Table 27 are close to each other (2.72, 2.75, 2.83) When we examine ANOVA results (Table 28), we see that the sig. value is  $0.77 < 0.05$  and we can

conclude that there is no statistically significant difference in the type of feedback teachers give in terms of having different educational backgrounds

**Table 27. Descriptive Results of Type of Feedback According to Education Level**

|            | <b>M</b> | <b>Std D</b> | <b>N</b> |
|------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| <b>BA</b>  | 2.75     | .66          | 86       |
| <b>MA</b>  | 2.83     | .63          | 56       |
| <b>PhD</b> | 2.72     | .85          | 15       |

**Table 28. ANOVA for Type of Feedback According to Education Level**

|                       | <b>Sum of squares</b> | <b>M. square</b> | <b>F</b> | <b>P</b> |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------|----------|
| <b>Between groups</b> | .22                   | .11              | .25      | .77      |
| <b>Within groups</b>  | 69.32                 | .45              |          |          |
| <b>Total</b>          | 69.54                 |                  |          |          |

When we examine Table 29, we see that item 1 has the highest mean (3.08) and the mean of the other items are closely similar (between 2.69 and 2.80). When we examine ANOVA results (Table 30), we see that the sig. value is  $0.29 < 0.05$  and we can conclude that there is no statistically significant difference among the teachers in the type of feedback in terms of having different teaching experience years.

**Table 29. Descriptive Results of Type of Feedback According to Teaching Experience**

| <b>Items</b>   | <b>M</b> | <b>Std D</b> | <b>N</b> |
|----------------|----------|--------------|----------|
| <b>1-3</b>     | 3.08     | .62          | 20       |
| <b>4-6</b>     | 2.76     | .65          | 36       |
| <b>7-10</b>    | 2.75     | .63          | 33       |
| <b>11-14</b>   | 2.69     | .68          | 34       |
| <b>15-over</b> | 2.73     | .71          | 34       |
| <b>Total</b>   | 2.80     | .65          | 157      |

**Table 30. ANOVA for Type of Feedback According to Teaching Experience**

| Items                 | Sum of squares | M. square | F    | P   |
|-----------------------|----------------|-----------|------|-----|
| <b>Between groups</b> | 2.20           | .55       | 1.24 | .29 |
| <b>Within groups</b>  | 67.34          | .44       |      |     |
| <b>Total</b>          | 69.54          |           |      |     |

Overall, findings show that teachers value feedback. However, there are some misconceptions and teachers seem confused. While 77% of the teachers stated their students like written commentary and want more feedback, half of them stated they do not revise and their main aim is getting better grades, not improving their writing. They contradict themselves. If students want more written feedback, their aim may not be only getting better grades. 74% of the teachers stated they can provide accurate feedback on any problem. However, half of them stated they are in need of training on teacher feedback. Moreover, half of them apply process-based writing in their classes and findings show that they do not provide feedback accurately for process-based writing. Literature (Peterson, 2010; Keh, 1990) recommends to provide feedback on different areas for earlier and later drafts but the teachers provide feedback on the same areas for both drafts.

According to Dodgson (2013), feedback focuses on content while error correction focuses on mistakes with grammar, vocabulary and structure. Feedback encourages students to redraft while error correction guides students to improved language use. When we examine the qualitative data, we see responses to the question “what is feedback?” as it is correction or error correction. When we look at the quantitative data, 70% teachers prefer to use evaluative feedback rather than descriptive feedback. They prefer to correct errors. This shows, some teachers are not clear what feedback is and its use.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **5. CONCLUSIONS**

#### **5.1. Introduction**

This chapter presents a brief summary and the conclusions of the study. Then it focuses on the suggestions for further studies.

#### **5.2. Summary of the Study**

The main purpose of this study was to find out the perceptions, feedback type preference and focus point of feedback of Turkish EFL teachers regarding giving written feedback through a questionnaire and then, to find if there is any difference among them in terms of gender, educational level and teaching experience.

This study was carried out with volunteer 157 EFL teachers from various cities of Turkey. As mentioned previously (see Chapter 3), this study employed both quantitative and qualitative research methods. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the items in the questionnaire and content analysis was used to analyze the responses to the open-ended question.

The following research questions, formulated to conduct the study, will lead the chapter:

1. What are the perceptions of teachers' of English towards feedback on writing?
2. What type of feedback do the teachers prefer to give?
3. What do the teachers mainly focus while giving feedback?
4. Is there any significant difference of teachers' perceptions of giving feedback regarding gender, education level and teaching experience?
5. Is there any significant difference of type of feedback teachers give in terms of gender, education level and teaching experience?

### **5.3. Conclusions and Discussion**

According to the responses to the open-ended question in the survey, it is clearly understood that most of the EFL teachers think feedback is a multi-dimensional tool for improvement, motivation and evaluation. While some of them think feedback is just a correction, others believe that correction is just a part of feedback and it guides students. Half of the teachers stated that feedback is the part of teaching and learning process in formative assessment and process based writing but others still focus on product. This confirms the problem stated in the first chapter, which is not having been adapted the understanding of new curriculum. As Richardson (1998) discusses some teachers resist change, “they just get in a groove of doing what they have always done and what they are comfortable with” (para, 1) and “teachers resist doing whatever is being proposed because they want to cling to their old ways. Change makes people feel uncomfortable” (para, 3). She also states teacher change is a voluntary process and there are of course teachers who change. There can be several underlying reasons why they resist change or do not prefer to focus on process. MoNE or education faculties of universities can organize events to find out those reasons and highlight the importance of feedback and process-based writing. Majority of the teachers think that feedback is necessary both for students and teachers. Students need it for improvement and development and teachers need it to adjust their teaching. As literature says, most of the teachers believe that feedback raises awareness of students to identify the gap and advises some clues for improvement (Ramprasad, 83; Sadler, 83; Boston, 2002; Broadfoot et al. 2002). The qualitative data justifies the quantitative data about perceptions of teachers as well.

When we look at the quantitative data to see the perceptions, we see similar understanding of WFB. Feedback is crucial and it has a great impact in students’ process for a vast majority of the teachers. The literature says that feedback should be on both positive and negative aspects of writings (Hyland, 2003) but half of the teachers think their students are discouraged when they see negative parts. So, the balance needs to be adjusted carefully and feedback should be given in a constructive way on negative aspects as well. In this way, students will benefit from feedback more. Otherwise, students will think they are good enough and do not any improvement.

Half of the teachers believe that students' main interest is in getting a better grade, not improving their writing. If teachers have a consistency in applying formative assessment and process based writing, their students can get used to it and understand the rationale and necessity of feedback for their improvement and for further better grades.

One interesting result of the study is that teachers do not consider WFB as time-consuming or tedious unlike the other researches in the literature (Sirigiri, 2013; Bamkin, 2013; Arora, 2015; Lee, 2009). It is obvious that it takes time to provide effective feedback and there is a lot of paper work when we think the number of the students. Somehow, this is a good thing that teachers do not give up giving feedback despite these difficulties or they may have found a practical way to provide feedback. This issue can be searched more detailed.

As there are a lot of teachers who have different experiences and backgrounds, not all of them see themselves as capable of providing effective feedback or have enough information about it. They stated they need some training on it. As a consequence of this, MoNE, in co-operation with universities, can organize some in-service trainings or workshops to fulfill these teachers' needs of providing effective feedback.

It is inevitable that teachers use a variety of feedback type as a consequence of their differences and learners. Most of them use individualized feedback and a combination of all types. There is a surprising result here. Although most of them stated that they have guiding principles or personal philosophies and explain their approaches to providing written feedback in advance, they did not choose the option they prioritize feedback according to rubrics.

It is a general fact that we become better at doing things with more practice and time. So, it is the same in providing feedback. We learn from our experiences as the teachers indicated they respond to student writing more effectively with more teaching experience. The more practice the better they become.

Teachers in this study do not prefer to use only one type of feedback. They use a combination of them while half of them combine all together. Although giving grades is not suggested (Keh, 1990), most of the teachers are in favour of giving grades or

marks besides written comments and error correction, which means they prefer evaluative feedback more. The most preferred feedback is indirect feedback as they provide a corrected version.

Unfortunately only half of the teachers require multiple drafts from their students. This result justifies the problem statement of the study. It shows some teachers still have problems in adapting process based writing in their classes. Of course there are several underlying reasons why they do not use it but this study is just to get the general picture.

When we look at the focus point of WFB, the top foci are grammar, vocabulary, content and organization. When we compare the focus point of earlier and later drafts the result is the same. They provide feedback on the same aspects for both drafts. However, focus points should be different in the drafts in a process-based writing (Peterson, 2010; Keh, 1990). Keh (1990) states feedback on early drafts should be on content, organization and style as students try to form their ideas as they can rewrite or eliminate some paragraphs. So, the feedback on grammar, vocabulary and mechanics will be of no use in the early part of process. When we have a better text in terms of content and organization, feedback on grammar can be provided. This result conflicts with the perception that half of the teachers claimed they can provide accurate feedback. As stated in chapter 1, teachers do not seem to have a clear idea about a good feedback practice.

Although most of the teachers provide selective feedback, there are still grammarian teachers who correct all the errors in their students' writings. Keh (1990) indicates, teachers should not be grammarian to avoid ineffective feedback and it should be selective as students cannot pay attention everything.

In conclusion, teachers have positive perceptions towards feedback and more than half of the teachers use a combination of techniques, provide individualized and selective feedback while giving feedback but only half of them apply process based writing in their classes and they are more concerned with grammar and vocabulary rather than content, organization and style.

#### **5.4. Suggestions for Further Research**

First of all, as earlier noted in the limitation part (see Section 1.5.) the number of the participants was not enough to put forth the whole picture about Turkish EFL teachers' perception of written feedback, therefore, more and detailed studies are needed to be conducted to confirm the conclusions.

Another point is that this study only researched teacher feedback. To see the total understanding of feedback, other feedback sources such as peer-feedback or conferences can be included in the studies. In addition to this teacher commentary is a crucial aspect of feedback. It can be studied in a detailed way and we can learn how effective they are. In Ellis' typology (2009), there are two more types of feedback as electronic feedback and reformulation. New studies can also include these items.

In addition, half of the teachers do not use process based approach although they are required to do it. So, the reasons under this problem can be searched and a solution can be found to solve it.

Moreover, beliefs and practices may not always be the same as Borg (2003) states or there can be misconceptions of feedback and it may not be provided effectively. Therefore, a detailed study researching on the feedback practices of teachers needed to be done. If their practices and beliefs are compared, we can have more accurate data.

Lastly, when we look at the literature we see the studies are mostly on perceptions of students towards feedback. So, their point of view should also be taken into consideration and compared with teachers'. In the end we can get the whole picture about feedback and further studies can be done to provide it more effectively.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Alamrew, G. M. (2005). A study on the perception of writing, writing instruction and students' writing performance of students. Unpublished PhD Dissertation. Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University
- Alceso, Mark A. (2011). [PowerPoint slides] Retrived May 5, 2015 from: <http://www.slideshare.net/Angilo/descriptive-research>
- Arora, S. (2015). Defossilising the errors of ESL learners through feedback. *Innovation in English Language Teacher Education*, 192
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of second language writing*, 9(3), 227-257.
- Ball, P. (2010). *Effective Feedback? Classroom Edition*
- Bamkin, S. (2013). Giving students effective written feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 125-129.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessment*. Granada Learning.
- Boston, C. (2002). *The Concept of Formative Assessment*. ERIC Digest.
- Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language teaching*, 36(02), 81-109.
- Broadfoot, P., Weeden, P., & Winter, J. (2002). *Assessment: What's in it for Schools?*. Routledge.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. ASCD.
- Bruner, J. S. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Harvard University Press.
- Burns, A. (1992). Teacher beliefs and their influence on classroom practice. *Prospect*, 7(3), 56-66.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Chapin, R., & Terdal, M. (1990). *Responding to Our Response: Student Strategies for Responding to Teacher Written Comments*.

- Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crooks, T. J. (1988). The impact of classroom evaluation practices on students. *Review of educational research*, 58(4), 438-481.
- Dodgson, D. (2013). *Reflections of a Teacher and Learner*. Retrieved May, 5 from: <http://www.davedodgson.com/2013/11/feedback-and-error-correction-with-web.html>
- Ellis, R., Sheen, Y., Murakami, M., & Takashima, H. (2008). The effects of focused and unfocused written corrective feedback in an English as a foreign language context. *System*, 36(3), 353-371.
- Ellis, R. (2009). A typology of written corrective feedback types. *ELT journal*, 63(2), 97-107.
- Erkkilä, M. (2013). Teacher written feedback: teachers' perceptions of given feedback.
- Fathman, A., & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: focus on form versus content (78-190), *Second Language Writing*, Kroll B.(cd.).
- Ferede, T., Melese, E., & Tefera, E. (2013). A descriptive Survey on Teachers' Perception of EFL Writing and Their Practice of Teaching Writing: Preparatory Schools in Jimma Zone in Focus. *Ethiopian Journal of Education and Sciences*, 8(1), 29-52.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. *Feedback in second language writing: Contexts and issues*, 81-104.
- Ferris, D. (2007). Preparing teachers to respond to student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(3), 165-193.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*.
- .Fraenkel J. R., & Norman E. Wallen (2009). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education* 7th Edition
- Gensburg, R., & Herman, B. (2009). An Analysis of the theory of constructivism as it relates to preservice and in-service teachers and technology. *EDTech: Opportunity Realized*. Retrieved May 5, 2015 from:

<https://sites.google.com/a/boisestate.edu/edtechtheories/an-analysis-of-the-theory-of-constructivism-as-it-relates-to-pre-service-and-in-service-teachers-and-technology-1>

- Han, Z. H. (2002). Rethinking the role of corrective feedback in communicative language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 33(1), 1-34.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of educational research*, 77(1), 81-112.
- Hennink, M., Hutter, I., & Bailey, A. (2010). *Qualitative research methods*. Sage.
- Heritage, M. (2010). Corwin Press. ISBN: 978-1-4129-7504-9 *formative assessment making it happen in the classroom* (1st Edition)
- Holsti, O. R. (1968). Content analysis. *The handbook of social psychology*, 2, 596-692.
- Hopkins, W. G. (2000), "Quantitative Research Design", *Sportscience*, 4/1. Retrieved May 5, 2015 from: <http://www.sportsci.org/2000/1/index.html>
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language teaching*, 39(02), 83-101.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On Communicative Competence. In J. P. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected Readings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Jacobs, G. M., Curtis, A., Braine, G., & Huang, S. Y. (1998). Feedback on student writing: Taking the middle path. *Journal of second language writing*, 7(3), 307-317.
- Johnstun, A. (2008). *Comparing Teacher and Student Perceptions about Second Language Writing Feedback*.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: A model and methods for implementation. *ELT journal*, 44(4), 294-304.
- Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research* 47: pp. 211-232
- Ko, K. (2010). *Perceptions of KFL/ESL teachers in North America regarding feedback on college student writing* (Doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University).
- Lee, I. (2008). Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17(2), 69-85.

- Lee, I. (2009). Ten mismatches between teachers' beliefs and written feedback practice. *ELT journal*, 63(1), 13-22.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (1990). Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in Communicative Language Teaching: Effects on second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448.
- Liu, E. Z., Lin, S. S., Chiu, C. H., & Yuan, S. M. (2001). Web-based peer review: The learner as both adapter and reviewer. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 44(3), 246-251
- Mack, L. (2009). Issues and Dilemmas: What conditions are necessary for effective teacher written feedback for ESL Learners? 33-39.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2003). Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective. *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing*, 1, 15-34.
- MEB, (2011). Ortaöğretim Kurumları İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı.
- MEB, (2013). İlköğretim Kurumları İngilizce Dersi Öğretim Programı.
- Mayor, M. (Ed.). (2009). *Longman dictionary of contemporary English*. Pearson Education India.
- Montgomery, J. L., & Baker, W. (2007). Teacher-written feedback: Student perceptions, teacher self-assessment, and actual teacher performance. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(2), 82-99.
- Noë, A. (2004). *Action in perception*. MIT press.
- Nunan, D. (1999). *Second Language Teaching & Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers p.304
- Peterson, S. S. (2010). *What Works? Research into Practice*.
- Qin, J., & Karabacak, E. (2013). Turkish EFL university instructors' practices in providing written feedback. *Conference proceedings published by Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* (70), 95-100. Antalya: Akdeniz University.
- Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioral Science*, 28(1), 4-13.

- Rea-Dickins, P. (2006). Currents and eddies in the discourse of assessment: a learning-focused interpretation1. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 163-188.
- Richardson, V. (1998). *How Teachers Change*. May, 2015, retrieved from: <http://www.ncsall.net/index.html?id=395.html>
- Sadler, D. R. (1983). Evaluation and the improvement of academic learning. *Journal of Higher Education* 54: pp. 60-79
- Sadler, D. R. (1998). Formative assessment: Revisiting the territory. *Assessment in education*, 5(1), 77-84.
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional science*, 18(2), 119-144.
- Sheen, Y., Wright, D., & Moldawa, A. (2009). Differential effects of focused and unfocused written correction on the accurate use of grammatical forms by adult ESL learners. *System*, 37(4), 556-569.
- Sheen, Y., & Ellis, R. (2011). Corrective feedback in language teaching. *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*, 2, 593-610.
- Sirigiri, M. B. (2013). *Enabling Autonomy in Writing through Indirect Feedback*.
- Steele, V. (2004) Product and process writing: A comparison. *Teaching English – British Council BBC*. Retrieved May 5, 2015 from: <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/product-process-writing-a-comparison>
- Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2012). Approaches to Teaching Second Language Writing. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 3, 1-26.
- Tunstall, P., & Gipps, C. (1996). Teacher feedback to young children in formative assessment: A typology. *British Educational Research Journal*, 22(4), 389-404.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language-Revised edition*.
- Wellington, J., & Szczerbinski, M. (2007). *Research methods for the social sciences*. A&C Black.
- Wen, Y. (2013). Teacher Written Feedback on L2 Student Writings. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(2), 427-431.

- White, R., & Arndt, V. (1991). *Process Writing*. London: Longman.
- Winnie P., & Butler D. (1994) Student cognition in learning from teaching. In Husen T, Postlethwaite T (eds) *International encyclopaedia of education*, 2nd edn, pp 5738–5745. Pergamon, Oxford
- Zaman, M. M., & Azad, M. A. K. (2012). Feedback in EFL Writing at Tertiary Level: Teachers' and Learners' Perceptions.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79-98.

## **7. APPENDIX**

### **7.1. Appendix 1: Questionnaire**

I am an MA student investigating the Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions of written feedback for my thesis and would be grateful if you could help me by completing this questionnaire. It is totally anonymous and the information provided will only be used in my research. It should take 10-15 minutes. Please read the questions carefully and complete them as indicated. Please answer the questions honestly to help me gain an accurate picture of teachers' practices and opinions on providing written feedback.

Thank you very much for your help.

Rabia AKÇAY

Çağ University, Faculty of Arts and Sciences ELT Department

#### **Part I**

This part asks about basic demographic information. Please choose the most appropriate response or write additional information in the space provided.

**1. What is your gender?**

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

**2. What is your highest level of education?**

- ☐ BA
- ☐ Currently working on MA
- ☐ MA
- ☐ Currently working on Ph.D.
- ☐ Ph.D.

**3. How many years have you been teaching English? \_\_\_\_\_ yrs**

**4. How long have you been teaching in the current institution?**

- ☐ 1 year
- ☐ 1 – 3 years
- ☐ 3 – 5 years
- ☐ 5- 9 years
- ☐ 10 years or over

5. Do you have any teaching experience in other institutions? If yes, please indicate the teaching context and duration.

|              |           |           |             |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Kindergarten | Primary   | Secondary | High school |
| Tertiary     |           |           |             |
| _____ yrs    | _____ yrs | _____ yrs | _____ yrs   |
| _____ yrs    |           |           |             |

6. You work in a

- ☐ state school \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ private school \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ university \_\_\_\_\_

7. Where do you think your personal beliefs about written feedback mostly come from?

- ☐ Teacher preparation courses
- ☐ Personal experiences as a student
- ☐ Personal experiences as a teacher
- ☐ Reading literature (i.e., research findings on written feedback)
- ☐ Teacher peers
- ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

## Part II.

This part asks about types of written feedback you use when responding to student writing. In each item, please mark the closest types of feedback you normally provide

1. What aspects of student writing do you focus on while providing feedback? [Please mark the most important three]

- ☐ Grammar
- ☐ Vocabulary (i.e. word Choices, collocations, etc. )
- ☐ Content (i.e. ideas)
- ☐ Organization (i.e. logic development)
- ☐ Style (i.e. tone, expression)
- ☐ Mechanics (i.e. punctuation, spelling etc.)

**2. What type of feedback do you usually give?**

- ☐ Only grades/marks
- ☐ Only error correction
- ☐ Only written comments
- ☐ Grade/mark and error correction
- ☐ Grades/marks and written comments
- ☐ Error correction and written comments
- ☐ Grades/marks, error correction and written comments
- ☐ None of the above

**3. If you provide feedback on the language use of student writing, on what portions of grammar errors do you provide feedback?**

- ☐ I address all grammar errors that students make. (comprehensive feedback)
- ☐ I address only a few significant grammar errors. (selective feedback)
- ☐ I do not provide grammar feedback.

**4. If you address only a few significant grammar errors on students' papers, how do you prioritize those grammar errors? (Select all that may apply.)**

- ☐ Based on course rubric, grading policy, or external standards
  - ☐ Based on the task on which students are working
  - ☐ Based on the needs of individual students
  - ☐ Based on lessons recently given in class
  - ☐ Other (please specify)
- 

**5. What is your primary focus when you write comments on students' papers?**

- ☐ I focus on positive sides of students' papers and try to provide encouragement.
  - ☐ I focus on room for improvement and try to provide constructive criticism.
  - ☐ I focus on both strong and weak aspects of students' papers and provide both encouragement and constructive criticism equally.
  - ☐ Other (please specify)
-

6. Do you provide the same types of feedback to all students? (i.e., comprehensive vs. selective, direct vs. indirect, and local vs. global issues)

- ☐ Yes, I usually provide the same types of feedback to all students.
  - ☐ No, I usually provide individualized feedback to each student.
  - ☐ Other (please specify)
- 

7. Do you require students to review your feedback and submit revised versions of their papers?

- ☐ Yes, I ask student to submit more than one draft after reviewing my feedback.
  - ☐ No, I do not ask student to submit revised versions.
  - ☐ Other (please specify)
- 

**(If your answer is “No” for question 7, skip number 8 and 9)**

8. If you require students to submit **multiple drafts**, on what aspects of **the early draft(s)** do you provide feedback? (Select all that may apply.)

- ☐ Grammar
- ☐ Vocabulary (i.e. word Choices, collocations, etc. )
- ☐ Content (i.e. ideas)
- ☐ Organization (i.e. logic development)
- ☐ Style (i.e. tone, expression)
- ☐ Mechanics (i.e. punctuation, spelling etc.)

9. If you require students to submit **multiple drafts**, on what aspects of **the later draft(s)** do you provide feedback? (Select all that may apply.)

- ☐ Grammar
- ☐ Vocabulary (i.e. word Choices, collocations, etc. )
- ☐ Content (i.e. ideas)
- ☐ Organization (i.e. logic development)
- ☐ Style (i.e. tone, expression)
- ☐ Mechanics (i.e. punctuation, spelling etc.)

**10.** What do you do when you see that students aren't responding to your feedback or when they respond poorly?

- o I usually ignore them and do not provide more feedback.
- o I have them write another draft.
- o I use follow-up methods other than written feedback. (specify)

### Part III

This part asks about your feedback practice. Rate the frequency with which you use each of the following error feedback techniques according to the scale below. How often do you use the following error feedback techniques?

**1- Never    2- Rarely    3- Sometimes    4- Often    5- Always**

|                                                                                                                                                                                            | <b>1</b> | <b>2</b> | <b>3</b> | <b>4</b> | <b>5</b> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| <b>1.</b> I indicate (underline/circle) errors and correct them, e.g., has <u>went</u> <sup>gone</sup> .                                                                                   |          |          |          |          |          |
| <b>2.</b> I indicate (underline/circle) errors, correct them and categorize them (with the help of a marking code), e.g., has <u>went</u> <sup>gone</sup> (verb form).                     |          |          |          |          |          |
| <b>3.</b> I indicate (underline/circle) errors, but I don't correct them, e.g., has <u>went</u> .                                                                                          |          |          |          |          |          |
| <b>4.</b> I indicate (underline/circle) errors and categorize them (with the help of a marking code), but I don't correct them, e.g., has <u>went</u> (verb form).                         |          |          |          |          |          |
| <b>5.</b> I hint at the location of errors, e.g., by putting a mark in the margin to indicate an error on a specific line.                                                                 |          |          |          |          |          |
| <b>6.</b> I hint at the location of errors and categorize them (with the help of a marking code) e.g., by writing 'Prep' in the margin to indicate a preposition error on a specific line. |          |          |          |          |          |

### Part IV

This part asks about your degree of agreement with various statements about written feedback. Please indicate your opinion after each statement by marking a choice that best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement.

|                                                                                                                                          | <b>Strongly Disagree</b> | <b>Disagree</b>       | <b>Neutral</b>        | <b>Agree</b>          | <b>Strongly Agree</b> |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| <b>1.</b> Providing feedback on student writing is an important part of being a second/foreign language teacher.                         | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>2.</b> Teachers' written commentary helps students improve their writing.                                                             | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>3.</b> Responding to student writing is time-consuming.                                                                               | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>4.</b> Providing written commentary on student writing is tedious.                                                                    | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>5.</b> Students like to receive teachers' written commentary on their papers.                                                         | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>6.</b> Generally, students want more feedback on their writing.                                                                       | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>7.</b> My written feedback type changes a lot from situation to situation.                                                            | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>8.</b> I explain my approach to providing written feedback in advance so that my students may fully understand it.                    | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>9.</b> I can provide accurate feedback on any problem in my students' writing.                                                        | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>10.</b> Students are discouraged when my written feedback on their writing is negative.                                               | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>11.</b> When students revise according to my feedback, their main interest is in getting a better grade, not improving their writing. | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>12.</b> The more teaching experience I have, the more effectively I respond to student writing.                                       | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>13.</b> I do not have any guiding principles or personal philosophies when I respond to student writing.                              | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <b>14.</b> I need some training on teacher feedback because I do not have enough knowledge of giving writing feedback.                   | <input type="radio"/>    | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |