

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF FEEDBACK LITERACY IN HIGHER
EDUCATION: UNCOVERING ENHANCING AND IMPEDING FACTORS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

CEREN KARA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES, CURRICULUM AND
INSTRUCTION

SEPTEMBER 2021

Approval of the thesis:

**A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF FEEDBACK LITERACY IN HIGHER
EDUCATION: UNCOVERING ENHANCING AND IMPEDING FACTORS**

submitted by **CEREN KARA** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of **Master of Science in Educational Sciences, Curriculum and Instruction, the
Graduate School of Social Sciences of Middle East Technical University** by,

Prof. Dr. Yaşar KONDAKÇI
Dean
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Hanife AKAR
Head of Department
Department of Educational Sciences

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yeşim ÇAPA AYDIN
Supervisor
Department of Educational Sciences

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Dr. Ayşegül DALOĞLU (Head of the Examining Committee)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Foreign Language Education

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yeşim ÇAPA AYDIN (Supervisor)
Middle East Technical University
Department of Educational Sciences

Prof. Dr. Oya YERİN GÜNERİ
TED University
Department of Educational Sciences



I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: Ceren KARA

Signature:

ABSTRACT

A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF FEEDBACK LITERACY IN HIGHER EDUCATION: UNCOVERING ENHANCING AND IMPEDING FACTORS

KARA, Ceren

M.S., The Department of Educational Sciences, Curriculum and Instruction

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yeřim APA AYDIN

September 2021, 173 pages

Feedback literacy refers to learners' competence and tendency to understand feedback information, make an evaluative judgment and use it to improve work and learning. The present study attempted to unveil feedback types, amount, and timing; and the indicators of feedback literacy along with the enhancing and impeding factors for feedback literacy. To answer the research questions of the study, a basic qualitative research design was employed. In total, 39 undergraduate students enrolled in English Language Teaching Program of two public universities and one private university in Ankara, Turkey, participated in the study. Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data. An inductive content analysis of qualitative data was conducted to generate codes and themes. During the coding process, the focus was constantly on the research questions consisting of four categories: feedback type, amount, and timing; feedback literacy; factors enhancing feedback literacy; and factors impeding feedback literacy. As a result, the findings of the current study revealed that the amount and timing of feedback depended on assessment methods and other factors such as task, teacher, and the number of mistakes. The indicators of student feedback literacy encompassed appreciating feedback, making judgment, managing affect, and taking

action. Lastly, the factors both enhancing and impeding feedback literacy were found to be comprised of instructional factors, feedback characteristics, learner characteristics, and social factors.

Keywords: feedback, effective feedback, feedback literacy, higher education, basic qualitative research



ÖZ

YÜKSEKÖĞRETİMDE GERİ BİLDİRİM OKURYAZARLIĞI ÜZERİNE NİTEL BİR ARAŞTIRMA: GERİ BİLDİRİM OKURYAZARLIĞINI ARTTIRAN VE AZALTAN FAKTÖRLER

KARA, Ceren

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri, Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Doç. Dr. Yeşim ÇAPA AYDIN

Eylül 2021, 173 sayfa

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığı, bir öğrencinin geri bildirimini anlayabilme, değerlendirici yargıda bulunabilme ve geri bildirimini bir diğer çalışmaları veya öğrenmeyi geliştirmek için kullanabilme kabiliyetleri ve eğilimleridir. Bu çalışma ise geri bildirim türlerini, miktarını ve zamanlamasını; geri bildirim okuryazarlığı göstergelerini; geri bildirim kullanımını arttıran ve azaltan faktörleri ortaya koymayı amaçlamaktadır. Araştırma sorularını yanıtlamak için temel nitel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Çalışmaya Ankara’da bulunan iki devlet üniversitesi ve bir özel üniversitede İngilizce Öğretmenliği programına kayıtlı 39 üniversite öğrencisi katılmıştır. Veriler ise yarı-yapılandırılmış görüşme tekniği yoluyla toplanmıştır. Kod ve temaların oluşturulması amacıyla nitel veriler tümevarımsal içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Kodlama sürecinde sürekli olarak dört kategoriden oluşan araştırma sorularına odaklanılmıştır: geri bildirim türleri, miktarı ve zamanlaması, geri bildirim okuryazarlığı, geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran ve azaltan faktörler. Çalışmanın bulguları, geri bildirim miktarının ve zamanlamasının değerlendirme yöntemlerinin yanı sıra öğretmen, çalışma ve hata sayısına göre farklılık gösterdiğini ortaya koymuştur. Ayrıca geri

bildirim okuryazarlığının göstergelerinin geri bildirimin değerini anlama, değerlendirici karar verme, duyguları kontrol etme ve geri bildirim sonuçlarını uygulama olduğu belirlenmiştir. Geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran ve azaltan faktörlerin ise öğretim bağlamı, geri bildirim özellikleri, öğrenci rolleri/özellikleri ve sosyal bağlam olduğu ortaya koyulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: geri bildirim, etkili geri bildirim, geri bildirim okuryazarlığı, yükseköğretim, temel nitel araştırma



To My Beloved Sisters, Mother and Father



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I owe my advisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Yeřim apa Aydın inexpressible thanks due to her support and guidance from the very beginning of my master’s degree to the end of this academic work. She was very generous and punctual in supporting me whenever I lost the track of this study. I have been always impressed with her mindset and expertise, thereby having taken her as a role model following her style in my current and future works. It has been a great pleasure for me to work with her.

I would like to present my thanks to Prof. Dr. Ayřegöl Daloęlu and Prof. Dr. Oya Yerin Güneri for their insightful and critical contributions to this study along with motivating words during the thesis defense.

I can never thank enough to my lovely budlet Ada Su Kara and my beloved sister Cansu Kara along with my mother Yasemin Kara and my father Erdoğan Kara. They did their best to give me a helping hand and motivate me in this challenging process. They always believed in me from the depths of their heart.

There has been a group of people whom I have been always grateful for their endless support. I would like to express my warm and sincere thanks to my dearest friends Gizem Baran and Altınay Özen for their eagerness to listen to me and offer immediate help to revive my motivation whenever I felt lost. I also would like to thank to my roommate Raha Shabani for her company. She was always generous for giving a helping hand whenever I needed. Last but not least, I am inexpressibly grateful to Onur Cořkun for keeping my hopes up and for believing in me with all his heart and soul whenever I felt down.

I also would like to send my regards to TÜBİTAK for the scholarship they provided me to pursue this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xv
CHAPTERS	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the Study.....	1
1.2. Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.3. Significance of the Study	3
1.4. Definition of Terms	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1. Assessment and Learning.....	7
2.1.1. Summative Assessment.....	7
2.1.2. Formative Assessment.....	8
2.2. Feedback.....	9
2.2.1. Effective feedback	10
2.2.2. Characteristics of feedback.....	12
2.2.3. Research on feedback	14
2.3. Assessment and Feedback Literacy.....	23
2.3.1. Assessment Literacy	23
2.3.2. Feedback Literacy	27
2.3.3. Social Constructivist Theory of Feedback Literacy	31
2.3.4. Research on Feedback Literacy	35
3. METHOD.....	46
3.1. Research Questions	46
3.2. Design of the Study	46
3.3. Context of the Study.....	47

3.4. Participants.....	51
3.5. Instruments.....	53
3.6. Data Collection Procedures.....	55
3.7. Data Analysis	56
3.8. Trustworthiness Issues	60
3.8.1. Credibility or Internal Validity.....	60
3.8.2. Dependability	61
3.8.3. Transferability	62
3.9. Limitations of the Study.....	62
4. RESULTS	64
4.1. Feedback Types.....	64
4.2. Timing of Feedback	66
4.3. Amount of Feedback.....	67
4.4. Feedback Literacy	69
4.4.1. Appreciating Feedback.....	70
4.4.2. Making Judgment.....	72
4.4.3. Managing Affect.....	74
4.4.4. Taking Action.....	75
4.5. Enhancing Factors	76
4.5.1. Feedback Characteristics.....	76
4.5.2. Instructional Factors	80
4.5.3. Learner Characteristics and Roles.....	82
4.5.4. Social Factors	86
4.5.4.1. Teacher-related factors	87
4.5.4.2. Peer-related factors	89
4.6. Impeding Factors.....	90
4.6.1. Feedback Characteristics.....	91
4.6.2. Instructional Factors	94
4.6.3. Learner Characteristics.....	94
4.6.4. Social Factors	98
4.6.4.1. Teacher-related factors	98
4.6.4.2. Peer-related factors	100
5. DISCUSSION	106
5.1. Conclusion of Results	106
5.1.1. Feedback Types, Amount, and Timing	106
5.1.2. Indicators of Feedback Literacy	107

5.1.3. Feedback Characteristics	108
5.1.4. Instructional Factors	109
5.1.5. Learner Characteristics	110
5.1.6. Social Factors	111
5.2. Implication for Practice	112
5.3. Recommendations for Further Research	114
REFERENCES	116
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	142
APPENDIX B: APPROVAL OF METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE	145
APPENDIX C: LIST OF THEMES AND DEFINITIONS OF CODES	146
APPENDIX D: TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET	160
APPENDIX E: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU	173

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Assessment Methods across Universities before Remote Education.....	48
Table 3.2 Distribution of Feedback Format of Assessment Methods across Universities before Remote Education.....	49
Table 3.3 Assessment Methods across Universities during Remote Education	49
Table 3.4 Distribution of Feedback Format of Assessment Methods across Universities during Remote Education	50
Table 3.5 The Number of Junior and Senior Participants, and the Range of their Ages and Cumulative GPA Regarding the Universities	52
Table 3.6 The Distribution of Participants in Universities A, B, and C across their Perception of Success, Interest in the Field, and Future Plans in the Field.....	53
Table 3.7 The Summary of Themes and Codes for Type, Timing, and Amount of Feedback Field	57
Table 3.8 Themes and Codes for Indicators of Feedback Literacy.....	58
Table 3.9 Themes and Codes for Factors Enhancing Feedback Literacy	58
Table 3.10 Themes and Codes for Factors Impeding Feedback Literacy.....	59
Table 4.1 Frequencies for Feedback Types in University A, B, and C.....	64
Table 4.2 Frequencies for Timing of Feedback in University A, B, and C	67
Table 4.3 Frequencies for Amount of Feedback in University A, B, and C.....	68
Table 4.4 Frequencies for Feedback Literacy Indicators in University A, B, and C .	70
Table 4.5 Frequencies for Feedback Characteristics as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C	77
Table 4.6 Frequencies for Instructional Factors as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C	80

Table 4.7 Frequencies for Learner Characteristics and Roles as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C	83
Table 4.8 Frequencies for Social Factors as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C	87
Table 4.9 Frequencies for Feedback Characteristics as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C	91
Table 4.10 Frequencies for Instructional Factors as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C	94
Table 4.11 Frequencies for Learner Characteristics as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C	95
Table 4.12 Frequencies for Social Factors as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C	98

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

MoNE	Ministry of National Education
CoHE	Council of Higher Education
ELT	English Language Teaching



CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter firstly presents the background of the study. Then, the purpose and significance of the study are elaborated. Lastly, the terms vital for the study are defined.

1.1. Background of the Study

In higher education, there is a considerable and expanding corpus of study on feedback and its role in student learning. Students' growth as independent learners who can monitor, make a judgment, and govern their own learning is considered critical, enabling them to feed up beyond graduation into the future profession (Ferguson, 2011). Eraut (2006) underlines that the feedback provided to students in higher education will shape their destiny in learning.

The usefulness of feedback in enhancing students' learning is undeniable, and it is supported with a vast amount of evidence (e.g., Diab, 2016; Dihoff et al., 2004; Guo, 2021; Huang, 2016; Huisman et al., 2018; Liu & Carless, 2007; Schroth, 1992; van der Mescht, 2004). Nonetheless, the features of feedback are not adequate to promote learning in solitary. Simply increasing the amount and quality of feedback may not be feasible when rising numbers of students along with their diverse learning needs in 21st century's higher education is considered (Hunt & Tierney, 2006). Within the higher education context, it has been widely claimed that feedback is a powerful means to acquire positive outcomes (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). However, there has been a lack of evidence in how feedback practices are improved and progressed (Orrell, 2006). Students' feedback process has come into prominence as a novel assessment culture within the higher education context.

More recently, there has been a crucial change in how feedback is perceived by undergraduate students. Previous ideas mainly address feedback as an input directed to students (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Kulhavy, 1977; Ramaprasad, 1983; Sadler, 1989; Shute, 2008). However, the position of feedback has evolved into a process where learners play an active role by seeking information and using it within their comprehension (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Henderson et al., 2019). Therefore, the need to include learners' perception on feedback arises because previous research is mainly based on input aspects ineligible for students in higher education varied in their understanding, capacity, and disposition.

Nevertheless, there is various evidence pointing to the situation that students do not understand and implement provided feedback and thus, cannot become aware of its for learning. For example, it has been reported that undergraduate students mostly complain about not understanding the feedback written on their works, thereby not being able to be engaged in it (Times Higher Education, 2019). In one of the studies, undergraduate students reported that they valued feedback but did not use it for their work (Brown & Glower, 2006). Similarly, MacDonald (1991) noted that the majority of students did not read the comments provided by the teacher while those who read the teacher feedback hardly acted on them. Then, why do not the learners use provided feedback? One response to that question may be Sadler's (1989) three key components assisting students to implement feedback information to diminish the gap. These components are that students are required to understand the purpose of the performance, evaluate their performance against a set of criteria, and generate strategies to change their performance in response to provided feedback information. In other words, it is learners' feedback literacy defined as capabilities and tendencies to make sense of feedback information, make evaluative judgment, and act on it to enhance work and learning. Then, it is the learners who are liable for using the presented information to modify their current state while the teacher plays the role of a facilitator. However, learners' uptake and use of feedback; in other words, feedback literacy are not very well investigated. To illustrate, Hounsell (2003) writes that there have not been studies on learners' understanding and use of feedback in large numbers and scopes with deeper insights. It is probably because the nature of this concept is not quantitative (Evans, 2013).

1.2. Purpose of the Study

The study aimed to find out the indicators of feedback literacy for undergraduate students in Turkey along with the factors enhancing and impeding feedback literacy. The scarcity of relevant studies conducted in feedback literacy of undergraduate students in Turkey may contribute to the current literature with an insight into students' improvement of feedback literacy in practice. Furthermore, the study aims to find out how students perceive the type, amount, and timing of feedback to understand the feedback context in Turkish higher education.

1.3. Significance of the Study

Evidently, feedback and its uptake have been an important area in students' learning and achievement. The impact of feedback on students' learning process is non-negligible. One of the main functions of feedback aims at making sense of students' perceptions to promote their performance. That is why, when its effect on learning and achievement was considered, an investigation of feedback regarding students' capacity, perception, and disposition (Carless & Boud, 2018) holds a significant position to be included in the feedback agenda within an educational context.

Concerning this demand in feedback literature, ample studies have been recently conducted. To begin with, feedback literacy components and roles were investigated within feedback literacy literature (Carless & Boud, 2018; Gravett et al., 2019; Molloy et al., 2020; Sutton, 2012). Furthermore, Malecka et al. (2020) conducted a study on integrating feedback literacy within curriculum. Feedback literacy profile of undergraduate students along with their expectations on feedback (Han & Xu, 2019a; Wei et al., 2020) along with development of feedback literacy within technology-mediated context (Ducasse & Hill, 2019; Wood, 2021) were also commonly studied. More specifically, Winstone et al. (2019) examined the impact of using engagement with feedback tools to promote feedback literacy in three different studies. Besides, several studies focused on feedback literacy specific to disciplines and disciplinary tasks (Noble et al., 2019; Li & Han, 2021; Winstone et al., 2020). Lastly, many studies were conducted on the influence of peer feedback or self-feedback on feedback literacy (Fernández-Toro & Duensing, 2020; Hoo et al., 2021; Wood, 2021).

Furthermore, most aforementioned studies have been underpinned based on the findings of the Student Experience Survey in Australia (Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching, 2017) and the National Student Survey in the UK (Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2016). Therefore, feedback from the perspective of students occupied a critical position within the educational agenda of countries. This has not been the case of feedback within the Turkish higher education context, however. Hence, the studies concerning feedback and students' understanding and usage of feedback have been limited in coverage.

In Turkey, feedback has been investigated to find out its effectiveness and the reasons behind its importance (e.g., Arıkan, 2012; Karaca, 2011). In addition, the studies related to feedback types were frequently investigated. For example, ample studies were conducted on the influence of different types of feedback on learning (Dökmen, 1982), commonly preferred feedback types (Çabakçor, et al., 2011), the effectiveness of feedback types depending on different subject fields such as elementary mathematics, Turkish education, English language teaching, science education (Çabakçor et al., 2011; Göçer & Şentürk, 2019; Özmen & Aydın, 2015). Regarding students' perception on feedback, Özmen & Aydın (2015) investigated students' perception of feedback types. Similarly, university students' perception towards feedback was examined by Çapa Aydın and Çalık (2018).

To specify, the feedback studies in Turkey have been intensely evolved around the use of oral corrective feedback (Fidan, 2015; Ölmezer-Öztürk, 2019; Özmen & Aydın, 2015; Öztürk, 2016) and corrective feedback on writing tasks (Erel & Bulut, 2007; Kahraman & Yalvaç, 2015) along with several studies on the students' feedback practices and preferences (Fidan, 2015; Taşdemir & Yalçın Arslan, 2018).

The literature on feedback literacy in higher education conceptualized the framework of feedback literacy as appreciating feedback, making a judgment, managing affect, and taking action (Carless & Boud, 2018). Due to the scarcity of studies addressing students' understanding and use of feedback in Turkey, their active engagement with feedback and feedback literacy profiles have hardly been investigated about the framework of feedback literacy. Furthermore, the factors influencing engagement with feedback are stated to exhibit a diverse student body concerning social and cultural

milieu and individuals' beliefs, experiences, and capacities (Beaumont et al., 2011; Robinson et al., 2013). Notwithstanding, how the factors affecting undergraduate students' feedback literacy in Turkey differ has not yet been known.

The scarcity of feedback literature from the perspective of students' understanding and action in Turkey is detrimental to a productive educational agenda to promote learning. Hence, the results having been acquired by this study may fill the current gap in the literature, thereby generating clues for decision-makers to shape an educational agenda to promote learning and for researchers to set a research agenda for further investigation of the construct of feedback literacy.

1.4. Definition of Terms

Definitions of key terms in this study are as follows:

Feedback is the information students receive in response to their works or performances as well as their progress in learning in reference to specific criteria or standards provided to students beforehand (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In this study, feedback is any response provided to students' mistakes, errors, weaknesses, and drawbacks, and correct responses, strengths, and achievements.

Effective feedback refers to the feedback information with specific characteristics provided to students in response to their works or performances to optimize learning. In the current study, effective feedback is students' perception of how format, timeliness, amount, specificity, complexity, and tone of feedback (Shute, 2008) should be to facilitate engagement with feedback.

Feedback literacy refers to students' competence and tendency to understand feedback information and use it to improve work and learning (Carless & Boud, 2018). In this study, feedback literate learners are those engaged in Carless & Boud's (2018) four components: appreciation of feedback by seeking and valuing feedback as well as recognizing one's active role; making judgment by understanding criteria and generating evaluative judgment on the quality of feedback, one's own work and peers' work; managing affect by managing emotional challenges and exhibiting openness to feedback; and taking action to improve following works, future career, and learning.

Higher education is defined as advanced level education where learners with certain achievement levels regarding their cognitive, affective, and behavioral facets are awarded an academic degree about their progress.

Basic qualitative research is a type of research design based on the social constructivist perspective. The aim is to unveil the way individuals build up and depict the meaning they ascribed to their experiences (Merriam, 2009). In this study, the purpose of basic qualitative design is to understand students' experiences and feelings in relation to their engagement with feedback.



CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter aims to present the theoretical background of feedback literacy and related studies. The chapter begins with assessment and learning, encompassing the description of formative and summative assessment as well as feedback and studies on feedback. Then, it continues with assessment and feedback literacy, where the concepts of assessment literacy, perception on feedback, and feedback literacy are described and previous studies on these concepts. Lastly, the theoretical background of the study as being Vygotsky's (1978) Social Constructivist Theory is presented.

2.1. Assessment and Learning

Assessment and learning are generally considered as integrated components. Supporting and improving learning are the main aims of an educational institution, while assessment is at the center of this process. Assessment mostly triggers or enhances learning, and thus learning process or products become more substantial when they are assessed. There are two important tools to mention in this process: summative and formative assessment (Scriven, 1967).

2.1.1. Summative Assessment

Summative assessment aims to cumulatively assess what pupils have learned and how their performances are compared to certain standards (National Research Council, 2001). It is generally given as a final and a cumulative assessment after a set of instructions to measure a student's learning outcomes. To determine students' future in getting through the next year, guiding their career paths, or being qualified for an award, summative assessments are closely related to high-stakes assessments (Dixson & Worrell, 2016). However, they are not only limited to high-stakes and standardized

state tests. The tests conducted at the end of a year, semester, program, or unit can also be identified under the category of summative assessment (Harlen, 2015).

When the summative assessment is focused on the subsequent performance and achievement and its relative success compared to standards, its function is referred to as “feedout” (Knight, 2002, p.276). The assessment functions as feedback if it aims to present information to facilitate and improve learning. However, summative assessment is challenging for feedback because most students are focused on the pass-fail process. Thus, they ignore the feedback given to them. Previous evidence also showed that students are not willing to accept and make use of the provided feedback after a summative and high-stakes assessment (Harrison et al., 2013).

2.1.2. Formative Assessment

An assessment is named as formative when it contributes to the learning process (William, 2007). To specify, formative assessment is defined as all the activities students or teachers are engaged in so that the information obtained from these activities can be used to develop and customize the learning and teaching process while they are evolving (Wiggins, 1998). As mentioned in the definition, these activities generally consist of analyzing pupils’ tasks, observing their performance, and maintaining a dialogue about their progress. Consequently, the success of these outputs is judged as they are being developed.

As formative assessment is based on providing ongoing information about the gap between current and expected situations to teachers and students to improve the process further, it is mainly feedback-oriented in nature. Teachers periodically observe when or where students have problems or advance. As a result, they modify the instruction or the program to empower students’ success. Similarly, students have the opportunity to realize the difference between their goals and current performances (Sadler, 1989). At that point, feedback information coming from formative assessment assists students to improve their performances for following assessments and ultimately to reach their goals.

Although feedback is generally provided by a teacher, learners can also generate their own feedback in formative assessment (Boston, 2002). As students comprehend the

required standards and criteria in the learning process, they provide feedback for themselves and evaluate their current knowledge and skills against these standards and criteria. Besides, they have the chance to regulate themselves and engaged in action in line with their evaluation. Subsequently, they play the role of an active agent and practice their self-evaluation skills in formative assessment.

2.2. Feedback

Multiple definitions of feedback have been asserted in the literature. To present the correctional aspect of feedback, Kulhavy (1977) defined feedback as any means of communication to notify learners about the correctness of their responses. Sadler (1989) conceptualized feedback as a gap filler between students' understanding and the expected understanding. Within the informational aspect of feedback, feedback was depicted as information delivered to learners to improve learning by modifying behaviors and ways of thinking (Shute, 2008). According to Hattie and Timperley (2007), this feedback information is not limited to one's understanding, but also includes the consequence of performances or behaviors, and this information is transferred "by an agent such as teacher, peer, experience, source, or self" (p.81). Despite divergent expressions, the common aspect of these multiple definitions is that they put an emphasis on the reflection of students' current state to improve learning.

Within an educational context, feedback is mainly considered a crucial and powerful key to improving skills and knowledge. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Hester, 2001; Kulhavy, 1977; Sadler, 1989). As Shute (2008) stated, the emphasis of feedback on success and achievement triggers student learning. In this process, students complete their academic cycle and present their activities. The existence of feedback enhances feedback, while lack of it may result in impeded learning. Then, feedback is a powerful pedagogical tool (Shute, 2008). Many researchers (e.g., Heron et al., 2015) also agree that feedback is an inseparable part of education and learning. Kealey (2010) states that regular and constant provision of feedback has a positive impact on student academic performance. Similarly, useful and proper feedback information contributes to the students' motivation to learn and perform successful results (Narciss & Huth, 2004). Besides, the disparity between learners' current state and learning goals is diminished via feedback (Brooks et al., 2019).

Feedback is neither functional nor powerful in solitary. This is provided with the existence of a context where learning occurs (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) and the learners perform their learning outcomes (Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006). Besides, Ramaprasad (1983) asserted that the information about the inconsistency between learning outcomes and standards is not feedback since feedback functions as a broader process where information is provided to learners, and then they modify or change the inconsistencies. As Winne and Butler (1994) explained, “a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure that information” (p. 5740). Then, the primary purpose of feedback is to improve the skills, knowledge, and understanding of learners in general or in a subject matter within a specific curriculum (Ramaprasad, 1983). Therefore, the ways of providing effective feedback addressing learners and educational context are the main concerns.

2.2.1. Effective Feedback

Despite the lack of agreement on the best types of feedback (Shute, 2008; Nelson & Schunn, 2009), effective practices for feedback are evidently framed in the feedback literature. According to Kulhavy and Stock (1989), effective feedback informs the learner in the form of verification and elaboration. When the message is a verification, it explicitly or implicitly notifies the learner about whether their response is correct or incorrect. On the other hand, elaboration focuses on a topic or response on which certain errors are discussed and guidance is provided.

Specificity of feedback refers to the information level in a delivered message (Goodman et al., 2004). Feedback specific to response or behavior has been found to increase achievement and learning (Mory, 2004; Wager & Wager, 1985). However, specific feedback and lengthy or complex feedback are different concepts regarding the effectiveness of feedback. Shute (2008) defines the complexity of feedback as the type and amount of feedback message delivered to learners. Unlike specific feedback, extremely long and complicated feedbacks distract learners as it may deviate from the main point and thus, results in the ignorance of feedback (Shute, 2008). Then, effective feedback needs to address the right amount of information with proper specificity to response or work.

Feedback information clear and appropriate to the students' language and comprehension level enhances the effectiveness and, thus, better benefits to learners (Knight & York, 2003). Different levels of students are required to be addressed with different timing of and types of feedbacks. For example, high-achieving students benefit from delayed, try again, and verification while low-achieving students take advantage of an immediate, correct answer and elaboration (Clariana, 1990; Gaynor, 1981; Hanna, 1976). Similarly, simplicity arranged regarding learners' language level facilitates the understanding of feedback and, thus, enacting on it.

Aside from the convenience of language and comprehension level, transparency of feedback (Wiggins, 2012) is also crucial to learners. Strengths of learner performance are encouraged via positive feedback, while the weaknesses are notified by means of negative feedback (Herold & Greller, 1977). When the negative and positive points are stated frankly, learners understand their proximity to desired standards.

Goal orientation is another aspect of effective feedback. Within this concept, feedback addresses certain learning goals which are provided to learners by means of instructions or guidelines prior to the assignments and tasks (Wiggins, 2012). In line with the expected goals, learners are informed about their progress. However, these goals are required to be compatible with the outcomes of lessons (Rukanuddin et al., 2021). According to Birney et al. (1969), unreachable and very high goals stated in feedback messages impede learning due to failure or difficulty in attainment. On the other hand, easily attainable goals minimize the learners' effort for further progress. Then, goal-oriented feedback at the right challenge level is effective for learners.

According to Wiggins (2012), consistent, continuous, and timely feedback are interdependent. Continuous feedback is the provision of multiple information throughout the learning process, while consistency is the unity or compatibility of multiple feedbacks. On the other hand, the timeliness of feedback refers to the conveyance of a message in time (Brookhart, 2017). Therefore, feedback information is effective when multiple and compatible information is constantly conveyed to learners at the right moment.

The research in the literature also revealed that feedback which is specific (Pridemore & Klein, 1995), goal-directed (Fisher & Ford, 1998), timely (Jurma & Froelich, 1984),

proper for learner level (Jurma & Froelich, 1984), and transparent (Williams & Kane, 2009) is considered as learning efficient and a facilitator of student achievement.

2.2.2. Characteristics of Feedback

To maximize the learning in an effective way, feedback is delivered in a variety of specific forms. In the literature, frequently discussed characteristics of feedback are categorized depending on certain variables such as frequency, timing, complexity, source, content, and tone.

Two of the most discussed types of feedback in literature are formative and summative feedback (e.g., Dixon & Worrell, 2016; Heron, 2011; Sinclair & Cleland, 2007). Formative feedback is defined as notifying learners about their academic performance regularly and repeatedly throughout an ongoing program or course (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). Kealey (2010) writes that it enables students to modify their behaviors and performances while the program or the course is advancing. Similarly, teachers can identify the needs of the learners and alter the instruction or teaching methods accordingly (Taras, 2009). On the other hand, summative feedback is the provision of feedback information about learners' achievement or success at the end of a program or a course (Dixon & Worrell, 2016). The purpose of summative feedback is to inform learners and teachers about the decisions on their achievement level (Kealey, 2010) or effectiveness of the program and instruction (Chappuis & Chappuis, 2008) at the end of allocated time.

Another variable to classify features of feedback is timing. It consists of delayed and immediate feedbacks (Shute, 2008). In immediate feedback, learners are given feedback right after a finished task, performance, or response. Delayed feedback is frequently described regarding immediacy and thus defined as the information delivered in "minutes, hours, weeks, or longer time" upon the completed tasks, performances, or responses (p. 163).

According to Shute (2008), complexity of feedback concept, types of feedback are classified as no feedback, verification, correct response, error flagging, elaborated, hints/cues/prompts, and informative tutoring. When there is no feedback, students are supposed to present a task, response, or performance, but they are not given any

information about its correctness. Unlike no-feedback condition, verification just tells the learners that their response is correct or incorrect while correct response explicitly presents the correct option or solution to a question. In error flagging, learners are informed about the place of mistakes, but they are not provided with the correct response. Tedick and Gortari (1998) stated that if the feedback is elaborated, it elicits the reason for the correct answer. This provides students to understand the explanation behind the correct option. However, feedback sometimes guides the learners with metalinguistic clues, hints, or useful sources without revealing the correct form (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In this way, learners discover the correct answer and how to improve on them. Lastly, Narciss and Huth (2004) write that the most complex and detailed type of feedback is informative tutoring where learners are not provided with the correct response, but they are richly presented verification and error flagging as well as the ways and the strategies to progress.

Teachers are not the only source of feedback (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In feedback literature, peers (Bostock, 2006) and learners themselves (Bedford & Legg, 2007) are among the commonly discussed feedback sources. When the peers are the source of feedback, learners at the same level of a certain category (e.g., age, class, program, studies) control one another's tasks and decides on whether the task is compatible with expected standards (Brookhart, 2017). Then, in peer feedback, learners make a judgment about the match between goals and current tasks and then deliver the information of their judgment to their peers. In self-feedback, the learner is the source of feedback information, and she or he makes a judgment about her or his work in comparison to goals and standards (Bedford & Legg, 2007).

Depending on the tone and content of feedback, the types of feedback are commonly discussed under the concepts of positive, negative, and constructive feedback. In the literature, positive and negative feedback are defined in multiple ways concerning the minimization or maximization of the gap between current and expected state, and tone of feedback report based on the quality of performance or “emotional connotation” to the learner (Ramaprasad, 1983, p. 9). The latter concept for positive and negative feedback is commonly used in feedback literature within educational sciences (Ilgen et al., 1979; Fong et al., 2021; Kuhn, 1975; Voerman et al., 2012), and

thus, the latter definition is employed within this literature review. Positive and negative feedback is given in the confirmation and disconfirmation form consecutively (Brockner, 1979). Ramaprasad (1983) explained that when the feedback is positive, learners receive a message about successful performance and are expected to progress in that specific direction. Nonetheless, poor performance is reported to the student as negative feedback, and thus, they are required to modify their performance. When the feedback recognizes the learners' efforts to continue with desired performance and accomplishments in the expected direction while encouraging them to improve poor performance, it is called constructive feedback (Ovando, 1994). In this way, feedback is given in such a specific way that learners are encouraged to take a positive attitude towards their performance and to progress in line with the desired goals and standards (Bee & Bee, 1996).

2.2.3. Research on Feedback

The importance and effectiveness of feedback have been investigated for more than twenty years and thus, well-framed in education literature. To begin with, Hattie (1999) synthesized more than 500 meta-analyses consisting of 180,000 research about factors having an impact on learner achievement conducted on roughly 30 million students. As a result, feedback was found to be one of the key effects on achievement in 12 meta-analyses consisting of 196 studies. The average effect size for feedback was found to be .79, which was one of the highest impacts on achievement after direct instruction with .93 and reciprocal teaching with .86 effect sizes. Nonetheless, the effect sizes for feedback varied from each other depending on its type. For example, feedback information in the form of cues, corrections, and reinforcement was found to be more influential, with the effect sizes ranging from 1.13 to 0.81 (Lysakowski & Walberg, 1982; Tenenbaum & Goldrig, 1989; Walberg, 1982). On the other hand, the least influential feedback messages were found to be rewards, punishment, and programmed instruction with the effect sizes between 0.20 and -0.04 (Getsie et al., 1985; Wilkinson, 1981).

Another meta-analysis of 131 studies on 12,562 students having aimed to report the influences of different feedback types was conducted by Kluger and DeNisi (1996). As a result of their analysis, it was concluded that presenting information of correct

answers, setting challenging goals, delivering constant and immediate messages, providing feedback by means of computer as well as tasks that are not complex and physical enhance the learning and, thus, the achievement level of learners. On the other hand, learning and achievement are negatively affected by praises, lack of goals, threats to self-esteem, oral message, and discouraging feedback aside from complex, physical, and rule-dependent tasks.

One of the meta-analyses in feedback literature was conducted by Bangert-Drowns et al. (1991). This meta-analysis examined 40 studies on types of feedback as well as timing and error rates. It was revealed that verification of response as correct or incorrect is less influential than correct response form where the correct solution is presented. In addition, feedback enhances learning and achievement if the learner is encouraged to discover the hints and meanings in his or her tasks and reflect on them. On the contrary, feedback directly providing correct solutions in advance to learners' exploration in memory and incongruent with learners' needs for complexity, challenge, and clarity impedes learning and achievement.

Narciss and Huth (2004) also examined a set of research on feedback types, especially elaborated feedbacks. The authors claimed that certain factors cooperating with the feedback design influence motivation and learning. These factors are feedback, instruction, and learner. Feedback factor was found to increase learning when it was designed concerning content, function, and presentation. The factor of instruction is also influential in promoting learning in line with tasks, objectives, and errors. In addition, individuals' goals, previous experiences, and academic motivation are among the effective elements. As a result, the authors concluded that effective feedback is constructed with the specification of individual goals, identification of tasks in line with the objectives, analysis of cognitive tasks and errors, and designation of error and problem information.

Mason and Bruning (2001) reported a review of literature on feedback types, elaboration level with reference to variables of previous experience, feedback timing, the complexity of task, and achievement of learners. It was asserted that regardless of tasks' complexity level, low achieving learners with previous knowledge benefit from correct response and topic-contingent feedback while the ones without previous

knowledge take advantage of correct response and response contingent feedbacks. On the contrary, high achieving learners avail themselves of immediate feedback when the task level is low. In the context of immediate feedback, correct response and response contingency are more effective if they do not have prior knowledge, while they make use of correct response and topic contingency in the case of high prior knowledge. As the complexity of task-level increases, high achieving learners seek delayed feedback. When the feedback is delayed, the learners with prior knowledge favor try again and delayed topic contingent while the ones without prior knowledge take advantage of verification, delayed correct response, and response contingency.

The investigations on the timing of feedback have also given a clue about the effectiveness of feedback. Some researchers have supported delayed feedback, while others objected to this idea. For example, Schroth (1992) conducted an experimental study with 192 undergraduate students on how delayed feedback and verbal feedback influence the transfer of knowledge in tasks based on the formation of a concept. Delayed feedback was investigated under four successive conditions: 30, 20, 10, and 0 seconds. The conditions for verbal feedback were verification in the form of incorrect versus correct, no feedback for incorrect versus correct, and no feedback for correct versus incorrect. After seven days of initial learning, participants were tested for the impact of the transfer. As a result, it was found that initial learning was curtailed by delayed feedback. Nonetheless, prolonged delay better promoted the transfer. This study interprets the findings depending on changing situations. In other words, the educational phenomenon of feedback timing is not restricted to a single result of favoring either delayed or immediate feedback. Instead, the effectiveness of each variable is discussed for different learning levels.

Similar to Schroth's (1992) findings, Guo (2021) examined 60 undergraduate students enrolled in low-level courses regarding their TOEFL results in order to investigate the most effective timing of feedback and interval of tests for retention of lexical items in the L2 setting. For this study, the dependent variable was the number of right answers in tests, while independent variables were the timing of feedback and intervals of tests. Four experimental conditions were Group A (long-interval and delayed feedback), Group B (short-interval and delayed feedback), Group C (short-

interval and immediate feedback), and Group D (long-interval and immediate feedback). Unlike previous studies on feedback, this study employed the approach of proactivity where feedback and its rationale was provided for each item. In the analysis of data, 2x2 repeated measures analysis of variance for short-long intervals and delayed-immediate feedback was employed. The results showed that short intervals with delayed feedback led to the highest performance on tests. Overall, delayed feedback groups performed higher than immediate feedback groups, although all the groups were found to acquire gains in the test. These results were also congruent with the prior studies on the effectiveness of delayed feedback (Agarwal et al., 2008, Carpenter & Vul, 2011; Metcalfe et al., 2009). The study is well-established in terms of comparing different groups to analyze the cause-and-effect relationship among variables of feedback and thus, presents a model of actual learning environment to assist practitioners. However, groups are not assigned randomly. Therefore, external variables may have influenced the results.

Contrary to the effectiveness of delayed feedback, Dihoff et al. (2004) conducted research on the influences of delayed and immediate feedback on academic test preparation and results. Sixty undergraduate students participated in the study. Four experimental conditions of immediate, end-of-test, 1-day delay, and control were set following the initial testing, and participants were randomly assigned to each group. After the administration of the final test, students revised the items and selected their correct and incorrect responses, as well as their confidence in their decisions. The authors revealed that their findings consistently failed to justify the positive effects of delayed feedback. In other words, immediate feedback enhanced confidence, retention, ability to find right and wrong responses while minimizing the repetition of wrong responses. The study is based on well-established statistical procedures in terms of appropriateness of participants' distribution and analysis of feedback timings and academic test variables.

Aforementioned studies supporting either immediate or delayed feedback employed a quantitative approach, which is restricted to initiate a new insight into complicated educational phenomena (van der Mescht, 2004). In another study, a mixed-method approach was favored, and immediate feedback was investigated within the context of group work or team assessment (Schmulian & Coetzee, 2019). For this study, survey

approach was utilized to understand the participants' experience in team assessment and immediate feedback. Therefore, yes-no responses and the Likert scale were employed for quantitative data, while open-ended questions were for qualitative data. Consequently, 91% of the participants acknowledged that they wished to go through team assessment with immediate feedback again. Besides, the qualitative data enabled the researchers to have a deep insight into this issue. They suggested that participants put an emphasis on their gain in the construction of novel knowledge, acquisition of various skills, collaboration with different cultural groups, and comprehension of content thanks to team assessment with immediate feedback.

In education literature, feedback has also been examined in terms of its source as peers in higher education. One of the studies compared the academic writing performance of 83 undergraduate students having given or having received peer feedback in academic writing tasks (Huisman et al., 2018). The study was administered throughout an 8-week course. Between the 3rd and 6th weeks, participants were asked to submit an essay on two topics covered during the lectures. In the 7th week, the participants received and gave peer feedback. At the very last week, they were given a chance to revise the essay drafts and submit their revised essays. The lecturers graded the final submissions of participants based on the criteria of content, structure, style, references, spelling, and presentation level. As a result, a final grade was assigned for each essay. An independent t-test was used to compare improvement of performance between students providing and receiving feedback. Then, a multivariate analysis of variance was used for the analysis of how students' feedback receiver and provider roles are related to their improvement in academic writing criteria. The researchers found that the academic writing performances of students significantly increased upon receiving or providing peer feedback. Besides, the participants commented that the adequacy of peer feedback and their motivation to act on them influenced the increase in their academic writing performances. The discussed study clearly presents how students' achievement as a peer feedback provider or a receiver is influenced in one of the core components of assessment methods in social sciences-academic writing (Chang & Schleppegrell, 2011). On the other hand, a quantitative investigation of peer feedback simply reveals the condition that students' academic performances improved. However, the process and the rationale behind how they

provided and then used the peer feedback for their learning is obscure.

Liu and Carless (2007) investigated the explanation behind peer feedback and its power to promote learning. The researchers claimed that focusing on grades for the interpretation of peer feedback curtailed its potential to enhance learning. Thus, an extensive questionnaire survey conducted on 1740 students and 460 academicians along with interview data were examined. The findings of the questionnaire revealed that a vast number of students and academicians resist peer assessment in graded form while a significant number of students expressed that they are hardly involved in peer assessment, which pointed to the academicians' resistance to using peer assessment in their lectures. The reason for students' resistance to peer assessment and feedback was that students perceived their peers as less knowledgeable and thus, did not count on their expertise in giving qualified feedback and assigning reliable grades. The academicians' resistance to this phenomenon results from power relations, in other words, their unwillingness to share their power with students. Besides, the comments of academicians and students showed that peer assessment or feedback was considered time-consuming. The study introduces the general idea about peer feedback and assessment in a quantitative way while elaborating on the rationale behind the resistance by means of interview data. In this way, more in-depth findings for peer feedback were presented with the interpretation of participants' opinions. In addition, the skills and abilities that are promoted by peer feedback were also discussed. For example, practicing peer feedback enable individuals to be engaged in self-assessment and act on their judgment as desired criteria and standards are common for both parties (Boud, 1995).

Diab (2016) carried out a quasi-experimental study on the influences of different corrective feedback sources on diminishing errors within the scope of English as a second language. Three groups were created, and groups were administered a pre-test where they were instructed and then practiced correction concerning the sources of feedback. Later, the students were administered delayed and immediate post-tests. When the participants' performances were compared, it was revealed that three groups enhanced the errors' percentages in the immediate post-test while reducing it on delayed post-test without any significant variance among the groups. Nonetheless, on the immediate post-test, students in self-feedback group significantly reduced the

percentage of errors in comparison to those in peer feedback group. There was no significant difference between peer and teacher feedback groups as well as between self-feedback and teacher feedback groups. On the delayed post-test, participants in self-feedback group significantly decreased the errors' percentage in comparison to the participants in teacher feedback group. However, there was no significant difference between self-feedback and peer feedback groups as well as peer and teacher feedback groups. The results showed that different sources of feedback, especially self-feedback, had an influence in improving students' errors and enhancing their performances. The study has compared the different sources of feedback in detail and has presented how these sources are beneficial in specific error conditions in the ESL context.

On the importance of self-feedback and self-assessment, Huang (2016) conducted a qualitative study within the context of English as a foreign language. The undergraduate students were required to submit a self-assessment task. For this task, the previous oral exam audio files were given to learners so that they were able to listen, transcribe, and analyze their own speaking performance concerning content, organization, pronunciation, fluency, intonation, expression of meaning, and grammar. The submitted assessment and feedback papers were used to analyze data. With the help of self-feedback, learners were able to realize the disparity between their previous and current performance, implicitly feed up, feed forward, feed back, investigate process and content of the task as well as practice feedback at self-level, and perform self-regulation. In this study, the comparison of previous and current performances in relation to learners' self-feedback reports clearly presented the specifically improved language and feedback skills as well as the rationale behind those explanations. However, learners' performances with reference to assessment criteria or standards were not specified. The results only explained the perspectives and experiences of students.

Regarding the effectiveness of feedback, studies on constructive feedback in terms of its content and tone were also conducted. For example, du Toit (2012) investigated whether first-year undergraduate students promoted their learning upon learning. The theoretical framework of student expectations, self-regulation, and constructive feedback was synthesized. Then, an empirical study was conducted through the

administration of a questionnaire to 92 first-year undergraduate students enrolled at Faculty of Education to understand their mindset about feedback. The participants' responses showed that they had a negative attitude towards feedback. They did not believe that feedback had been improving their learning. However, when the feedback constructively criticized learners, in other words, specifically addressed all aspects of their task and explained misconceptions of the task without referring to the identity of learners, they felt positive and believed that it had been improving their learning.

One of the most discussed characteristics of feedback in educational literature is the discrepancy between current and desired performance as well as positive feedback (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Faulconer et al. (2021) administered a survey on 176 online undergraduate students. Within their courses, a group of students was given performance-gap feedback while the rest of them were provided with performance-gap and positive feedback. The results showed that students' perspectives and individually reported attitudes in their courses did not change. Nonetheless, the grades of the participants having been given both positive and performance-gap feedback averaged higher than those having received only performance-gap feedback. These findings are congruent with what Plakht et al. (2013) revealed in terms of the correlation between positive feedback and higher grades. However, the study does not address how students' poor performances or errors are handled.

Another study in feedback literature focused on the effects of negative feedback in an online setting. Guichon et al. (2012) inspected how tutors make use of one of the videoconferencing tools (Visu) to give negative feedback. For this study, eight tutors and eight undergraduate students enrolled in Teaching French as a Foreign Language program were matched, and their uses of the tool were observed. It was found that negative feedback is valued when it explicitly and clearly states the mistakes and weaknesses on Visu. Regarding the use of online tools, tutors commonly employed verbal and chat feedbacks, although it highly depended on the individual tutors. Besides, the tutors providing verbal feedback were also inclined to use markers. However, the marking process was found to take time for both parties. Thus, the researchers suggested a system where both the learners and tutors interact with each other as well as negotiating on the assigned tasks. The discussed study clearly shows when negative feedback is effective and how it is benefitted in an online setting.

Within the scope of online education, though, the study is only restricted to two forms of feedback (verbal and written) and a single feedback type (negative feedback). Although online education is insufficient in providing interactivity of face-to-face learning (Delen, Liew & Willson, 2014), the variety in feedback design contributes to learners' engagement (O'Brien & Toms, 2008).

Feedback has also been investigated within an online context. Chih-Yuan Sun et al. (2019) aimed to develop a creative online environment for learning and to find an answer to the way encouraging and warning feedback affects the cognitive, behavioral, and emotional engagement of learners. Therefore, 191 students enrolled in a graduate program were randomly selected into four different groups (no feedback, encouragement feedback, warning feedback, both encouragement, and warning feedback). Participants' behavior patterns were observed, and immediate feedback was provided. The findings showed that cognitive and emotional engagement were triggered more in the warning plus encouragement group. On the other hand, warning feedback resulted in higher cognitive engagement. The researchers came up with the suggestion that the design of a creative and online learning environment combined with both encouraging and warning feedback contributes to the emotional engagement of learners, which increases motivation and confidence to learn as well as cognitive engagement facilitating mental load, skills, and effort. The results of the study match with the O'Brien and Toms' (2008) suggestion about assuring feedback variety in an online setting.

Along with the recent increase in distance learning due to the pandemic, there has been an emphasis on the use of online tools to provide feedback. For example, the practices of online feedback types in speaking skills as well as instructors and learners' perception of these practices were examined in one of the joint universities (Qingyang Sun & Zeyang Yang, 2021). Therefore, four instructors and 11 students enrolled in the English for Academic Purposes program were interviewed. The participants specified the types of online feedback as comments in written format, audio recordings, interactive feedbacks in breakout rooms, and whole-group feedback sessions provided to the class. There found to be an agreement on the ineffectiveness of online feedback compared to face-to-face feedback. The participants commonly indicated that feedbacks were delayed and impersonal. Some

of the participants stated the benefits of checklists and written feedback due to detailed explanations of expected goals. On the other hand, the others found the checklists and written feedbacks confusing and thus, requested more assistance. In terms of audio-recordings, the majority of instructors expressed their motivation to use it. The students had a positive attitude towards recordings due to the personal and emotional connection that they felt while the minority of them found them confusing and hard to understand. Group feedback sessions were stated as manageable by instructors. Similarly, students also benefitted from group feedbacks. Yet, those in need of individuality had difficulty in adapt group feedback to their situation. As for peer feedback, all the instructors put an emphasis on the necessity of peer feedback to increase efficiency in terms of time, while there was a concern about monitoring all the students and ensuring that peer feedback was provided by each student. However, learners believed that it was not a productive process for them in online education as they were not willing to provide negative feedback. The study equally addresses both learners and instructors within a distance learning context where instructors and students have been challenged with adjustment to an online setting, ensuring engagement, uncertainty, and identity problems (Kim & Asbury, 2020). Their perceptions, needs, and demands about a variety of feedback designs and types (O'Brien & Toms, 2008) were compared to each other to find a solution to commonly experienced problems.

2.3. Assessment and Feedback Literacy

Feedback is a crucial part of the assessment process. Well-established approaches to assessment put an emphasis on the provision of information about the performance of learners (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Ramaprasad, 1983; Sadler, 1989; Shute, 2008). However, how learners seek, understand, and use the assessment and feedback information is the main concern in assessment and feedback literature due to agreement on their active role (Boud & Molloy, 2013; Carless, 2020; Henderson et al., 2019; Smith et al. 2013). In other words, learners' literacy of assessment and feedback has come into prominence.

2.3.1. Assessment Literacy

Stiggins (1991) defines assessment literacy as an essential understanding of high-

and low-quality assessments and the ability or capacity to practice that judgment in multiple measures of achievement, while assessment illiteracy is not being able to understand and make an evaluative judgment about the meaning of high-quality data and thus, use assessment data. Stiggins (1991) stated that assessment literates develop literacy skills at three different levels. At the first level, the individuals play the role of users (e.g., students, parents) who have been using the assessment data gathered by others. Those at the second level are literate ones (e.g., teachers, principals) in a practical way in that they gather, create, and use data. At the very last level, advanced level literates are positioned, and they are able to construct data so that others can benefit from them. However, the concept has been mainly discussed from the perspective of two main stakeholders within the educational context: teachers (e.g., Popham, 2009; Stabler-Havener, 2018; Xu & Brown, 2016) and students (e.g., Siegel & Wissehr, 2011; Smith et al., 2013).

According to Siegel and Wissehr (2011), one way of becoming an effective teacher is assessment literacy. Grabowski and Dakin (2014) assert that assessment literacy capacitate teachers by enabling them to make sound decisions about teaching, learning, and assessment usage. Similarly, assessment literate teachers are able to develop measures of achievement where learners convert standards, goals, and criteria into performances indicating achievement level of pupils (Mertler & Campbell, 2005). Aside from making a judgment, Siegel and Wissehr (2011) suggest that teachers are required to have an understanding of three aspects: principles, tools, and purposes.

Principles are theoretical concepts determining judgments about assessment (Abell & Siegel, 2011). The principles that teacher has embarked on student achievement and learning constitute the basis of employed assessment methods (Shepard, 2000) and thus, adopted assessment process evolves around assessment designated for learning (Black & William, 1998). Concerning the assessment principles based on assessment for learning, the aforementioned two other components constituting the framework of assessment literacy for teachers are understanding of tools and purposes. Knowledge of tools has information on assessment formats and methods (Siegel & Wissehr, 2011) as well as understanding of equitable assessment where different learners are assessed to enhance individual's achievement and learning in a fair way (NRC, 1996). Then, an insight into the benefits and drawbacks of each type of assessment in

comparison to learners' diverse learning styles is crucial to the assessment literacy of teachers. On the other hand, knowledge of purpose is an understanding of the scope and the aim of assessment (NRC, 2001). Therefore, recognition of multiple strategies to assess learners' comprehension of meaning is crucial in framing the purpose of assessment and thus, maintaining a deep understanding of learners (Shepard, 2003). Assessment was originally considered as an end, but recently it has been viewed as a tool to promote students' learning, and thus, assessment for learning has been underlined (Price, 2018). According to Nicol (2009), students are expected to be liable for their learning process, and formative assessment provides them with the opportunity to practice monitoring and judging. Thus, they are required to make a judgment about their tasks as well as the convenience and goodness of their response to assessment criteria or standards (Sadler, 2009); in other words, to develop assessment literacy. Then, assessment literate learners are active and dynamic partners in the assessment process. Stiggins (1991) suggests that assessment literate individual is capable of clearly and professionally expressing their learning needs and goals in reference to their current situation or assessment evidence. Thus, they gather assessment data to use as a guide to their learning and achievement. Gibbs and Simpson (2004) noted that feedback is an integral part of formative assessment as it informs students about their responses in comparison to the criteria of assessment. Therefore, assessment literate learners are "critical consumers of the feedback provided by teachers," and they possess "growth mindsets" motivating for seeking and using feedback (Stiggins, 1991, p. 535).

Various benefits of assessment literacy for students or their perception of assessment have been commonly discussed in the literature (e.g., Smith et al., 2013; Rust et al., 2003). As students enhanced their literacy in assessment, they began to have control over their learning and, thus, an urge to develop self-evaluation (Price, 2018). However, self-evaluation is not merely adequate to promote assessment literacy. Boud & Faulchikov (2006) notes that students may be expected to make a judgment about their own or others' work in their future career. Therefore, it is crucial to ensure that they possess sufficient practice in peer and self-evaluation (Price, 2018). Aside from evaluation of peers and self within a community, it allows students to improve their self-confidence as well as capacity to comprehend and ability to

participate in learning. They also become learners who are capable of self-monitoring and self-regulation. (Smith et al., 2013).

Although there have been ample studies on assessment literacy of teachers (e.g., Kavaklı & Arslan, 2019; Mellati & Khademi, 2018; Popham, 2009; Schafer 1993; Stabler-Havener, 2018; Xu & Brown, 2017), only a few of them focused on assessment literacy of students. In their studies, Smith et al. (2013) aimed to measure learning and assessment literacy with an intervention based on assessment literacy as well as developing a survey on assessment literacy. A convenience sample consisting of 369 university students was chosen for the study. Quasi-experimental research design was employed. To assess the influence of intervention, two groups were included: one group took the intervention (assessment rubric) while the other did not. The intervention group (Campus A) was conducted a pre- (assessment literacy survey) and post-test while the control group (Campus B) was only administered a pre-test (assessment literacy survey). Lastly, participants completed a literature review article as part of their coursework using an intervention rubric. For the development of scale, decision-making and reviewing steps, data screening, corrected item-total correlation, exploratory factor analysis, and reliability analysis were completed. The correlation among factors (assessment literacy [understanding], assessment for learning, minimum effort orientation, assessment literacy[judgment]) was checked. An independent sample t-test was conducted to examine the difference between the two campuses after the pre-test. Besides, a paired-sample t-test was employed to investigate the impact of the intervention. For the assessment literacy level of high-low-medium, four one-way ANOVA was utilized. The results of the pre-test showed that there was no significant difference between the group's minimum effort orientation, assessment literacy (judgment), and assessment literacy (understanding). However, Campus A scored more poorly than Campus B. A scored significantly lower than B in terms of assessment for learning. However, the results of the intervention revealed that the intervention was influential in three factors: assessment literacy (understanding and judgment) and assessment for learning. For Campus A, the assessment literacy factor was significantly and positively correlated to the report mark. There was no significant relationship between minimum effort orientation and report mark. Merely assessment literacy (judgment) revealed a

significant difference in the report mark. As a result of ANOVA, there was no significant difference across the groups in assessment for learning. In both assessment literacies, the average report marks significantly varied. In minimum effort orientation, there was no significant difference across the groups.

Similar to assessment literacy of students, Rust et al. (2003) reported the findings of a two-year project. Within this study, students' understanding of the assessment process and criteria were developed through an intervention (multiple assessment activities in workshops), which has been replicated twice in consecutive years. Prior to intervention, they were required to complete mark sheets as well as their justification for assigned marks. After the initial marking and intervention, they were expected to evaluate their own works. As a result of collected data, it was found that students participating in workshops significantly developed their assessment sheets compared to those not having participated in workshops. It was also revealed that merely explaining assessment standards and criteria are not functional to convey knowledge of assessment. Therefore, the criteria and standards on assessment should be accompanied by the opportunity to make a judgment about the quality of a piece of work.

2.3.2. Feedback Literacy

The definition of feedback literacy has originally derived from Stiggin's (1991) assessment literacy which was thoroughly discussed above. However, its definition and dimensions were firstly asserted by Sutton (2012). He defined the process of being feedback literate as "the process that enables learners to reach the standard of disciplinary knowledge indicated in module and programme learning outcomes, subject benchmarks, etc.; that assists learners in forming judgements concerning what counts as valid knowledge within particular disciplines; and that helps them develop the ability to assess the quality of their own and others' work" (p. 33). Similarly, Carless and Boud (2018) put forward another definition of feedback literacy as "the understandings, capacities, and dispositions needed to make sense of information and use it to enhance work or learning strategies" (p. 1316).

Sutton (2012) conceptualized feedback literacy under three dimensions:

epistemological, ontological, and practical. The epistemological dimension refers to how students understand feedback (Chong, 2020). According to Sutton (2012), students primarily enhance their capacity to comprehend feedback on and for knowing. Feedback on knowing is originally based on evaluation and correction (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). In this style of instruction, teaching, and learning, “quality and quantity of knowledge” learners exhibited in their tasks were evaluated, and learners made sense of the reason behind assigned marks (Sutton, 2012). To illustrate formative feature of feedback literacy, Batchelor (2006) brings the concept of “for” to the attention to emphasize students’ eagerness and potential for improvement and dynamicity. Then, feedback for knowing concerns about the ways of improving and promoting evaluative judgments, the understandable transmission of knowledge as well as “feed up (where am I going?)” and “feed-forward (where to next?)” (Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 87).

According to Barnett (2007), a sense of being is key to students’ development of knowledge and skills. From this aspect, the ontological dimension of feedback literacy addresses self-confidence, self-efficacy, and self-identity (Chong, 2020). According to Sutton (2012), learners having confidence in themselves and their work are capable of understanding and interpreting feedback information, thereby improving their literacy of feedback. On the other hand, the educational being of learners is vulnerable and fragile (Barnett, 2007). Therefore, they may suffer from a curtailed perception of self within the academic milieu (Sutton, 2012) as “being a student is to be in a state of anxiety” (Barnett, 2007, p. 32). This state, generally resulting in ignorance of feedback, thereby avoidance of engagement with feedback is resolved by caring for students’ emotions and careful usage of language without any threat to educational identity (Sutton, 2012).

Learners’ action concerning the provided feedback information; in other words, the practical dimension of feedback literacy is Sutton’s (2012) final dimension. Within this dimension, the role of Hattie and Timperley’s (2007) feed forward comes into prominence. This means that feedback literate learners convey feedback information that they understand and interpret to actions; in other words, following works (Sutton, 2012).

Carless and Boud (2018) conceptualized the notion of feedback literacy under four components: “appreciating feedback, making judgment, managing affect, and taking action” (p. 1316). Appreciating feedback encompasses multiple roles of students as acknowledging that feedback is valuable, and they are active players in this process (Carless & Boud, 2018). However, the majority of learners view the feedback process as the provision of message, comment, or information (McLean et al., 2015) by ignoring their active role (Bunce et al., 2017), and expecting corrective feedback from their instructors (O’Donovan, 2017). The passive role that students have absorbed prevents them from uncovering their potential for learning (Carless, 2007). To enhance engagement with feedback, learners need to acknowledge their responsibility as well as making sense of the value and meaning of feedback (Carless & Boud, 2018). Besides, it has been observed that feedback delivered with the use of technology has been found effective and valuable by learners (Brearley & Cullen, 2012; Pardo, 2018; Pardo et al., 2017; Parkes & Fletcher, 2017), and thus, it is a good opportunity to enable students to value for feedback (Carless & Boud, 2018). For example, students find personal audio feedback valuable and, thus, engaged in audio feedback more (Parkes & Fletcher, 2017).

Making judgment is the second component of feedback literacy framed by Carless & Boud (2018). Concerning the judgments made by students, Dawson (2017) suggests that students learn better when they assess others’ works regarding a set of criteria on good work. That is to say, they need to have evaluative judgment referring to the “capacity to make decisions about the quality of work of oneself and others” (Tai et al., 2018, p. 467). Feedback literate students who are able to make judgments actively participate in peer feedback (Chong, 2020) because it improves students’ understanding of criteria and standards as well as evaluative judgment by actively and regularly evaluating peers’ work (McConlogue, 2012; Nicol et al., 2014). Similarly, sharing exemplars representing the criteria in multiple ways enables learners to compare their works to criteria as they progress (Sadler, 1989). Besides, evaluation of self contributes to the capabilities to make judgment (Carless & Boud, 2018) as the learners provide internal feedback for themselves due to reconsideration of progress (Butler & Winnie, 1995). Therefore, the learners become more open to change and act as they generate their individual judgment (Boud & Molloy, 2013).

The third component of feedback literacy is managing affect referring to students' dispositions to manage their feelings, emotions, and attitudes (Carless & Boud, 2018). (Robinson et al., 2013) states that students' attitude towards feedback is defensive when they get a low grade or critical message in that they perceive feedback as threat to their identity and thus, react negatively. Therefore, equilibrium in emotional state is crucial for readiness to embrace critical feedback (To, 2016). Pitt and Norton (2017) suggests that critical feedback influence learners positively or negatively depending on their motivation, belief in their works, and capability to deal with challenging emotions. To enhance the confidence and belief of learners, a comfortable and trustworthy feedback atmosphere as well as the tone of the provided feedback is necessary because the dispositions of learners to uptake feedback are not always at an ideal level (Carless, 2013).

Taking action is the last component of Carless & Boud's (2018) feedback literacy framework. As Sutton (2012) asserts, learners need to act on feedback information that they have received. Boud and Molloy (2013) addressed this process as the closure of feedback loop where learners are active in understanding information and using it to contribute to their following works. Therefore, they need to have motivation and opportunities to act on feedback information should be provided (Shute, 2008). According to Winstone et al. (2017), learners are generally come up with strategies to overcome problems and drawbacks stated in feedback information though they have difficulty in implementing those strategies. That is why, students should recognize their active role by adapting their identities as a learner accordingly (Boud & Molloy, 2013).

In an attempt to expand the feedback literacy framework, "a three-dimensional student feedback literacy model" was conceptualized (Chong, 2020, p. 5). Along with the engagement dimension, the model presents that learners' emotional, behavioral, and cognitive engagement with feedback is influenced by two factors: individual and contextual. The engagement dimension in this model is based on Carless and Boud's (2018) feedback literacy framework encompassing cognitive, affective, and behavioral engagement; in other words, appreciating feedback, making judgment, managing affect, and taking action.

The contextual dimension comprises four levels: textual, interpersonal, instructional, and socio-cultural. In the textual level dimension, the tone and the type of feedback influence students' engagement with feedback. For example, authentic feedback facilitated with technology such as audio-recordings or video increase engagement with feedback (Chong, 2020). Interpersonal dimension addresses multiple concepts such as trust, relationship, power, and emotions (Chong, 2020). Maintaining a trustable rapport with teachers or peers is key for learners to be engaged with feedback (Carless, 2009). Regarding power; in other words, locus of control, fair distribution of control between teacher and student gives students the opportunity to optimally interact with feedback (Dann, 2019). Within instructional context, Carless and Winstone's (2020) teacher feedback literacy concept has an important function on the way students respond to feedback. This dimension also evolves around the development of tasks, activities, and assessment criteria, as well as strategies to implement them to promote engagement with feedback (Chong, 2020). As the last component of the contextual dimension, culture has a significant impact on attitudes and behaviors towards understanding and using feedback (Winstone & Boud, 2019). Furthermore, students identify their role in the feedback process depending on how their culture views the authority of the teacher (Chong, 2020).

The individual dimension is the last component within the three-dimensional model. It has been commonly discussed that diversity of students in their beliefs, capacities, abilities, goals, and experiences (Han & Hyland, 2019; Shute, 2008; Sutton, 2012) has an impact on their uptake of feedback. Concerning the abilities and capacities of students, high achieving students have more dispositions to make sense of feedback and then use it in comparison to low-achieving ones (Sommers, 1980). Similarly, van der Kleij (2019) claims that the more learners have confidence in their knowledge and skills, the more they perceive feedback in a positive way, thereby eagerly responding to it. Han (2019) suggests that learners' engagement with feedback is optimal when information delivered with feedback is in line with individual learning goals and their beliefs about the usefulness and effectiveness of delivered feedback information. Regarding the previous experiences in feedback, students in higher education grow dependent on teacher feedback due to their role in the feedback process as a free-rider prior to university (Beaumont et al., 2011).

2.3.3. Social Constructivist Theory of Feedback Literacy

The origin of constructivism goes back to Piaget's (1969) developmental view and Bruner's (1961) discovery learning. Constructivism is a combination of multiple approaches, mainly cognitivism and behaviorism. Caffarella and Merriam (1999) defined constructivism as a process where learners perceive their experiences and construct meaning upon them. There are two major branches of constructivism: cognitive (Piaget, 1971) and social (Vygotsky, 1978) constructivism, which is the underlying theory of this study.

People are social beings, and they continuously interact with other people in their communities (Woo & Reeves, 2007). This characteristic of human beings has been conceptualized in educational theories and studies. According to Vygotsky's (1978) social constructivism, people initially develop their cognition within a social context, and then it grows individually. Daniels (2001) suggests that characteristics of language and other means of communication facilitate knowledge construction on inter-psychological level while it is internalized on intrapersonal level. Therefore, learning is perceived as a social interaction where learners discuss and negotiate (Ernest, 1995). However, Vygotsky (1986) suggests that negotiation and interaction are primarily mediated by language, and thus, it is subject to be decoded to transmit personal constructs to social ones. Then, social practices, means, and tools within a learning environment contribute to learners' cognitive development.

The perception of specific circumstances within a culture or context is the primary focus in knowledge construction and, as a result, learning (Derry 1999). At that point, the aim is to come to an agreement on interpretations of knowledge rather than objective testing of reality or truth as it concurs within a social group (Heylighen, 1993). To give an example, an individual evaluated to have been unsuccessful in comprehension may be instead judged to have poorly interpreted in comparison to socially acknowledged way. Thus, learners raise their awareness of others' realities in comparison to their own (Adams, 2006). As Roth (2000) noted, the construction of knowledge at the social level enables learners to perceive others and, thus, make a connection between observed circumstances and themselves. As knowledge construction is an indication of reality and the reality appears in various forms

depending on learners' minds, the possibility of numerous theories exists.

According to Woo and Reeves (2007), social constructivism is based on three concepts in the learning process: zone of proximal development, intersubjectivity, and enculturation. Vygotsky (1978) defined zone of proximal development as “the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers” (p. 86). At the actual level, learners perform their capacity or ability on their own (Wang et al., 2011) while learners reach the potential level with the help of a more competent peer or tutor; in other words, through scaffolding (Bruner, 1985). Intersubjectivity is defined as reciprocal comprehension among people acquired by effective interaction (Woo & Reeves, 2007). Through interaction, Meter and Stevens (2000) state that individual aspects are shared, and then, learners construct the knowledge collectively, which is also called collaborative elaboration. Enculturation provides students to learn commonly agreed values and norms of a society or community through established culture (Vrasidas, 2000).

The procedures and principles of multiple instruction theories have evolved around social constructivist theory (Hein, 1991; Saunders, 1992; Wheatley, 1991), which also informs the framework of student feedback literacy. The main principles commonly discussed in the literature are as follows (Adams, 2006):

(1) Focus on learning not performance. (2) View learners as co-constructors of meaning and knowledge. (3) Establish a teacher-pupil relationship built upon guidance not instruction. (4) Seek to engage learners in tasks seen as ends in themselves and consequently as having implicit worth. (5) Promote assessment as an active process of uncovering and acknowledging shared understanding (p. 247).

According to Carless & Boud (2018), the construct of student feedback literacy primarily put an emphasis on students' understanding of feedback information to use it for future works, thereby promoting and improving learning. Concerning the principle of 'learning orientation' instead of performance, Watkins (2001) asserts that learners take control of the process and evaluate one's own individual progress against one's prior condition. Similarly, Dweck (1999) suggested that learners depict themselves as a person expanding one's comprehension while cherishing their success

in challenging tasks. On the other hand, ‘performance orientation’ results in a lack of control on learning as enhancing performance has been the main concern leading to learned helplessness (Dweck, 1999). Therefore, students face a challenge (MacGilchrist, 2003) where effort is measured with praises and punishments (Shepard, 2000). The concept of mind in society (Vygotsky, 1978) is a crucial asset in understanding learning, and thus, social constructivist principles regard learning as “a mindful activity” (Adams, 2006, p. 248). As mentioned above, learners construct knowledge and meaning in company with others (Vygotsky, 1978) while contributing to the learning process of others by bringing their perspectives to be cultural and social context (Sutherland et al., 2004). Then, the learning process is reciprocal: learners interact with their teachers and peers to collaboratively construct meaning within a socio-cultural milieu; in other words, their mindful activities scaffold one another (Silcock, 2003). Similarly, the social constructivist feedback approach assumes that dialogue, making sense of information, and co-construction between stakeholders improve individual and shared interpretations (Carless & Boud, 2018).

Feedback is viewed as a process where teachers and students evenly share responsibilities (Nash & Winstone, 2017). Within social constructivist principles, teachers are not only instructors but also facilitators (Copley, 1992) and organizers (Hanley, 1994) represented as a potential information source (Crowther, 1997) whereas guiding pupils to discover favorable circumstances and their motivation to construct meaning and knowledge (Adams, 2006). Therefore, teacher is responsible for creating a secure learning environment (Jonassen, 1994) and designating an effective feedback process (Malecka et al. 2020) where social interaction and cooperative construction of knowledge are predominant phenomena. On the other hand, students also take the responsibility of multiple actions: seeking, engaging with, and taking action on information delivered with feedback (Malecka et al., 2020).

Pupils’ perception of what is valuable for themselves leads to genuine learning (Silcock, 2003). Desforges (1993) asserts that mindful commitment is not alone sufficient to enhance learning. Learners’ goals and self-awareness lead to persistence of learning and engagement with feedback as well (Han & Hyland, 2015). In this way,

they feel that they have a purpose and understand their position within a task, which provides a sense of meaning (Adams, 2006), and thereby enhancing motivation to uptake feedback (Han, 2019). As Silcock (2003) suggests, mindful commitment is inadequate to yield tenacity in learning with a mere focus on interest, though. Then, the underpinning principles hereby are pupils' perception of value and meaning of feedback information (Chong, 2020), as well as the potential of knowledge to be mediated into socio-cultural context (Adams, 2006).

The difference between assessment for learning and on learning has been commonly discussed (Harlen, 2009; Hume & Coll, 2009). In the former one, the principles of social constructivist theory focused on the assessment as a dynamic process where learners discover and internalize shared understanding. In Vygotsky's (1978) zone of proximal development, the support of significant and knowledgeable others enables plentiful circumstances for learning (Sutherland et al., 2004). Concerning this idea, Storch (2018) claims that expert assistance, typically from professors, is especially important in empowering students to promote their work and interact meaningfully with feedback - knowledge that can only be taken action by students under the favor of experts (e.g., zone of proximal development). Therefore, designating an active, continuous, and integrated assessment is achievable with the construction of inter-psychology (Adams, 2006). As Tharp and Galimore (1988) suggested, interactive and dialogic attempts yield conversation on instruction divulging hidden or unconscious thoughts, knowledge, and meaning.

2.3.4. Research on Feedback Literacy

Sutton (2012) utilized the empirical data from a previous study funded by Higher Education Academy. The aim of this study was to explain the process of becoming feedback literate as well as the impact of academicians' educational identities on feedback literacy. For this study, semi-structured interviews of 21 students and eight academicians from two social sciences departments in England and Scotland were analyzed. In the analysis of data, Fairclough's (1992) critical discourse analysis compatible with the academic literacy approach was employed. As a result of the data analysis, it was found that learners are expected to be engaged in ontological, epistemological, and practical dimensions to be feedback literate. In the

epistemological dimension, learners were engaged in feedback on knowing; in other words, the quantity and quality of knowledge as well as feedback for knowing meaning being open to playing an active role in improvement. In the ontological dimension, learners identify their educational existence influencing their challenges in anxiety, vulnerability, and self-confidence. In the practical dimension, students read, comprehended, and acted upon the feedback information they acquired. Aside from these dimensions, it was also revealed that the relationship between academicians and learners played an important role in the engagement of feedback positively and successfully. The author provides a theoretical background to support each type of analysis and interpretation. The conceptualization and the framework start with the most general and basic explanations and moves towards details of findings.

Malecka et al. (2020) aimed to conceptualize the integration of feedback literacy of students into the curriculum of undergraduate degrees with three key elements: “eliciting, processing, and enacting.” Consequently, the researchers suggested that certain feedback practices are required to be included in the curriculum. These practices are requesting feedback, progressively using self-assessment, cumulatively engaging in peer review, utilizing e-portfolio specifically regulated for feedback. However, there has still been a need to empirically and longitudinally inspect eliciting, processing, and enacting mechanisms to elaborate on feedback literacy.

The characteristics of feedback literacy, in other words, how learners comprehend and then use feedback to promote their learning, were identified (Molloy et al., 2020). For this purpose, a large-scale survey was conducted on 4541 students and five focus groups consisting of 28 students enrolled in two Australian universities to find out practices and experiences related to feedback. Next, seven case studies where 20 students were interviewed were carried out. To analyze the data from open-ended questions, an initial coding framework was employed. Then, the researchers discussed the assigned codes, consulted to expert opinion, structured the codes, and lasted these procedures until theoretically achieving a saturation point. As a result, it was reported that students are engaged in feedback as improvement, highly value it as an active practice, elaborate on information to promote learning, act on feedback information to achieve desired results, manage emotions, consider feedback as a

mutual process, and act on outcomes. The study clearly explains the findings in line with an extension of the theoretical framework of feedback literacy.

Feedback literacy profile of focal students and how feedback literacy influences their engagement with feedback was also investigated with a case study where students were required to write five argumentative essays (Han & Xu, 2019a). The first task with the second draft was take-home. The rest was in-class essays completed within an allocated time. Then, the teacher provided both content-related and written corrective feedback. Within-case and cross-case comparisons were conducted through thematic analysis. It was revealed that two students' coding schemes and themes were common. As a result, feedback literacy was found to have two characteristics: intrapersonal and interpersonal variations. Interpersonal variations referred to motivation, beliefs, and metacognition of students, while intrapersonal variations refer to the way the same student acquired feedback literacy at different levels depending on temporal dimensions and facets of construct. Besides, it was revealed that feedback literacy is not stagnant but can be improved. To achieve high level feedback literacy, the balance of three components was required: socio-affective capacity, socio-affective disposition, and cognitive capacity. On the other hand, lack of strategies, knowledge, motivation, belief, and self-concept restricted feedback literacy. The current case study shows how three components of feedback literacy were interrelated. The complex nature of feedback and educational context was resolved with the help of qualitative data and their interpretation. However, the generalization or transferability of single English writing tasks to the whole feedback literacy literature may not be possible.

In another study, it was aimed to investigate the factors constituting cognitive and socio-affective readiness of 5 international postgraduate students within the frame of their feedback literacy in L2 disciplinary writing (Li & Han, 2021). Three data sources were used for the current study. For the first one, three interviews were conducted upon the assignment of essay topics and suggestions on planning, the end of first drafts, and the submission of final essays. The second one was that a single and stimulated recall session was conducted after the feedback reports of the essays. The last one consisted of supplementary data where students' essay drafts and final submissions, as well as teachers' written and verbal feedback reports, had been

analyzed. Thematic analysis using an initial coding framework was used. The first framework was based on cognitive and socio-affective readiness. Later, analytic induction was employed to clarify the subcategories of each theme and to identify the factors of student feedback literacy in L2 disciplinary writing. The findings of cognitive readiness were categorized as knowledge of the subject, disciplinary conventions, L2 linguistic, and pragmatic competence. Data revealed that participants had limited subject knowledge, and this prevented them from using teacher feedback, except for one participant founded to make use of given feedback more. In the scope of disciplinary conventions and epistemologies, the lack of them caused three of the participants to interpret the given feedback wrong and impeded them from taking it. Because of limited L2 linguistic knowledge, all the participants had difficulty in fixing their linguistic problems. As part of their pragmatic competence, the interview data showed that three of the participants had trouble in counterbalancing the pragmatic meaning of the instructor's comments. On the other hand, the findings of socio-affective readiness were categorized as proactivity in using feedback and attitudes towards/appreciation of tutor feedback. Within the frame of proactivity, others' ideas, different tutors, and a variety of materials assisted the progress of taking the teacher's feedback, while lack of proactivity caused not to understand the given feedback sufficiently. In the scope of attitudes and perceptions, participants were found to be engaged in the uptake of feedback more when they believed in the expertise of the teachers. It has also been observed that students perceived a tutor credible in one of the components of essay writing while they did not find him/her expert in another component.

The construct of feedback literacy was also studied longitudinally. Students' responses to feedback were also questioned within the concepts of feedback loop: single and double loops (Carless, 2019). Evidence from a 5-year longitudinal inquiry of a case combined with eight regular interviews with 4 Arts and Education students was utilized to analyze feedback loops. As a result of the analysis of data, it was reported that students had multiple experiences. They were not successful in engagement with comments provided at the end of the semester while they acted on them temporarily and strived to develop learning strategies in the long run. Although the feedback loop was fixated to shorter-term, feedback spirals presented an iteration of the learning

process in the long term.

Learner characteristics play an important role in the feedback process (Carless, 2020; Carless & Boud, 2018; Chong, 2020; Han & Xu, 2019a; Molloy et al., 2020). Wei et al. (2020) inspected whether there had been a change in senior students' expectations of teacher feedback in comparison to junior ones and whether this change could be justified by the change in feedback literacy of students. Initially, quantitative data were collected from 427 undergraduate students via an 11-item survey. Participants were also invited to comment on two-open ended questions about the quality and quantity of teacher feedback. Also, interview data were collected from 5 students to investigate the change in students' feedback literacy and its effect on the expectation on teacher feedback practice. For the analysis of quantitative data, descriptive analysis and ANOVA were run. To interpret the interview data, codes were generated based on the literature on effective and ineffective feedback as well as Carless and Boud's (2018) feedback literacy components. ANOVA results showed that there was no significant difference between the levels of students in terms of feedback items though the means of the ratings in satisfaction of senior students with quality and quantity of feedback decreased. A categorical difference was observed between senior and junior students as a result of interview data. There is a change from instructing on tasks and answers to offering opportunities for the feedback receivers to use comments for self- evaluation in the future. For the quantity of feedback, senior students were inclined to have more control over their feedback by demanding teachers to be more flexible on time. In reference to the interview data, it has been found that the participants increased their awareness in five components of feedback literacy.

Feedback literacy of students has also been discussed within a specific field. Noble et al. (2019) also problematized the feedback literacy of students from their perspective within the healthcare context. One hundred five healthcare students participated in a workplace feedback literacy program followed by an interview. Among them, 27 of the students voluntarily participated in an interview about their perception and experience of feedback before and after the feedback program. The transcripts were analyzed following the steps of familiarization, generation of thematic framework, indexing, charting, and interpretation. The interpretations presented previous

experiences in feedback as a one-way process formed feedback engagement within placement context. Besides, the participants experienced arousal in terms of their active role and comprehension of the purpose of feedback. Workplace feedback program contributed to the construction of the feedback process and social feedback capacities.

The improvement of feedback literacy of students through educational technology and feedback conversation was also discussed. Ducasse and Hill (2019) aimed to enhance uptake of feedback, fill the gap between students' and teachers' expectations and goals, give support to students to take an active role as well as decrease the workload of teachers. Therefore, 50 undergraduate students enrolled in a Spanish program were administered a questionnaire about their perception of motivation, feedback, and interest. Then, an intervention where students were provided with feedback on their 12-week tasks was applied. Upon the intervention, the participants completed a post-intervention questionnaire on benefits, perception, and uptake of feedback as well as self-assessment. In addition, they were invited to an interview session. Data from questionnaires were analyzed with descriptive statistics, while thematic analysis was used for interview data. The findings showed that there was a general understanding that feedback should be specific to improvement, corrective, and informative. Most participants agreed that they were more inclined to be engaged in the feedback and take responsibility for their learning than before. An appreciation of self-assessment was commonly observed. Despite certain problems in using technology for feedback, participants were generally positive about the use of e-portfolio.

In feedback literature, students' feedback literacy has been the primary focus (Chong, 2020; Han & Xu, 2019a; Molloy et al., 2020). However, academicians' feedback literacy is also a crucial point necessary to be considered to develop effective strategies in favor of feedback literacy. Gravett et al. (2019) aimed to initiate a dialogue about the role of feedback literacy for students and academicians. That's why the researchers administered interviews mediated with concept maps where 6 participants working at the academic development department were asked to write concept labels on a post-it and relate them on a piece of paper. Then, the interviewer digitally created the map and made the interviewee check whether it was a good reflection of their

experiences. After the discussion, participants wrote a follow-up reflection. To analyze the data, open coding of corpus, generation of substantial coding, identification of recurrent themes, and semantic themes were followed successively. Consequently, it was reported that participants appreciated the positive aspects of feedback, developed their skills in evaluative judgment, acknowledged the benefits of peer feedback, felt comfortable about it, developed a strategy to take advantage of feedback. Nonetheless, several negative aspects were also stated. These were disconnection with feedback, anonymous reviewer, feedback out of engagement, and threat to identity. Feedback literacy from the academicians' point of view has contributed a different aspect to literature in that it extends the concept beyond students. As Chan and Luo (2021) stated, the instructors' understanding of feedback is important to promote achievement and learning.

Peer assessment has been discussed to play a key role in engagement with feedback and, thus, feedback literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018). Therefore, students' gaining from peer marking, comparing their marking to those of their peers, perception of peer marking were examined (Fernández-Toro & Duensing, 2020). Students registered to a distance learning course at Open University in the UK were observed during their learning activities regarding their engagement with feedback. To present the distribution of marks in the forum discussions, numeric data were also collected, but it was not the focus of the study. The procedure consisted of three steps. Firstly, students were given a marking template and peer assessment guide. Then, they were asked to mark two exemplars and write their comments. Lastly, they explained their marks anonymously on a tutor-moderated forum discussion. Engagement patterns were detected, and forum discussions were analyzed thematically, as well as a quantitative analysis of marks on the forums. The results evolved around three main themes: judgment formation, comparison of markings to each other, and attitudes and perceptions of students towards peer marking. In the scope of judgment formation, four sub-themes came out: reporting issues related to grading, making comparisons, discussion of performance according to marking criteria, and feeding forward. Besides, the main theme of comparison of markings to each other emerged. Lastly, the majority of the students commented about the activity's value while few did not find it useful.

In another study about peer feedback in feedback literacy, Han and Xu (2019b) identified the role of teachers' feedback as a follow-up on peer feedback to promote feedback literacy of students. For this purpose, several case studies were conducted with 30 master's students taking an academic writing course. Data were collected from numerous sources: tasks, semi-structured interviews, class documents, observation field reports, and verbal notes were employed. Within the current study, students were required to write an argumentative essay as a first draft, and then, they were expected to give and receive peer feedback in line with the instructions of the teacher. Upon this practice, teacher provided feedback on peer feedbacks. Next, the students submitted the second draft in company with peer feedback on different aspects of essays. Lastly, teacher feedback on peer feedback was followed by the submission of the final version of essays. Among 30 students completing these steps, only 3 of them were selected purposively due to their divergency. Data were analyzed with the use of content analysis and cross-case comparisons. The results indicated that there was a disequilibrium between students' social and cognitive readiness. Students were able to provide cognitive and practical knowledge, while moderate improvement was observed concerning their affective and social readiness. Moreover, cross-case variations were revealed in the development of feedback literacy. Each student had different paces to achieve different aspects of feedback literacy. In this process, teachers had the roles of scaffolding and authority in the improvement of students' feedback literacy.

The use of specific tools designed for feedback context has been suggested to contribute to feedback and its use by students (Burford et al. 2010; Caruso et al. 2019; Davis et al. 2017). In one of the studies, "Developing Engagement with Feedback Toolkit (DEFT)" (Winstone & Nash, 2016) which is an accessible resource designed to enrich proactivity of students was investigated regarding its usefulness to enhance feedback literacy (Winstone et al., 2019). Three studies were conducted to collect data on DEFT and feedback literacy. In the first study, an online survey was administered to 92 undergraduate Psychology students to collect data on the perception of DEFT, use of feedback, and learning approaches (deep or surface). Descriptive and correlation analyses of variables were employed. The results showed that participants with a deep approach rated the use of feedback higher. Also, their current state and

ideal use of feedback were rated closely. On the other hand, the perception of DEFT was not related to the approach to learning. Both surface and deep learning approaches were negatively and weakly correlated with perception of using DEFT. However, the ones with a strong deep approach were inclined to think positively for tools while those of surface approach perceived them more pessimistically. In the discussed study, the correlation among the perception and the approach on the variables are reported concerning individual differences, which has been previously stated to mean a lot in feedback literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018; Molloy et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2020). However, the explanation behind those perceptions is unknown. Besides, the use of non-parametric approach to analysis may not yield theoretical accuracy.

In another study, students' perception of DEFT was explored with potential facilitating and impeding factors (Winstone et al., 2019). 13 undergraduate Psychology students participated in the study. Firstly, a rapport-building activity was conducted. Then, students were given the summary of each DEFT tool for the introduction. Also, they were given a copy of feedback guide with the glossary, some workshop activities, and screenshots of portfolio. After the participants explored these sources, they were asked about how these may help their learning and their use of feedback. Finally, they were asked to express their take-home message. The transcripts of interviews were thematically analyzed in a deductive way. It was found that feedback guides, glossary, workshops, and portfolios were valued while certain weaknesses of them were noted down. A feedback glossary was stated to clarify academic terminology from the perspective of markers, although it could not take the place of dialogue with academics. Feedback guides were found to be useful when it was explicit and made learners understand their emotional readiness. Yet, emotional descriptions inhibited engagement with feedback. Engagement with feedback, the dialogue with peers, and the existence of feedback examples were expressed among the benefits of the feedback workshop. Lastly, multiple participants explained that feedback portfolio was time-efficient while the rest found them intricate and remarked the necessity to cover them within contact hours. The study gives the reader the chance to see what is going on in the students' minds when they are engaged with feedback. The researchers also point to the interaction between

students' level and their feedback literacy, which is discussed as one of the variables influencing feedback literacy (Ducasse & Hill, 2019; Gravett, 2020; Han & Xu, 2019a).

Winstone et al. (2019) also aimed to explore the influence of feedback literacy workshops on feedback literacy. Therefore, 103 undergraduate Psychology students were firstly asked to complete a 14-item scale on feedback literacy. Then, a workshop with feedback literacy discussions and activities was held with the participants. Right after the workshop, they were asked to complete the 14-item feedback literacy scale one more time. To analyze the data from scales, the averages of participants in 14 items were computed. The normality of the distribution was also checked. As some individuals' skewness was high, both parametric and non-parametric approaches were used in analyzing averages to robust the findings to alternative analyses. The participants' scores were 3.99 out of 5 prior to the workshop, while they scored 4.19 right after the workshop. A paired samples t-test showed that this is a statistically significant increase in feedback literacy, $t(76) = 6.80$, $p < 0.001$, $d = 0.62$. A non-parametric Wilcoxon test also resulted the same, $Z(n = 77) = 5.55$, $p < 0.001$, $r = 0.45$. The study fills the gap in the feedback literacy literature, which is the lack of feedback literacy scales to collect quantitative data in that most of the studies have been investigating feedback literacy qualitatively. It also presents the influences of one of the feedback literacy interventions, workshops. However, getting higher scores after the post-test may not result from workshops. The administration of the same scale to participants as pre- and post-test may not be valid because of the testing effect.

The framework of feedback literacy was also developed with an interrogation of discipline-specific curriculum (Winstone et al., 2020). For this purpose, a content analysis of NQFs and SBSs of five countries (Hong Kong, UK, USA, South Africa, Mexico, and Australia) guiding universities on goals and outcomes was conducted to develop discipline-specific feedback literacies. Also, experts were consulted on the subject matters. To analyze the data, Carless and Boud's (2018) framework of feedback literacy was used for the development of a coding scheme. The content and the criteria of the curriculum were matched with five feedback literacy components: appreciating feedback- strengths and weaknesses, professional development, function

of feedback; making judgment- self-assessment, reflection, peer feedback; managing affect- constructive criticism, striving for improvement, learning through mentoring/supervision; taking action- use feedback, acting on feedback. In NFQ findings, the most observed component was making judgments. There were no examples of appreciating feedback and taking action while a single sample of managing affect was observed. In SBS findings, feedback literacy components were mostly identified in applied sciences. There was not a significant difference between hard and soft subjects. Appreciating feedback was observed in one of the Soft Pure fields - English. Making judgment was observed in almost soft-hard/pure-applied fields except for Chemistry, Physics, Astronomy, Astrophysics, History, and Law. Managing affect was the second important component and it was mostly observed applied fields (soft or hard). There were only two hard-pure fields where this component was identified. Lastly, taking action was only identified in Law and Sociology (soft sciences).

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

This chapter aims to present the details of the research method. First, the research questions and the design of the study are introduced. Then, the context of the study, participants, instrumentation, data collection procedures, and data analysis process are elaborated in separate sections. Finally, the trustworthiness issues and limitations of the study are explained.

3.1. Research Questions

The aim of the study was to investigate the indicators of feedback literacy within Turkish Higher Education context in respect of English Language Teaching (ELT) students, factors enhancing and impeding feedback literacy, as well as type, timing, and amount of given feedback.

Hence, the research questions leading the study were as follows:

1. How do ELT students perceive feedback practices in terms of type, amount, and timing of feedback?
2. What are the indicators of feedback literacy for ELT students?
3. What are enhancing factors affecting the feedback literacy of ELT students?
4. What are impeding factors affecting the feedback literacy of ELT students?

3.2. Design of the Study

This study mainly employed a qualitative design. There were two reasons why a qualitative design was utilized for this study. The first reason was that the concept of feedback literacy had hardly been investigated within the context of Turkish higher education before. As Maxwell (2004) suggested, qualitative design was especially suited to understand phenomena within a specific context on which the individuals'

actions, behaviors, experiences, and feelings had an impact. The second reason was that the study evolved around revealing the participants' interpretation of experiences, events, and situations in relation to feedback literacy. When the goal was to comprehend meaning from the perspective of individuals, qualitative research was a solid design to contribute to the research process (Maxwell, 2011).

Among the categories of qualitative methods, a basic qualitative design was chosen. In this qualitative design by Merriam (2009), the way individuals built up and depicted their world, as well as the meaning they ascribed to their experiences, were the interest of the qualitative researcher. Since the overall aim of this study was to understand students' experiences and feelings within their feedback context, basic qualitative design was a suitable match for the nature of the phenomenon.

3.3. Context of the Study

The context of the study was within the scope of the English Language Teaching (ELT) Program. This four-year ELT program was published by Council of Higher Education (CoHE), and it was the commonly used framework in both private and public universities in Turkey. The program was renewed in 2018 to extend teaching practice over a period and adjust it to the Ministry of Education's latest program. The purpose of the program was to educate preservice teachers in the acquisition of professional teaching knowledge and skills.

According to CoHE (2018), the ELT program introduced four English skills, foundations of education, basic subject matter knowledge, and general culture courses in the first year, followed by the advanced levels of the same courses, as well as technology and research courses. In the following years, teaching practice and more field-specific courses were offered.

In this study, data were collected from three universities. These universities were labeled as A, B, and C to ensure confidentiality. University A and B were public universities, while University C was a private one. All of them had been following the framework and the program of CoHE in their ELT programs. University A and B had been offering their ELT programs for 77 and 39 years, respectively. On the other hand,

University C had had this program for 12 years. Hence, the context of the ELT program was well-established in these universities.

To understand the context better, participants were asked to report assessment methods used in their courses before remote education. Assessment methods utilized in these universities were reported to be exams, quizzes, assignments/projects, presentations, and portfolio. All of the responses in each of the universities were summarized in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Assessment Methods across Universities before Remote Education

Assessment method	University		
	A	B	C
Exams	16	13	10
Quizzes	5	13	8
Assignment/Project	13	13	10
Portfolio	11	8	10
Presentation	16	13	10
Others	1	2	0

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

In all universities, it was reported that exams, presentations, and assignments/projects were frequently employed. The frequency of quizzes and portfolio were noted to be relatively lower than exams, assignment/project, and presentation. Unlike other universities, the frequency of quizzes in University B was reported to be same as those of exams, assignment/project, and presentation.

Participants were also asked to report feedback format of commonly used assessment methods before remote education. Responses were summarized in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Distribution of Feedback Format of Assessment Methods across Universities before Remote Education

Assessment method	University		
	A	B	C
Exams/Quizzes	Individual Oral	Individual Oral	Individual Oral
	Individual Written	Individual Written	Individual Written
	Whole-Class Oral	Whole-Class Oral	Whole-Class Oral
Assignment/Project	Individual Oral	Individual Oral	Individual Oral
	Individual Written	Individual Written	Individual Written
		Electronic Oral	Electronic Written
		Electronic Written	
Portfolio	Individual Written	Individual Written	Individual Written
Presentation	Individual Oral	Individual Oral	Individual Oral
		Electronic Written	Electronic Written

As summarized in Table 3.2, the participants reported exposure to various feedback formats before remote education. In all universities, individual written and individual oral feedback were reported to be used for each assessment method: exams/quizzes, assignments/projects, portfolio, and presentation. On the other hand, participants in each university mentioned using whole-class oral feedback for only exams/quizzes. The electronic, written format was reported to be used only by University B and C to provide feedback for assignments/projects and presentations. In contrast, only University B participants reported that electronic, oral format (e.g., voice recording) was utilized to deliver feedback for assignments and projects.

Participants were also asked to report the assessment methods employed during remote education. The number of responses for each assessment method was summarized in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3

Assessment Methods across Universities during Remote Education

Assessment method	University		
	A	B	C
Exams	9	4	7
Quizzes	0	2	3
Assignment/Project	14	13	10
Portfolio	0	2	3
Presentation	13	5	7
Others	1	7	2

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

The majority of participants reported that the ELT program in University A mainly employed assignment/projects and presentations during remote education. Although it was not as frequent as face-to-face education, more than half of the participants noted that exams were still used during remote education. None of the participants in University A mentioned the use of quizzes and portfolios. Only one participant mentioned that participation in class discussions was assessed during remote education. Similar to University A, participants in University B and University C reported that assignments and projects were commonly used. Portfolios and quizzes were also least commonly used in University B and University C. On the other hand, presentation and exams were less commonly reported to be used than University A. In University B, almost half of the participants addressed the use of other assessment methods: take-home exams and participation.

Respondents were also asked to report feedback format during remote education; their responses were summarized in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4

Distribution of Feedback Format of Assessment Methods across Universities during Remote Education

<i>Assessment method</i>	University		
	A	B	C
Exams/Quizzes	Whole-Class Oral	Whole-Class Oral Electronic Written	Whole-Class Oral Electronic Written
Assignment/Project	Synchronous Oral Electronic Written	Synchronous Oral Asynchronous Oral Electronic Written	Synchronous Oral Electronic Written
Portfolio	Electronic Written	Electronic Written	Electronic Written
Presentation	Synchronous Oral	Synchronous Oral Electronic Written	Synchronous Oral Electronic Written

Regarding the participants' reports, all universities resorted to electronic, written feedback for each assessment method: exams/quizzes, assignments/projects, portfolio, and presentations, but only University A did not use this format for presentations. On the other hand, synchronous oral format feedback was employed by all the universities for assignments/projects and presentations. Only University B utilized asynchronous oral format to deliver feedback for assignments and projects.

3.4. Participants

In qualitative research design, non-random or specifically purposive sampling was well-suited as the purpose of the researcher was to procure a sample compromising with the aim of the study since the primary concern was not generalization (Fraenkel et al., 2015). The most fundamental strength of purposive sampling was that it provided prosperous and plentiful information about the inquired phenomenon (Patton, 2002). Moreover, as LeCompte and Preissle (1993) suggested, the term criterion-based selection and purposive sampling can be used interchangeably since the researcher generated a list of criteria suited to the study and strived to detect a group reflecting the predetermined criteria, which were used as the selection strategy in this study.

The participants of the current study were selected with the method of purposive sampling based on predetermined criteria. The first criterion was the existence of feedback context in the participants' undergraduate program. Upon examining feedback studies in Turkish higher education, the ELT program had been found to be context-rich in terms of methods, format, and types (Kahraman & Yalvaç, 2015). Selection of proper level was the second criterion. In this study, first and second year students were not included. The reason was that they are inclined to overestimate their comprehension of the assessment process. Thus, there was a considerable gap between their thoughts on assessment criteria and what is required (Francis, 2008). Moreover, first and second-year students did not have enough experience to apply feedback information to their future tasks. Therefore, they might not be suitable for the feedback literacy context. For these reasons, the study was limited to third- and fourth- year university students. The final criterion was to identify public and private universities where a well-established ELT program had been followed. As stated in the context of the study, public universities (University A and B) had been offering their ELT programs for 77 and 39 years, respectively, while the private university (University C) had had this program for 12 years.

In total, 39 undergraduate students enrolled in the English Language Teaching Program of two public universities and one private university in Ankara, Turkey,

participated in the study. The characteristics of participants by age, year of study, and cumulative grade point average (cGPA) were presented in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5

The Number of Junior and Senior Participants, and the Range of their Ages and Cumulative GPA Regarding the Universities

University	Number of Participants		Range	
	Juniors	Seniors	Age	CGPA
A	7	9	21-24	2.99-3.62
B	6	7	21-28	2.61-3.94
C	6	4	20-25	2.12-3.92
Total	19	20	20-28	2.12-3.94

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

There were 16 students from University A, while 13 of them were from University B. On the other hand, ten students enrolled in University C participated in the study. Overall, 20 students were in 4th year, whereas 19 of them were in 3rd year. Their ages ranged from 20 to 28. Besides, the cumulative GPA of the participants was between the range of 2.12 and 3.94. Among 16 participants enrolled in University A, there were nine fourth year and seven third year students, ages ranging from 21 to 24. Their cumulative GPA varied between 2.99 and 3.62. Participants of University B constituted of seven fourth year and six third year students with a cumulative GPA between 2.61 and 3.94. Their ages ranged from 21 to 28. Of the 12 participants from University C, four were fourth year, whereas six were third year. Their ages ranged from 20 to 25, and their cumulative GPA varied between 2.12 and 3.92.

In addition, participants were asked three open-ended questions: (1) Do you consider yourself a successful student? (2) Do you like your field of study? (3) Do you plan to work in your field of study in the future? Their responses to the first question were categorized as “yes,” “average,” and “no,” while their responses to the last two questions were categorized as “yes” and “no.” These were tabulated in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6

The Distribution of Participants in Universities A, B, and C across their Perception of Success, Interest in the Field, and Future Plans in the Field

University	Perception of Success			Interest in Field		Future Plans	
	Yes	Average	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
A	7	7	2	14	2	16	0
B	10	2	1	13	0	13	0
C	5	2	3	9	1	9	1
Total	23	10	6	36	3	38	1

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

More than half of the participants ($n = 23$) stated that they considered themselves successful learners, while six expressed the opposite. On the other hand, ten reported that they regarded their success as average. Concerning their interest in the field, the majority of the participants ($n = 36$) noted that they had liked their field of study, whereas only three of them expressed their dislike. When the participants were asked whether they plan to work in their field of study in the future, almost all participants ($n = 38$) said “yes.” Answers to these three questions were similar in three universities.

3.5. Instruments

As a data collection instrument, an interview protocol was developed by the researcher. Merriam (2009) stated that the primary method of data collection in basic qualitative research was interview when the aim was to understand the meaning of an experience. Both structured and semi-structured questions were generated for the interview. In order to collect demographic data from the participants, the first section of the interview protocol was designed as structured. It consisted of questions revealing participants' age, university, department, year of study, and cumulative GPA. It was followed by a semi-structured section where the researcher pursued a list of open-ended questions but had the flexibility to change the order and the wording of the interview to elaborate on the research question (Merriam, 2009). These questions were initially generated in line with the conceptual framework of feedback literacy and previous qualitative research on feedback, considering the feedback context in Turkish higher education. The language of the interview was in Turkish as it was the native language of the subjects.

Four experts were consulted regarding the initial interview questions to avoid any biased or vague expressions. Firstly, two experts in Educational Sciences revised the questions' congruence with the concept of feedback literacy and the frame of a good interview design. The questions about judgment and the value of feedback were added. Upon the suggestions, the interview started with assessment and feedback context in general. It then evolved into feedback literacy components, and finally, it included questions related to assessment and feedback during remote education. More specifically, the questions were formed under the following headings:

- Perception about field, success, and career plan
- Assessment methods
- Feedback types and formats
- Timing and amount of feedback
- Judgment about feedback
- Value of feedback
- Interpersonal context of feedback
- Management of affect

Sample questions were as follows:

- Why is feedback essential for progress? What types of feedback have contributed to your progress the most? Why? Do you have any specific memory to share regarding the feedback you have received so far?
- How do you feel when you receive feedback? How does it affect you? (*motivation/self-confidence*)
 - How does positive feedback affect you? Why?
 - How does negative feedback affect you? Why?
- What do you do when you are not able to make sense of provided feedback? (*interaction with professors/peers*)

Aside from the content and the format, the use of language and terminology for the level of participants were evaluated by an instructor teaching third- and fourth-year students and a graduate student enrolled in Educational Sciences. Some word revisions were made considering their comments.

A pilot study was performed with two recent ELT graduates previously involved in the same program at one of the selected universities. Online interviews were conducted and recorded upon the consent of the participants. The scripts of the piloted interviews guided the researcher on how to prevent bias and ambiguity, direct relevant prompts and probes, provide clarification, and elaborate on the questions. Furthermore, the question about utilizing feedback for self-study was eliminated as it did not make any sense to participants. The wording of some questions was also changed. For example, the expression “being successful in a course” was altered to “being successful in an assignment, presentation, and exam” since it was perceived as too broad and vague. The questions, including the terminology “assessment methods,” were also specified as “assignments, exams, and presentations” as the subjects in the pilot study had difficulty understanding the meaning of assessment methods. As a result, the final version of the interview protocol was developed (see Appendix A).

3.6. Data Collection Procedures

Before data collection procedures, an application explaining the details of the study was submitted to Middle East Technical University Human Subjects Ethics Committee. The study was found to be ethically appropriate by the Committee (see Appendix B). Upon the approval of the study, lecturers were asked for permission to announce the study in their virtual classes. Upon their permission, the virtual classes were visited to announce the details. Additionally, several lecturers provided the opportunity for the researcher to announce the study through online class groups. Voluntary students were contacted to schedule individual Zoom meetings.

Data were collected from English Language Teaching students during the 2020-2021 Spring semester. Participants were initially asked for their permission for audio recording. They were also notified that their participation in the study was voluntary, and they had the right to leave the study at any time. Moreover, they were informed that their identity and answers would be confidential, and nobody other than the researcher would have access to audio recordings. Each interview lasted 40 to 120 minutes. In accordance with the issues observed during the pilot

study, the researcher strived to administer a standard interview protocol and direct situation-specific prompts and probes.

3.7. Data Analysis

In the data analysis process, MAXQDA 2020 qualitative data analysis software was used. As Braun and Clarke (2013) stated, the first step of qualitative data analysis should be familiarization, where the researcher revised and internalized the data to comprehend potential codes better. Before data analysis, the researcher listened to each participant, transcribed the audio recordings, read the transcripts, and wrote a memo on them. These enabled the researcher to get familiar with the data.

In qualitative data analysis, the purpose of the researcher was to analyze the content of the data inductively and comparatively in line with the research questions (Merriam, 2009). In this study, the interview questions addressed four main components: (1) amount, timing, and type of feedback; (2) indicators of feedback literacy; (3) factors enhancing feedback literacy; and (4) factors impeding feedback literacy. Qualitative and inductive content analysis was used to address each of these categories in that it enables researchers to manage a variety of data with numerous insights of interpretations (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Graneheim & Lundman, 2004). The codes were mainly assigned based on the research questions. The researcher initially used open coding where segments were induced, and any possible codes were assigned. After the induction of a vast number of initial codes, they were compared to one another in terms of patterns and regularities to reduce the initial code list. The codes holding similar meanings were clustered, and the clusters were labeled with a name representing the relationship between the codes. They were principally based on the conceptual framework of feedback literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018; Sutton, 2012) and previous qualitative studies on feedback literacy (Fernández-Toro & Duensing, 2020; Gravett et al., 2019; Han & Xu, 2019a; Han & Xu, 2019b; Li & Han, 2021; Chong, 2020; Wei et al., 2020). The clusters meeting on a common ground also generated a theme. The emergent themes and codes were presented in Appendix C with their definitions.

The emergent codes and themes around the categories of “type, amount, and timing of feedback” were shown in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7

The Summary of Themes and Codes for Type, Timing, and Amount of Feedback

	Codes
Feedback Types	Asking for elaboration Error flagging Explicit correction Marks Providing clarification Providing clues/sources Rubrics/Guidelines Warning
Timing of Feedback	Task Teacher
Assignments/Projects	Within seven days One or two weeks More than two weeks At the end of the term
Presentation	Right after presentation
Exams	One or two weeks More than two weeks Within four or five days At the end of the term
Amount of Feedback	Amount of mistakes
Assignments/Projects	One paragraph One or two pages One or two sentences Marking Detailed Not detailed No feedback
Presentations	One or five minutes Five or ten minutes Ten or 20 minutes Three or four sentences Five or six sentences Detailed Not detailed
Exams	One paragraph Marking Detailed Not detailed No feedback

Underneath the indicators of feedback literacy, four themes emerged: appreciating feedback, making judgment, managing affect, and taking action (Carless & Boud, 2018). Themes along with codes were shown in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8

Themes and Codes for Indicators of Feedback Literacy

Themes	Codes
Appreciate feedback	Understanding their active role Seeking feedback Recognizing value of feedback
Make Judgment	Understanding Criteria Evaluative Judgment Self-evaluation
Manage Affect	Managing emotional challenges Emotional openness to feedback
Take action	Following tasks Adapting to different contexts Self-improvement Future career

As presented in Table 3.9, factors enhancing feedback literacy appeared under four themes: feedback characteristics, instructional factors (Shute, 2008), learner roles/characteristics, and social factors (Chong, 2020). The social factors encompassed two sub-themes: teacher and peer-related factors.

Table 3.9

Themes and Codes for Factors Enhancing Feedback Literacy

Theme	Codes
Feedback Characteristics	Brief feedback Expected feedback Constructive feedback Detailed and long feedback Explicit feedback Feedback including clues/sources Feedback within a new context Honest Individual Storable feedback Timely feedback
Instructional Factors	Continuous tasks Task difficulty Use of exemplars Use of peer feedback Use of rubric Use of self-evaluation Written feedback or private meetings Whole class feedback

Table 3.9 (continued)

Learner Characteristics/Roles	Extrinsic motivation Feeling of success Feeling of value Intrinsic motivation Self-confidence Self-regulation Valuing for different ideas
Social Factors	
Teacher-related Factors	Appreciation of hard work Positive teacher attitude Strong relationship with teacher Teacher availability Teacher effort Teacher expertise Teacher guidance
Peer-related Factors	Common experiences Comparison of peer performance Effort of peers Language of peers Peer availability Strong relationship with peers Trust in peer expertise

Factors impeding feedback literacy were categorized under four themes: feedback characteristics, instructional factors (Shute, 2008), learner characteristics, and social factors (Chong, 2020). The social factors encompassed two sub-themes: teacher and peer-related factors. Codes under these themes were presented in Table 3.10.

Table 3.10

Themes and Codes for Factors Impeding Feedback Literacy

Themes	Codes
Feedback Characteristics	Delayed feedback Empty praise Unexpected feedback Insufficient/superficial feedback Irrelevant feedback Negative feedback in class Threat to identity Too many corrections Unconstructive feedback Written feedback
Instructional Factors	Ambiguous criteria Discontinuous tasks

Table 3.10 (continued)

Learner Characteristics	Confident about task Fear of teacher reaction Feeling of failure Feeling of unfair assessment Goal-oriented attitude No experience with feedback Personal traits Resistance to feedback Uninterest
Social Factors	
Teacher-related Factors	Indifference to hard work Lack of teacher guidance Mistrust in teacher judgment Negative teacher attitude Poor relationship with teacher Poor teacher effort Teacher authority Teacher unavailability
Peer-related Factors	Comparison to peers Mistrust in peer judgment Peer opinion about teacher Poor relationship with peer

3.8. Trustworthiness Issues

The concept of trustworthiness referred to all the procedures and protocols to prove the true value of a qualitative study in terms of data, applied strategies, and interpretation (Polit & Beck, 2014). The key factors to ensure trustworthiness were credibility, dependability, transferability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

3.8.1. Credibility or Internal Validity

Merriam (2009) defined credibility or internal validity as the degree to which the results are congruent with the reality and presented several ways to ensure credibility: adequate engagement in data collection, researchers' reflexivity, member check, peer examination, and triangulation. Among them, adequate engagement, researcher's reflexivity, and peer examination were employed in the present study.

In this study, adequate engagement in data collection was assured by reaching at a saturation point for the collected data (Merriam, 2009). To specify, the researcher jotted down the key factors during the interviews, compared them to previous interview notes, and continued to find participants until the collected data were repeated.

The reflexivity of the researcher was another critical issue to increase the credibility of this study. As a human instrument, the researcher reflected on the strengths and weaknesses of self (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). The researcher was a graduate of the English Language Teaching Program in one of the universities selected in this study. Therefore, she was knowledgeable about the context of the program. Being a graduate facilitated the comprehension of feedback context with ease and generation of interview questions accordingly. However, the researcher was not familiar with semi-structured interview procedures as a novice one. Therefore, after the pilot study, verbatim transcripts of two pilot interviews were examined with the thesis supervisor. Some revisions were made in the interview protocol to increase credibility.

Merriam (2009) asserted that peer examination was provided with a knowledgeable peer or expert's revision of topic, data, procedures, interpretations, and methods. Therefore, peer examination was performed at different levels of this study. As stated in the "Instrument" section, the interview questions were revised by four experts (three in Educational Sciences and one in English Language Teaching) in terms of feedback context, question format and structure, use of Turkish terminology, and level of language for undergraduate students. The thesis supervisor also closely monitored the whole process of data collection and analysis to ensure that findings were credible and congruent.

3.8.2. Dependability

Dependability or consistency referred to the extent to which data remain stable when the study was replicated. The suggested strategies to ensure this issue were triangulation, peer examination, researchers' position, and audit trail (Merriam, 2009). In this study, peer examination was employed.

Peer examination was employed to increase the consistency in the study, as explained in the “Credibility” section. In addition, the strategy of intercoder agreement commonly used in qualitative feedback literacy studies was included (Fernández-Toro & Duensing, 2020; Wei et al., 2020; Winstone et al., 2020). Therefore, the investigator firstly coded the transcripts and generated a code list. Then, a peer knowledgeable about coding procedures independently assigned the codes to one in-depth transcripts using the same code list. The similarities and differences in coding were discussed to concur on a common point. To ensure dependability further, the thesis supervisor also coded a different set of three transcripts (one from each university). Later, the emergent codes were compared, and each code was discussed one by one to simplify code list.

3.8.3. Transferability

Fraenkel et al. (2015) explained that the issue of generalizability in qualitative research differed from that of quantitative research since it addressed the transferability of results or conclusions to specific conditions. To empower transferability, the researcher needed to present “thick description” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 359). Hence, the researcher of the study provided detailed information about the context and elaborated on the methods and findings step-by-step so that interested researchers and practitioners apply them to their situations.

3.9. Limitations of the Study

The current study was subject to certain limitations. The first limitation was the attitude of the subjects. As the participants expressed their past experiences, they had difficulty remembering specific context-related details, which might have resulted in the loss of crucial information. Also, the subjects may have altered their real experiences and ideas since they were aware that their voices were recorded.

The second limitation was the decay of human instrument. The researcher had hardly had training or experience in conducting interviews before. Therefore, semi-structured lengthy interviews may have posed a threat to the administration of interviews in a standardized format. To eliminate this drawback, a pilot study was conducted, and the recordings were transcribed verbatim. The supervisor of

this study was consulted to get feedback on interviews. Subsequently, the strengths and weaknesses of the interviews were analyzed. The possible probes and prompts to be directed during the interviews were included in the protocol to standardize the process.

Another issue to be considered as a limitation was the location and history effect. Due to the pandemic, the participants were virtually interviewed using the Zoom meeting platform. Unpredictable physical or environmental factors might have influenced or distracted the subjects during the interviews.

The final limitation was that some participants went through different programs. As stated earlier, in the context of the study, the English Language Teaching undergraduate program was renewed in 2018. The majority of the students were within the scope of this program, while few had experience with both the 2006 and 2018 programs. Besides, each course was offered by different lecturers in different sections. This situation may have led to the difference in interpretation of assessment and feedback context at the same year of the same university.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of qualitative data analysis are presented. The results are demonstrated in reference to the research questions with six major titles. In the first section, types of feedback university students have received are provided. The second and third parts present the participants' reports on the timing and amount of feedback, respectively. The fourth part presents university students' feedback literacy indicators. The last two parts deal with the factors enhancing and impeding feedback literacy.

4.1. Feedback Types

This section presented findings for the first research question about the ELT students' perceptions of feedback practices in terms of the type of feedback. Feedback type was the way, method, or strategy to convey feedback information. As summarized in Table 4.1, eight codes emerged within feedback types: explicit correction, providing clarification, providing clues/sources, asking for elaboration, rubrics/guidelines, only grades, error flagging, and warning.

Table 4.1

Frequencies for Feedback Types in University A, B, and C

Feedback Types	<i>The Number of Participants</i>			
	A	B	C	Total
Explicit correction	13	10	8	28
Providing clarification	11	9	5	25
Providing clues/sources	8	6	3	17
Asking for elaboration	4	7	4	15
Rubrics/Guidelines	6	3	3	12
Marks	6	4	1	11
Error flagging	2	2	1	5
Warning	0	1	1	2

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

The most-reported feedback type by participants was explicit correction ($f = 28$). It was underlined that this type of feedback generally informed that the response was incorrect and presented its correct version. Most of these participants noted that explicit correction was more common in writing tasks. As P19 explained, “*within our writing tasks, we were frequently corrected explicitly. The incorrect use of vocabulary or sentences was crossed out or underlined, and the best alternative to them was presented. Most of our feedbacks were like that*” (University A). Several also pointed to explicit corrections during presentations. As P28 expressed, “*our micro-teaching was full of content and strategy mistakes. The professor commented as ‘it is not appropriate to use such advanced words for young learners. Instead, you should include simple ones such as...’*” (University A). In addition, more than half of the participants referred to the provision of clarification within feedback ($f = 25$). Aside from informing about mistakes, more clarification behind the mistakes was provided. To illustrate, P16 noted that “*instead of underlying and saying that it was incorrect, our professors were explaining why it was correct or incorrect*” (University A).

Another feedback type underlined by 17 participants was providing clues and sources without directly providing the correct answer. In this way, it was reported that the students were guided to correct answers. For instance, P10 expressed, “*it makes you think and find on your own. It was like ‘do you think it is correct?’, or ‘what did we cover about this topic during the class?’*” (University A). Feedback asking for elaboration was also reported by almost half of the participants ($f = 15$). This type of feedback was reported to ask for more information or detail. As P15 stated, “*I saw statements like ‘what did you mean? I did not understand. What else can you add?’*” (University A).

Furthermore, 12 participants reported the use of rubrics or guidelines. They also added that this type of feedback presented the information or judgment about the presented work in a more structured way. To illustrate, P30 expressed that “*we are generally provided with a rubric after our presentation. When we have a look at it, we are able to see the feedback strong and poor parts of your task in a structured way*” (University B). Another feedback type was the use of error flagging reported by five participants. The respondents stated that this type of feedback only showed the location of error or mistake without informing them about the correct answer. As P29 mentioned, “*the*

errors were underlined and highlighted with red color, but it did not say how to correct it. You were expected to find” (University B). In addition, only two participants pointed to the provision of marks without further explanation. Concerning this type of feedback, P5 stated that *“we only see our marks on an exam paper. Teachers just mark where the point is deduced or where the score is given”* (University B). The least mentioned feedback type was a warning, with only one participant referring to it. As P29 noted, *“sometimes, we see warnings like ‘please be clear’ or ‘please be careful at that point.’ ”* (University B).

4.2. Timing of Feedback

In this section, findings related to the first research question about the ELT students’ perceptions of feedback practices regarding the timing of feedback were presented. Timing of feedback referred to how soon feedback information was provided to students. Participants were asked the feedback timing for each assessment method (i.e., assignments/projects, presentation, and exams) with open-ended questions. As summarized in Table 4.2, four codes emerged within assignments and projects: within seven days, one or two weeks, more than two weeks, and at the end of the term. Similarly, four codes appeared beneath the theme “exams”: within four or five days, one or two weeks, more than two weeks, and at the end of the term. Only one code came up for presentations: right after the presentation. Besides, the timing of feedback was reported to be depending on two other factors: task and teacher.

Table 4.2

Frequencies for Timing of Feedback in University A, B, and C

Timing of Feedback	<i>The Number of Participants</i>			Total
	A	B	C	
Assignments/Projects				
Within seven days	2	6	4	12
One or two weeks	2	4	3	9
More than two weeks	2	4	3	9
At the end of the term	1	1	1	3
Presentation				
Right after presentation	15	10	9	34
Exams				
Within four or five days	-	-	1	1
One or two weeks	4	8	4	16
More than two weeks	4	3	-	7
At the end of the term	2	-	-	2
-				
Task	3	1	1	5
Teacher	3	4	3	10

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

Concerning assignment/projects, 12 participants reported that feedback was provided within seven days at the earliest. The number of participants stating that feedback was provided in one or two weeks and more than two weeks was equal ($f = 9$). Only three underlined that feedback was given at the end of the term. In addition, most of the participants ($f = 34$) expressed that feedback was provided right after the presentation. Exams were provided with feedback within four or five days at the earliest, but only one respondent reported it. Feedback provided in one or two weeks was the most mentioned one ($f = 16$). Seven pointed out that the provision of feedback information took more than two weeks. Only two highlighted that feedback was delivered at the end of the term.

Furthermore, almost half of the participants ($f = 15$) reported that feedback timing depends on the teacher ($f = 10$) or the task ($f = 5$).

4.3. Amount of Feedback

This section presented findings related to the first research question regarding the ELT students' perceptions of feedback practices in terms of the amount of feedback. The amount of feedback referred to how much feedback information was provided to students. Again, the amount of feedback was asked for each assessment method.

Participants' responses to these open-ended questions were coded. Some participants reported the amount of feedback in the duration of receiving feedback; some reported in the number of sentences. Even some stated only whether the feedback is "detailed" or "not." As summarized in Table 4.3, seven codes emerged within assignments and projects: one or two pages, one paragraph, one or two sentences, detailed, not detailed, markings, and no feedback.

Regarding presentations, seven codes came up: between ten and 20 minutes, between five and ten minutes, between one and five minutes, five or six sentences, three or four sentences, detailed, and not detailed. Six codes related to exams appeared: one paragraph, one or two sentences, markings, detailed, not detailed, and no feedback. Besides, the amount of feedback was reported to be depending on the number of mistakes.

Table 4.3

Frequencies for Amount of Feedback in University A, B, and C

Amount of Feedback	<i>The Number of Participants</i>			
	A	B	C	Total
Assignments/Projects				
Detailed	4	6	6	16
Not detailed	-	3	-	3
One or two pages	1	-	-	1
One paragraph	2	2	2	6
One or two sentences	-	2	4	6
Markings	3	1	3	7
No feedback	3	2	-	5
Presentation				
Detailed	8	8	2	18
Not detailed	1	1	-	2
Between ten and 20 minutes	1	1	4	6
Between five and ten minutes	2	2	2	6
Between one and five minutes	4	-	1	5
Five or six sentences	-	-	2	2
Three or four sentences	-	-	1	1
Exams				
Detailed	4	1	1	6
Not detailed	6	6	-	12
One paragraph	1	2	1	4
One or two sentences	1	3	4	8
Markings	4	6	2	12
No feedback	4	2	2	8
-				
The number of mistakes	1	2	2	5

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

Within assignments and projects, the amount was noted in pages, paragraphs, sentences, and detailedness. The most frequently mentioned code within assignments/projects was “detailed feedback” ($f = 16$), while only three underlined that feedbacks were not detailed. In terms of length, only one respondent reported that feedbacks were one or two pages long. Six participants stated that feedback was provided in one paragraph, while another six reported one or two sentences. Seven noted that feedback was presented as markings only. Besides, five participants reported that no feedback was provided for assignments and projects.

Concerning the presentations, the amount of feedback was reported in minutes, sentences, and detailedness. The most frequently mentioned code within presentations was “detailed feedback” with 18 respondents, whereas only two underlined that feedbacks were not detailed. The most prolonged feedback in minutes was between 10 and 20 minutes ($f = 6$). Six respondents referred to feedback lasting between five and ten minutes, while five participants pointed to those between one and five minutes. The amount of feedback expressed in the number of sentences was referred to like five or six sentences ($f = 2$). Only one respondent addressed to feedbacks given in three or four sentences.

Regarding the exams, feedback amount was presented in paragraphs, sentences, and detailedness. One of the most frequently reported codes was “markings” ($f = 12$), while the other was “not detailed” feedback ($f = 12$). On the other hand, “detailed feedback” for the exams was reported by six respondents. The amount of feedback expressed in the number of sentences was one paragraph ($f = 4$) or one or two sentences ($f = 8$). Lastly, eight stated that no feedback was provided.

Furthermore, five participants reported that the feedback amount depends on the number of mistakes. That is to say, the exam papers with more mistakes resulted in more feedback in amount.

4.4. Feedback Literacy

In this section, findings of the second research question on the indicators of feedback literacy were presented. Feedback literacy refers to how learners make sense of feedback information and use it to improve their learning. It will be presented under

four categories: appreciate feedback, make a judgment, manage affect, and take action (Carless & Boud, 2018). The codes assigned for feedback literacy components and the number of participants for each code were shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4

Frequencies for Feedback Literacy Indicators in University A, B, and C

Feedback Literacy	<i>The Number of Participants</i>			
	A	B	C	Total
Appreciate feedback				
Understanding their active role	10	11	6	27
Seeking feedback	14	12	8	34
Recognizing value of feedback	14	12	9	35
Make judgment				
Understanding criteria	14	11	7	32
Evaluative judgment	11	11	8	30
Self-evaluation	14	13	9	36
Manage affect				
Managing emotional challenges	12	10	7	29
Emotional openness to feedback	14	10	6	30
Take action				
Following tasks	15	13	9	37
Adapting to different contexts	5	10	7	22
Self-improvement	8	6	5	19
Future career	9	7	3	19

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

4.4.1. Appreciating Feedback

Appreciating feedback referred to learners' understanding of their active role along with their recognition of value of feedback (Carless & Boud, 2018). To begin with, the appreciating feedback category consisted of three codes: understanding the active role, seeking feedback, and recognizing the value of feedback. Twenty-seven participants described the situations where they understood their active role in the feedback process. Within the findings of understanding their active role, the participants acknowledged that they should play an active role in receiving, negotiating, and providing feedback information. For example, P8 from university A put an emphasis on his/her active role as "*I strive to break myself of being passive and be active when I receive feedback.*" Similarly, P23 from university B stated the role of negotiating on feedback as "*the student should ask questions about the reason behind the given feedback by the teacher when s/he cannot understand. At least, I think I*

initiate this kind of dialogue.” They also underlined the benefit of being active in providing feedback to their peers. For instance, one participant expressed:

We were giving feedback to each other in one of the writing classes. I realized that my friend had many mistakes, and I corrected them. We worked on them even after the class. I encouraged her that she could improve her future tasks. Later, she got higher grades on her task. I even practiced and revised my skills in this way. (P18, University A).

Among 39 participants, 34 of them pointed to their behavior in seeking feedback. The findings of seeking feedback addressed students’ need for feedback in different situations. Most of the participants underlined that they sought feedback when they were not provided because they felt the lack of feedback no matter how their grade and success was. Several participants stated that they search for feedback even if their task was successful. For instance, P24 from University B explained:

why would not an instructor giving that much feedback to everyone also provide feedback for me? Even if I got the maximum grade, it does not mean that everything was one hundred percent correct and logical. So, I thought s/he could still have comments to provide for me as feedback.

Unlike a successful performance, participants also sought feedback when no feedback was provided due to their poor performance or low grade. P22 from University A explained this situation “*when I did not expect to receive a low grade, I asked my instructor ‘sir/madam, could you please have a look at my mistakes? I would like to learn not to make the same mistakes in my next exam.’*” Another condition where the learners sought feedback was difficulty in understanding provided feedback. For example, it was underlined that “*when I did not understand the given feedback, I just went to the teacher and asked, ‘could you please clarify this point because I did not understand.’*” (P20, University B). While preparing their tasks, projects, or presentations, learners also initiated a dialogue with the teacher and demanded feedback on their questions. For instance, P28 explained that “*I remember that while preparing one of my tasks, I got my instructor’ opinion, ‘I think in this way for my task, but I am not sure. I am planning to complete it in that way. What do you suggest?’*” (University C). Moreover, feedback-seeking behavior was observed when the learners had specific questions about their completed performance or task. In line with this need, P6 added:

I went to the instructor’s office and asked, “Sir/madam, you just provided feedback during the class, but I want to ask in detail. During my performance,

I did these specific things. How was it? Do you think it is good and appropriate for my task?” (University A).

Thirty-five participants described their state of recognizing the value of feedback. This was the most frequently mentioned code of appreciating feedback. The participants mentioned that feedback was a valuable source of information for correcting their mistakes, improving their tasks, and enhancing learning. P39 underlined that *“if no feedback had been provided, I would have never realized my mistakes or drawbacks. I will even keep making the same mistakes in my future career. So, feedback is vital”* (University C). It was also commonly asserted that feedback was valuable in that it augmented the performance of tasks. For instance, one of the participants mentioned that *“in general, feedback is important. It improved our performance in a good way. With regular feedbacks, I improved my posture and body language in presentations over time”* (P3, University A). Furthermore, the value of feedback on improvement of learning was emphasized with the words *“feedback is important for change. It enables students to improve themselves and comprise a basis for learning. It motivates students to change and come up with different ideas”* (P40, University C).

4.4.2. Making Judgment

Making judgment referred to learners’ development of evaluative judgment to make decisions about the quality of one’s or others’ work (Carless & Boud, 2018). There were three codes under making a judgment: understanding criteria, evaluative judgment, and self-evaluation. Thirty-two of thirty-nine participants pointed to their understanding of criteria. Within this component, the participants referred to their understanding of what criteria to be followed to correct and improve performance. P25 from University C gave an example on this issue:

once our instructor advised us to present meaningful and related reading texts for grammar activities. We realized that our previous activity was neither meaningful nor related to our previous lesson plans. In our following lesson plan, we were careful about this point.

Most of the participants also underlined that they first made sense of given criteria before completing a task. For instance, P18 reported that *“when the criteria were provided to use, I underlined the important parts. If I had the main topic, I was*

assigning sub-topics. Then, I was trying to understand the points to be covered and to be paid attention” (University A).

Thirty participants addressed making an evaluative judgment. Participants pointed to evaluating the quality of feedback, peers’ work, and exemplars. Most participants in evaluative judgment indicated their evaluation of the quality of feedback. For example, P23 from University B criticized the quality of given feedback as *“sometimes, I come across short comments like ‘well written,’ ‘good job,’ or ‘well done.’ To my opinion, this is not qualitative feedback.”* Nonetheless, another participant also explained their judgment of high-quality feedback with an example:

After my presentation, my instructor provided feedback on specific points to be improved in my presentation skills, such as eye contact, body language, teaching techniques, etc. I found them beneficial and applicable because it was directly referring to my actions. (P9, University A).

Another point mentioned in evaluative judgment was judging the quality of peers’ work. For instance, P15 exemplified how s/he evaluated his/her peer’s work in comparison to given feedback by the teacher and concluded what to do and not to do, *“in our presentations, I generally presented during the third week due to my name in the class list. So, I had learned what to do and not to do by observing the first presenter and the given feedback for that presenter”* (University A). The participants also referred to the evaluation of provided exemplars against a set of criteria. To illustrate, P28 expressed:

while we were preparing a lesson plan, the instructor presented us with a good example of a lesson plan prepared by senior students. I checked how they had formed the lesson plan. I was examining content and structure in comparison to written feedback on the paper. Lastly, I was thinking about how I could change and adapt this structure and content to my own topic (University C).

Lastly, 36 participants pointed to making judgments by means of self-evaluation. This was the most frequently uttered category of making a judgment. Participants expressed that they evaluated themselves compared to expected criteria. For example, P23 delineated their self-talk during the task process:

upon completing my task, I just check it one more time compared to the rubric. For example, the rubric states, “is there any example?” I check whether there is an example in my assignment. If there is, I put a tick. It says, “is each statement summarized in the very last part?” I just check it and see that each

statement is not summarized. Then, I revise each statement one more time and edit the summary part to include each statement (University B).

Similarly, P30 from University B described their self-evaluation process upon provided feedback:

As far as I remember, it was about the phonetic alphabet. The instructor provided feedback and crossed out incorrect words written with phonetic letters. Within these words, I searched for a common point, let's say a theme. I deduced that I had difficulty in words, including that specific letter.

4.4.3. Managing Affect

Management of emotions, feelings, and attitudes (Carless & Boud, 2018) was defined as managing affect. The category of managing affect included two codes: managing emotional challenges and emotional openness to feedback. Twenty-nine participants pointed to managing the emotional challenges they had gone through due to given feedback. This was the least expressed code in the category of managing affect. The interviewees elaborated that they strived to find strategies to get over when they experienced challenging emotional conditions such as anxiety, stress, pessimism. For instance, P15 from University A explained how s/he coped with pessimistic thoughts and consoled herself or himself:

The moment when I got negative feedback, I felt really bad. Bad thoughts wandered around my mind. It was a vocabulary teaching session, and it was one of the well-known skills in ELT courses. Thus, I had felt worried for one or two days. Then, I thought it was not supposed to be this way "it is good to make this mistake now because it would be worse if I made the same mistake in the future. So, I had a look at the given feedback more carefully."

Several of the participants also mentioned that they got anxious as they thought the instructor would be angry due to their questions. Thus, they were afraid of initiating dialogue or asking for feedback. However, they explained how they dealt with anxious thoughts:

When I did not understand the feedback, I was afraid that the instructor would get angry with me. Then, I thought, "who cares?". Even if s/he got angry, s/he would explain it. Then, I began to feel relaxed about asking questions" (P6, University A).

Thirty participants implied their emotional openness to feedback. The respondents illustrated that they were open to negative or positive feedback from the very beginning of the process. For instance, P13 mentioned that they did not feel any

difference between negative or positive feedback, “*positive or negative, it does not matter. I generally feel very comfortable with feedback in that I see what I have done from a different perspective.*” (University A). Similarly, P22 detailed their openness to negative feedback by underlining commonly stated negative thoughts:

I have never felt bad, unmotivated, or small as my professor comments on my mistakes. I always acknowledged negative feedbacks and thought, “I need to edit these parts.” When the good points were stated, I also felt that I needed to keep doing like that (University A).

4.4.4. Taking Action

Taking action meant acting upon the feedback to inform later works (Carless & Boud, 2018). The findings of taking action revealed that it was the most frequently implied feature of feedback literacy. Thirty-seven participants emphasized that they acted on the feedback information and utilized it to notify their later work. The most frequently discussed component was the use of feedback for the following tasks, mentioned by thirty-five students. Within this concept, the participants reported that they used feedback for their following or later tasks, especially when the format or the content of the tasks were similar. To illustrate, P28 mentioned:

As I told before, I was preparing my next assignment in compliance with my previous assignment. If there were mistakes, drawbacks, and problems in my previous assignment, I was revising the feedback carefully and acting on them for my next assignment (University C).

When the following tasks were not similar to previous ones, the interviewees reported that they adapted the previously given feedback to their new tasks. The number of participants adapting the feedback to different tasks was 22 out of 39. To give an example, P35 detailed how they adapted the given feedback to a different task “*I received feedback on my material projects during material development course. Then, I benefited from this feedback while preparing lesson plans and performing micro-teaching for my school practice course*” (University C).

One of the least reported codes in taking action was feedback usage for self-improvement ($f = 19$). Participants expressed that they wished to improve themselves in one of the subfields within their major: linguistics, literature, or language teaching. To illustrate, P24 demonstrated their wish to improve herself or himself in literature:

I was not able to interpret poems and understand the metaphors within them. Thus, I asked for advice from my professor as I was interested in improving myself in English literature. S/he advised me to read poems in English and even in Turkish because it would contribute to my interpretation skills regardless of the poem's language, and then, I did so. This was one of the most productive feedback I had ever received as it was a unique perspective that I could benefit from not only in that specific course but also throughout my learning process (University B).

Using feedback for the future career was also the other least mentioned feature of taking action. Almost half of the participants ($f = 19$) referred to this component. The respondents reported that they benefitted from the feedback provided during their theoretical courses and acted upon them during their school practice, described as a teacher-like experience in a real classroom context. For instance, P6 explained this experience, *"it is like a mirror. My professor reflects my strengths and weaknesses to me, and then, I reflect all of them to a real classroom context. That is a good feeling"* (University A). Similarly, it was also underlined that all the feedback provided during undergraduate degree would be used in their future career as a teacher, *"I always bear in mind that these points are crucial. I will pay attention to them upon becoming a teacher"* (P22, University A).

4.5. Enhancing Factors

In this section, findings referring to the third research question, "What are enhancing factors affecting the feedback literacy of ELT students?" were presented. Enhancing factors were mainly about increasing learners' making sense of feedback information and using feedback to improve their work. It was presented under four themes: feedback characteristics, instructional factors, learner characteristics and roles, and social factors. Only social factors consisted of two sub-themes: teacher-related and peer-related factors.

4.5.1. Feedback Characteristics

Feedback characteristics were the first theme that appeared as an enhancing factor for feedback literacy. Feedback characteristics were examined under 11 codes, as shown in Table 4.5. These codes are constructive, timely, expected, explicit, detailed and

long, brief, within a new context, storable, including clues/sources, honest, and individual.

Table 4.5

Frequencies for Feedback Characteristics as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C

Feedback Characteristics	The Number of Participants			
	A	B	C	Total
Constructive feedback	15	12	8	35
Timely feedback	13	9	8	30
Expected feedback	5	7	6	18
Explicit feedback	6	8	3	17
Detailed and long feedback	6	5	3	14
Brief feedback	3	7	1	11
Feedback within a new context	4	2	3	9
Storable feedback	6	1	1	8
Feedback including clues/sources	4	1	2	7
Honest feedback	2	2	2	6
Individual feedback	1	1	-	2

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

The use of constructive feedback was the most addressed feature of feedback, enhancing students' engagement with feedback ($f = 35$). The majority of participants reported that they became more engaged with feedback when the feedback encouraged them to continue with their good work, while offering ways to improve poor performance in a friendly manner. For instance, P13 explained their response to encouraging feedback for good performance:

The professor commented that "it is a good idea to use that kind of materials taking attention like the hat you wore. You can also use it in the real classroom." So, I started to be attentive to my clothes and materials as I thought that it drew the attention of students (P13, University A).

Similarly, P12 expressed that encouraging feedback for poor performance enhanced their engagement with the feedback, "*Some of our professors were commenting 'you can do a good job, but it would be better if you had done this part in that way.' Eventually, we came up with better jobs due to these feedbacks*" (University A). One of the participants also addressed that feedback provided on their skills rather than their knowledge increased their engagement:

To be honest, if I receive feedback on my skills rather than on my knowledge, I strive to do my best to fix them... Indeed, it is very easy to acquire knowledge, but it is not that easy to improve your skills (P32, University C).

One of the most mentioned features of feedback was its timeliness. Thirty emphasized the importance of timely feedback. The participants reported that timely feedback provided either immediately or in a short time facilitated their understanding and use of feedback. For instance, P36 stated that *“I believe that immediate feedback we received after presentations have been beneficial for us because it was provided in the heat of the moment, thereby being more permanent. So, you easily remember it while preparing your next presentation”* (University C). Similarly, another participant reported, *“the shorter time it takes to receive feedback, the easier it is for me to use it. I can remember my responses in an exam for up to one week”* (P9, University B).

Almost half of the participants pointed to expected feedback ($f = 18$). They referred to their tendency to understand and openness to use feedback when teachers' and their own ideas on their performances were compatible. For instance, P25 from University B explained this experience: *“When I see that ideas are congruent between my professor and me, I become more open and interested in that feedback. I also expected the same thing. It is not a surprise, so easy to accept it.”*

Explicit feedback was another factor reported by approximately half of the participants ($f = 17$). The respondents expressed that they became more engaged in feedback when each detail was explained clearly without yielding any ambiguity, confusion, or misunderstanding. For example, P9 elaborated on one of their experiences:

When I was a junior or sophomore, I guess it was within a literature course. We had very long essay-type exams. In one of our exams, I was provided with explicit corrections and comments with underlined words and arrows pointing to the reasons behind mistakes. It was like, “it is not correct to use this word within this sentence for this reason. You can try that word which is more suitable.” It was very useful for me. Later on, I kept those little notes in my mind and then got higher grades on a significant number of essays I had submitted (University B).

Detailed feedback was also mentioned by 14 respondents. They discussed that they took the feedback more seriously when each point in their tasks was elaborated with comments and when feedback was lengthy. To illustrate, P19 from University A explained the benefits of detailed feedback for them:

The more detailed the feedback is, the better it is for us... When a point is explained in detail, let's say, instead of telling “you have mistakes in speaking skills,” it is more beneficial for me to be told, “in speaking, you are making

this point and that point wrong. ” I was paying more attention to point-by-point explanations.

While some preferred detailed and long feedback, some participants mentioned the characteristic of being “brief” ($f = 11$). It was explained that concise but to the point, feedback enhanced their engagement with feedback. To illustrate, P20 expressed:

I would use that feedback if it were neat, how to say, were not wordy. To give an example, it should explain what and how to do or correct in two or three sentences by keeping it short but concise (University B).

Some respondents ($f = 9$) addressed feedback within a new context or for a new task. The participants mentioned that they become more attentive to given feedback when it was presented within a new task or course. For example, P3 stated:

If you take the course for the first time, how to say, it is a new world. Or, to talk about presentations, especially when I am going to do it for the first time or am the first to present, I am generally all ears (University A).

Storable feedback was also among the discussed feedback characteristics. Eight participants reported that they reviewed and benefited from feedback more when they had a chance to keep or store the provided feedback. Some of the participants expressed that they stored feedback delivered in electronic format:

I have already been keeping the feedback delivered in word document as well as in voice recordings. When I run into a similar task, I quickly go back to those stored feedbacks. Then, I make a connection and change the erroneous parts for my present task (P40, University C).

Other characteristics mentioned by the participants were inclusion of clues and sources ($f = 7$). The respondents reported that the provision of clues and sources directing to solution motivated them to utilize feedback. Several participants disclosed that receiving clues for a task excited them, “*I was getting motivated to find the correct answer when the professor commented like ‘how did we explain this term?’*” (P19, University A). Similarly, P39 stated the benefits of being provided sources for them, “*when I do not have any idea in my mind regarding the activities in my lesson plan and the professor advises me websites where I can find creative activities, I immediately search the website on Google and save it*” (University C).

The participants ($f = 6$) also disclosed that they became more willing to uptake feedback when it was honest. As P24 from University B explained:

Only if the feedback is honest, the stated points and drawbacks become more understandable. Otherwise, the student will continue with their mistakes or think that their assignment is flawless if a poor assignment is commented as a good one. There is no need to avoid criticism so that the student does not get upset... I become more disciplined and read carefully to remember when the feedback is objective.

Of the respondents, only two mentioned the characteristics of being individual. The participants reported that it was more beneficial and easier to apply when feedback focused on the individual. For instance, P8 expressed:

When the professor makes individual comments like “you are going well” or “where are you and where are you going?” I find it easier to use because it is my own learning process. So how am I doing? What is the teacher’s opinion about my performance? I can figure out these when the feedback is provided to me individually (University A).

4.5.2. Instructional Factors

Instructional factors were the second theme that appeared as an enhancing factor for feedback literacy. As shown in Table 4.6, instructional factors were examined under eight codes: use of exemplars, rubrics, self-evaluation, and peer feedback; task difficulty; written feedback or private meetings; continuous tasks; and whole class feedback.

Table 4.6

Frequencies for Instructional Factors as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C

Instructional Factors	The Number of Participants			
	A	B	C	Total
Use of exemplars	13	12	9	34
Use of rubric/guidelines	13	12	8	33
Use of self-evaluation	13	9	8	30
Use of peer feedback	9	3	3	15
Task difficulty	5	2	3	10
Written feedback or private meetings	4	4	2	10
Continuous tasks	1	4	3	8
Whole class feedback	2	0	0	2

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

Use of exemplars was the most mentioned factor, with the majority of participants ($f = 34$) referring to it. Exemplars are defined as “carefully chosen samples of student work which are used to illustrate dimensions of quality and clarify assessment

expectations” (p. 1, Carless & Chan, 2017). The existence of exemplars for an assigned task was revealed to enhance respondents’ engagement with feedback. To give an example, P23 elaborated on their mindset about exemplars:

Yes, we were given exemplars, but then I was trying not to copy as the professor had already had that type of assignment at her/his hand. It means s/he does not expect the same things. As the name implies, it is an example. We are expected to create something different by using our creativity. That’s why I have always used exemplars and adapted them to my tasks without stealing ideas. Indeed, it was a good way to understand what to do because it was perceptible (University B).

The second most mentioned factor was the use of rubrics/guidelines with 32 participants. The provision of rubrics was disclosed to trigger participants’ feedback engagement. One of the respondents explained that “as I can see what to do and to pay attention... Indeed, it is like the feedback given beforehand. I prepare my task by checking it like ‘if I do this, will it match with that criterion?’” (P8, University A). Another excerpt of this code read:

Once, we were supposed to complete a project on storytelling, so we were provided with guidelines, which were very understandable regarding what to do and not to do. You know, when you comprehend the task, you easily come up with ideas as you infer the criteria. (P40, University C).

The use of self-evaluation was also one of the most attributed factors ($f = 30$). The interviewees reported that they understood feedback and feedback criteria and thus, accepted the given feedback after they were given a chance to evaluate or give feedback to themselves. With reference to self-evaluation, P36 expressed that “we had lots of reflection papers where we were expected to evaluate ourselves. In this way, you easily make sense of feedback given by professor or peers” (University C). Similarly, almost half of the participants pointed to the use of peer feedback. They explained that peer feedback during courses enabled them to understand the criteria better as they both received and gave feedback. To give an example, P8 explained this reciprocal process:

I avail myself of peer feedback in comprehending what to do or what to include in my assignment... Indeed, it is also useful when you give feedback to someone else. Once, I helped my friend with peer feedback. S/he was unsure about her/his structure of activities in a lesson plan, so I assisted her/him to form the outline. It would not be in my lesson plan, although it was my idea. However, giving feedback also improves my mindset and creativity for my works. Besides, we do not always practice activities for the sake of grades (University A).

Task difficulty was also another factor stimulating feedback engagement. Ten participants mentioned that they were inclined to initiate a feedback dialogue when they had difficulty in task. P37 from University C conveyed their attempt as “*I can talk for myself. If I am not sure how to manage a challenging task, I directly ask the professor or my friends*”. Furthermore, the feedback given in private meetings or in written format was also brought up by ten participants. It was specified that private meetings or written feedbacks gave students the chance to either internalize feedback or individually ask questions. As one of the participants explained:

The best feedback is one-to-one meetings with the professor and I... It is the best way to receive feedback when there is no time limit and I have the chance to ask lots of questions. So, when there is no time limit, in one-to-one meetings, and we are free to ask our questions, the feedback is more effective (P4, University B).

Eight respondents pointed to continuous tasks as an enabling factor. They uttered that they paid attention to given feedback more when it was specified for the first and second draft of a task preceding a final submission as well as a set of sequential tasks preceding the last task. To give an example, P29 mentioned how they used the feedback provided for sequential tasks:

I just keep those feedbacks. Sometimes, we have five consecutive tasks that are very similar to each other. Let's say that I got a comment on my drawbacks for the first one. Then, I try not to make the same mistakes for the second or the third task (University B).

Finally, the last code was “whole class feedback,” which was the least mentioned enhancing factor ($f = 2$). The respondents underlined students felt comfortable and did not have negative feelings about uptaking feedback when negative points were directed to the whole class instead of individuals. For instance, it was emphasized that “*if the feedback is required to be given in front of the class, it should address to the whole class, not to individuals. I feel more comfortable with that correction, especially when I have that mistake on my exam paper*” (P16, University A).

4.5.3. Learner Characteristics and Roles

Learner characteristics or roles were the third theme that appeared as an enhancing factor for feedback literacy. As presented in Table 4.7, learner characteristics and roles were summarized under seven codes: self-regulation, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic

motivation, the feeling of success, feeling valued, self-confidence, and valuing different ideas.

Table 4.7

Frequencies for Learner Characteristics and Roles as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C

Learner Characteristics and Roles	<i>The Number of Participants</i>			
	A	B	C	Total
Self-regulation	14	13	9	36
Intrinsic motivation	15	11	9	35
Extrinsic motivation	7	10	2	19
Feeling of success	10	7	-	17
Feeling valued	4	3	2	9
Self-confidence	1	-	1	2
Valuing different ideas	-	2	-	2

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

Within learner characteristics and roles, one of the most frequently appearing codes was self-regulation ($f = 36$). Zimmerman (2000) defined self-regulation as “self-generated thoughts, feelings, and actions that are planned and cyclically adapted to the attainment of personal goals” (p.14). According to his model, self-regulated learners show strategies such as goal setting, attention focusing, self-instruction, self-reflection, in addition to traditional cognitive strategies. Within this study, the code “self-regulation” was assigned when one of the self-regulation strategies (e.g., goal-setting, attention focusing, self-instruction, self-reflection, traditional cognitive strategies) was reported by the participants. Hence, self-regulation did not necessarily refer to all self-regulation strategies at the same time. The participants in this study expressed that they monitored and managed their behaviors or performances, which facilitated the understanding and use of feedback. As P37 mentioned:

I strive to analyze the given feedback critically. Negative or positive does not matter. Then, I think ‘I made these mistakes in my previous assignment. Then, I should pay attention to them for my next assignment’ and improve myself step by step” (University C).

Many participants also stated that they used multiple strategies to remember feedback for future work. For example, “I was trying to see my mistakes and taking notes. According to them, I was analyzing the points that I had written on my task. In fact, I was paying attention to the points stated within feedback” (P17, University A). Self-awareness of weaknesses through self-reflection was also commonly discussed. It was

mentioned that the respondents readily accepted and used feedback when they were also aware that their performance was poor. For instance, P19 from University A uttered:

I had already realized my mistakes during a presentation. Like reading the text on slides, staying still, or sticking to a point in class... When the professor commented on these things, I accepted them. These comments had a strong and positive effect on my subsequent presentations.

Many participants also expressed that criticizing their own mistakes and ways of completing tasks assisted them in internalizing the given feedback. For example, “when I give feedback for myself, I keep strengths and weaknesses in my mind. I criticize my mistakes in line with the given feedback. Indeed, this helps me to figure out the parts needing improvement” (P16, University A). Similarly, several addressed being aware of their strengths. The participants reported that being aware of their own good or successful performance led them to be engaged in given feedback eagerly. One of the interviewees mentioned:

...indeed, it depends. If I know that my assignment is good, that means if I am in control of the process or if I can guess the point for which feedback is forthcoming, I can feel more relaxed about accepting or using that feedback (P29, University B).

Lastly, only a few reported goal setting. To illustrate, one of the participants clarified how their goals were a motivation factor for feedback usage:

You know, each criterion on the rubric starts with ‘excellent’ and goes towards ‘poor.’ Excellent has always been my goal, so I was only examining the criteria written there. I have never had a look at the ‘poor’ criteria as it was not my aim. Anyway, setting those kinds of goals increases my motivation to pay attention to given feedback (P5, University B).

Another dominant code was intrinsic motivation ($f = 35$). Within this study, the code “intrinsic motivation” was assigned when one of the factors related to intrinsic motivation (e.g., learning from mistakes, interest in field of study, motivation to seek feedback, motivation for future career) was reported by the participants. Thus, intrinsic motivation did not necessarily refer to all factors of intrinsic motivation at the same time. Firstly, the respondents expressed that they had a motivation to promote their learning or to perform better. Hence, they strived to take their fill utilizing provided feedbacks. For example, P8 from University A expressed their role as “I am here to learn. Of course, I will get the maximum use or advantage from it”. One of the

participants also emphasized the motivation to use feedback to come up with better tasks because they wanted their tasks to be a good example for future students:

I have a look at the tasks presented to us as a good example, evaluate them in my mind, and find their drawbacks. Then, I try to do better without any flaws because I also wish my tasks to be presented as a good example to junior students (P20, University B).

Most participants underlined the importance of learning from mistakes or poor performance. For instance, P34 presented their idea on the power of mistakes:

Of course, I corrected them. In fact, it is good, and I am more careful about them. I believe in the power of learning from mistakes. I think I am more inclined to pay attention to mistakes (University C).

Furthermore, almost half of the participants referred to motivation to seek feedback. They stated their ambition to ask for feedback in various situations such as lack of feedback and good or poor performance. To illustrate, P26 expressed their motivation:

no matter what happens, I may come up with a good or poor task. If I have difficulty in accepting that comment on my task, I do not have to behave like I accept them or do not have to step back. I feel like I need to knock at the professor's office and ask, 'could you please clarify the comments on my task a little more?' (University B).

Lastly, the motivation to internalize and act on the feedback due to its benefits for their future career was also reported. P28's explanation for this motivation was as follows:

I have hardly ignored feedback provided in our practice teaching course because we are about to graduate. We will never have the chance to find professors and ask for feedback in our future careers. For that reason, I keep them in my mind as a teacher (University C).

Within this study, the code "extrinsic motivation" was assigned when one of the factors related to extrinsic motivation (e.g., motivation to get higher grades, motivation to get the praise of teacher) was reported by the participants. Thus, extrinsic motivation did not necessarily refer to all factors of extrinsic motivation at the same time. The extrinsic motivation was reported by 19 participants. Most of them discussed that the reason behind seeking and acting on feedback was the motivation to get higher grades. For instance, P19 explicitly stated their motivation, "*I always strived to act on feedback to get a higher grade. Hence, my grades and the average score increased after I had started to use feedback*" (University A). Several underlined that they were motivated to please their teacher and thus made use of provided feedback. For instance, P17 clarified the reason behind the motivation to use feedback, "*the professor's*

appreciation was a source of motivation for me. I was ingratiating myself with the professor, thereby using the feedback provided by them” (University A).

Almost half of the participants reported that they became more motivated to use and engage with feedback when they felt that they were successful ($f = 17$). To illustrate, P14 mentioned how s/he guides herself or himself to the next step due to the feeling of success, *“it makes me feel like I can do it. I think ‘so, that means I am capable of coming up with better tasks. My ideas are working. Then, what should I do next regarding these ideas?’” (University A).* Another code appeared was “feeling valued” ($f = 9$). It was reported that the tendency towards paying attention to delivered feedback increased as the participants felt that they were valued due to language, specificity, or just the existence of feedback. To set an example, P36 described this feeling as *“I felt that my work was given close attention. Then, it was like a mood of feeling valued, and thus I was also giving close attention to that feedback” (University C).* Moreover, the interviewees possessing self-confidence revealed their tendency towards engagement with feedback ($f = 2$). For instance, P35 from University C sought more feedback when they had confidence in their work but got unexpected comments:

Once, I had prepared a lesson plan for my micro-teaching, and I was very confident of the activities, but the professor did not like them. So, I sent an e-mail like ‘I was very confident of my activities, so could you please give extra information on my mistakes?’

Finally, value for different ideas was also addressed by participants ($f = 2$), which was the least reported factor. Regarding this factor, P24 explained:

You cannot see your mistakes or drawbacks on your own and thus, feel that you are doing great. It is like losing your sight. However, evaluation by different people expands your perspective. Indeed, it is very precious to include those ideas in your work (University B).

4.5.4. Social Factors

Social factors were the last theme that appeared as an enhancing factor for feedback literacy. As presented in Table 4.8, the theme consisted of two sub-themes: teacher-related and peer-related factors. Regarding teacher-related factors, findings were summarized under seven codes: positive teacher attitude, the guidance of teacher, teacher expertise, appreciation of hard work, strong relationship with teacher, effort of

teacher, and availability of teacher. Similarly, the findings for peer-related factors were presented under seven codes: peer availability, common experiences, trust in peer expertise, comparison of peer performance, strong relationship with peers, effort of peers and language of peers.

Table 4.8

Frequencies for Social Factors as an Enhancing Factor in University A, B, and C

Social Factors	The Number of Participants			
	A	B	C	Total
Teacher-related Factors				
Positive teacher attitude	10	11	9	30
Teacher guidance	11	8	8	27
Teacher expertise	8	9	5	22
Appreciation of hard work	7	6	3	16
Strong relationship with teacher	7	2	4	13
Teacher effort	3	2	3	8
Teacher availability	1	-	3	4
Peer-related Factors				
Peer availability	8	4	7	19
Common experiences	4	5	5	14
Trust in peer expertise	7	6	1	14
Comparison of peer performance	4	3	3	10
Strong relationship with peers	2	-	3	5
Effort of peers	3	1	-	4
Language of peers	-	1	1	2

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

4.5.4.1. Teacher-related factors

Regarding enhancing factors resulting from teacher, positive teacher attitude was the most discussed facet ($f = 30$). Within teacher attitude, most of the participants explained that language of teacher affected their acceptance of feedback. For example, P10 from University A elaborated on their attitude towards feedback due to the teacher's way of expression:

I have never come across with a harsh or offending comment even if my work is poor. Mostly, it has been expressed like "it will be better if you do in this way." This kind of sentences motivates so much that I pay more attention.

In the same manner, several participants also added that they were engaged in feedback more when they could observe the facial expression, gestures, or mimics of the teacher. To illustrate, P9 mentioned, *"I remembered his/her tone of voice or mimics. So, it was*

sticking to me more permanently. In this way, it was easier to use it in my assignments” (University A).

Teacher guidance was the second most discussed factor ($f = 27$). The respondents reported that they acted on the feedback when the teacher guided them on meaning of feedback as well as how to complete a task or to use given feedback. For instance, P26 noted one of their experiences on guidance of teacher:

We were junior students and were expected to write a reflection paper. However, we were not familiar with how to write a reflection paper. First, s/he taught us the definition of reflection and the method of brainstorming. Then, s/he wanted us to include those brainstorming ideas on our reflection paper. It was like step by step. Next, we were given feedback. In line with the feedback, we revised our papers and submitted. It was very useful for me. I still keep them in my mind while writing reflection papers (University B).

Another code appeared was teacher expertise ($f = 22$). The respondents expressed that trust in their teacher’s expertise and judgment enhanced their use of feedback. To give an example, P12 expressed how their acting on feedback changed depending on the teacher’s expertise, *“there is a professor whose feedback is valuable and trustable for me. S/he comes up with very professional comments. Hence, I would definitely act on the given feedback if it had been provided by her/him”* (University A).

Appreciation of hard work was also addressed as an enhancing factor by 16 participants. They stated that teacher’s recognition and appreciation of hard work and effort promoted their engagement with feedback. For example, P6 referred to increase in their motivation to use feedback when their effort was recognized, *“I have worked on the preparation of materials for days, or even weeks. To see and hear that your efforts were appreciated...It was music to my ears. Believe it or not, you want to use that comment more”* (University A).

Thirteen emphasized the relationship with teacher by stating that positive relationship with teacher made them initiate feedback conversation. To illustrate, P39 emphasized on the importance of mutual attitudes:

we always maintained our relationship on the basis of mutual respect...so, I was at ease while asking for a point that I had not understood. As I trusted in our attachment, I was asking the professor without any hesitation” (University C).

Furthermore, perceived teacher effort appeared as an enhancing factor ($f = 8$). They specified that they became more willing to act on feedback when the teacher seemed to put an effort on tasks, feedback, or lesson. In the same manner, P8 spoke of, *“s/he does not fudge the feedback. When you demand it, s/he explains in detail. S/he strives to make you understand. So, I take heed to that feedback”* (University A). Finally, the least mentioned factor was availability of teacher ($f = 4$). According to the statements of these participants, they got motivated to seek and use feedback when the teacher was available for communication or feedback dialogue. For instance, P28 pointed to teachers’ openness to student visits for feedback, *“there is one more thing. Our professors were open to communication. That is to say, their position was easily accessible. So, I was comfortable to knock at their doors to ask for feedback”* (University C).

4.5.4.2. Peer-related factors

Within peer-related factors, the most mentioned factor was peer availability ($f = 19$). The participants reported that they resorted to their peers when they did not understand the feedback provided by teacher. As P34 expressed, *“I was asking my friends as they could point up things having flown my radar”* (University C). In addition, almost half of the participants ($f = 14$) addressed to common experiences by expressing that everyone was involved in the same process and thus, the same problems, which increased their tendency to seek feedback from professors. As P4 explained their individual attempt, *“I feel relaxed when I realize that it is not only me who cannot understand a certain point. So, I act bravely regarding asking for feedback. I add, ‘Sir/madam, nobody understood that task’ ”* (University A). Similarly, many participants highlighted that they were more relaxed to ask for feedback from their peers as they had gone through the same process, *“we are all tarred with the same brush, so I have also asked for their feedback as I know they are familiar with the same issue or the same problem”* (P9, University B).

Similarly, almost half of the participants brought up trust in peer expertise as an enhancing factor for engagement with feedback ($f = 14$). To illustrate, P4 stated their trust in friends’ judgment, *“I have good classmates whose achievement level is really high. Besides, they are able to very critical points. When I feel incompetent or*

inadequate, I trust in their comments, thereby asking them for their opinions” (University B).

Another factor which enhanced feedback literacy was students’ comparing their works to those of peers ($f = 10$). For example, P36 mentioned:

... we had rubric where we could see our scores for each criterion. After I had received the scored rubric, I compared my rubric to that of my friend. Let’s say that my score for the first criterion was 3 while my friend got 5 for the same part. Then, I was making a comparison by revising both tasks. In fact, I was able to notice the problem on my own (University C).

As in teacher-related factor, having a positive relationship with their peers was also reported as a factor ($f = 5$). An excerpt showing this code read, *“when s/he was someone within my close circle of friends, I felt at ease asking for feedback”* (University C). In the same manner, P13 elaborated on their relationship with peers:

To my opinion, the attitudes and the ideas of our friends are more objective. Even if you do something wrong, your friend will eventually tell you just because s/he is your friend. When you have drawbacks, I am sure s/he will explain in detail. It feels good (University A).

Another similar code within teacher-related theme was “peer effort.” Participants ($f = 4$) expressed that when peers paid attention to their works or when they took peer feedback seriously, they trusted in the given feedback, thereby making use of it. For example, P8 spoke of, *“I see that s/he devotes her/his time and makes a great effort to give feedback. Of course, I make use of it in that case”* (University A). Finally, the least mentioned peer-related factor was language of peers ($f = 2$). As P27 mentioned their attitude towards positive and kind language of peers, *“I do not remember feeling offended. They were commenting on my micro-teachings very kindly. So, I was thanking and keeping their suggestions in my mind for my next micro-teaching”* (University B).

4.6. Impeding Factors

This section presented the findings related to the fourth research question, “What are impeding factors affecting the feedback literacy of ELT students?” Impeding factors were mainly about the elements negatively influencing learners’ making sense of feedback information and using it to improve their work. It was presented under four themes: feedback characteristics, instructional factors, learners characteristics, and

social factors. Only social factors consisted of two sub-themes: teacher-related and peer-related factors.

4.6.1. Feedback Characteristics

Feedback characteristics were the first theme that appeared as an impeding factor for feedback literacy. As presented in Table 4.9, the theme consisted of ten codes: insufficient/superficial feedback, delayed feedback, empty praise, unconstructive feedback, too many corrections, unexpected feedback, irrelevant feedback, the threat to identity, negative feedback in class, and written feedback.

Table 4.9

Frequencies for Feedback Characteristics as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C

Feedback Characteristics	The Number of Participants			Total
	A	B	C	
Insufficient/superficial feedback	10	10	1	21
Delayed feedback	8	7	5	20
Empty praise	5	4	4	13
Unconstructive feedback	6	4	2	12
Too many corrections	5	4	1	10
Unexpected feedback	5	2	2	9
Irrelevant feedback	4	4	1	9
Threat to identity	6	3	-	9
Negative feedback in class	2	2	-	4
Written feedback	-	1	1	2

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

Insufficient and superficial feedback was the most frequently mentioned factor impeding engagement with feedback ($f = 21$). The respondents reported not trying to understand or use feedback, not presenting adequate information to guide them. For instance, P25 expressed their mindset, “*if the feedback is slurred over or superficial, I cannot internalize as I have lots of question marks on how to use it. So, I am not able to use it*” (University B). One participant stated that error flagging refrained them from understanding or using feedback: “*There was not any information about why my response was incorrect and how I could fix it. Hence, I did not bother myself thinking about the mistakes or problems*” (P9, University B).

The second most mentioned code was delayed feedback ($f = 20$). The respondents stated that delayed feedback hindered them from understanding or using feedback. For example, P17 explained how they ignored the feedback given after submitting the task, *“after you submit your assignment, you do not care about the feedback as everything is over. Sometimes, I do not even read them”* (University A). In the same manner, P26 mentioned that they did not even remember the task, *“let alone using it, I do not even remember that I have submitted such an assignment before. So, you become distanced and do not take it seriously”* (University B). Similarly, P40 expressed: *After a while, I even forget what I have written on that exam paper. I studied them before, but it has been a long time. That means I do not have the knowledge of feedback content and thus, go through them* (University C).

Another characteristic was empty praise ($f = 13$). The participants stated that only positive comments exaggerating the presented work without informing about mistakes were useless and unrealistic, resulting in ignorance of feedback. To give an example, P3 elaborated on this problem, *“For the sake of encouraging the students, teachers sometimes exaggerate positive comments. For that reason, you do not become aware of your problems, let alone facing them. There is no use taking notes of them”* (University A). Another excerpt read, *“...fancy words like ‘that’s great, ‘I think you are perfect,’ or ‘there is nothing wrong. At that point, I do not take feedback. I mean I listen to their comments, but do not act on them later on”* (P8, University A).

Some participants ($f = 12$) addressed unconstructive feedback. Most of these participants stated that they refrained from uptaking feedback when it directly emphasized negative points in a discouraging way. To illustrate, P23 mentioned their experience:

I feel like I have been attacked. All the things that I heard in that kind of feedback were ‘this is wrong,’ ‘you cannot say this in that way,’ or ‘you cannot use this word within this context.’ I became so demotivated that I started to have stage fright. So, it was impossible to use given feedback because I could not focus on them (University B).

Within unconstructive feedback, only one participant spoke of their tendency not to use feedback when it was directed to their knowledge, *“if the feedback comments focus on my knowledge, I cannot use as it is not useful and does not inform you how to use it. I can learn pure knowledge on books, no feedback is required for that”* (P32,

University C). Ten brought up too many corrections as detrimental to engagement with feedback. To illustrate, P13 specified their fear of asking for feedback in this case:

The given feedback was in the form of corrections on essay paper where you see lots of underlined or crossed out words with red color. It was not useful for me. I did not feel like correcting them. Even when I needed feedback for my essay, I was not asking... I was afraid that there would be marks all over the paper (University A).

Furthermore, several of these participants reported that they did not act on feedback when it corrected minor mistakes, “*if the feedback repeatedly points to minor mistakes, I ignore and send final draft without correcting those mistakes*” (P9, University B).

While some pointed to too many corrections, some mentioned unexpected feedback ($f = 9$). The respondents explained that they neither initiated feedback dialogue nor acted on given feedback when it was unexpected or incongruent with their own ideas. For instance, P19 expressed:

Sometimes, you have different opinions from the teacher. You think that ‘I was right, s/he misunderstood what I wrote or what I mentioned.’ In other words, you do not accept their comments. At that point, I do not take that feedback seriously (University A).

The same number of respondents also brought up that when the feedback was irrelevant to the main aim of the task, their uptake and use of feedback decreased ($f = 9$). To give an example, P26 elaborated on one of the irrelevant feedbacks they had received:

Again, I got feedback irrelevant to the content of the course. Interestingly enough, we were singing songs within a pronunciation course. The professor underlined that s/he would not pay attention to our skills in singing, but only our pronunciation would be taken into consideration... However, the provided feedback was all about my intonation while singing. It was not even related to learning or teaching English. So, it was not eligible to use (University B).

Furthermore, nine participants underlined the threat to identity. If the feedback focused on the characteristics of an individual in a personal way, the participants noted that they did not consider it. As P21 underlined, “*if it refers to my personality, I do not make any effort to use it. To me, it is useless*” (University B). Similarly, negative feedback given in front of the class was found detrimental by four participants. P16 expressed that “*...when you were commented about your mistakes in front of the class, you got demotivated. So, I could not pay attention to what had been told*” (University A). Lastly, a few participants ($f = 2$) referred to written feedback. They stated that

written feedback did not initiate any feedback conversation. As P9 from University B mentioned, “*written feedback does not enable you to start a dialogue with the teacher when you have questions. It is written there and thus, remain unfulfilled on the paper.*”

4.6.2. Instructional Factors

Instructional factors were the second theme that appeared as an impeding factor for feedback literacy. As presented in Table 4.10, the theme consisted of two codes: ambiguous criteria and discontinuous tasks.

Table 4.10

Frequencies for Instructional Factors as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C

Instructional Factors	The Number of Participants			
	A	B	C	Total
Ambiguous criteria	11	6	5	22
Discontinuous tasks	4	6	4	14

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

The most frequently discussed factor within the instructional context was ambiguous criteria ($f = 22$). The respondents stated that they refrained from starting feedback dialogue when the task criteria were vague. For instance, P10 explained:

To be honest, it is not clear what is expected from you. You attempt to start writing your assignment, but you do not know how to do it. The criteria written on the rubric are unclear. For example, it is stated, “appropriate words are used.” Then, what are these appropriate words? As you do not know these so-called appropriate words, you cannot naturally use that feedback (P20, University B).

Some participants pointed to discontinuous tasks ($f = 14$). They explained that they did not have any reason to use feedback when there were no follow-ups or sequentially similar tasks. As P39 elaborated, “*Let’s say that we submitted assignment A. If I am not expected to complete another task related to assignment A, I do not even turn to the given feedback, let alone read it*” (University C).

4.6.3. Learner Characteristics

Learner characteristics were the third theme that appeared as an impeding factor for feedback literacy. As presented in Table 4.11, the theme consisted of nine codes:

resistance to feedback, grade-oriented attitude, uninterest, feeling of failure, fear of teacher reaction, personal traits, feeling of unfair assessment, confidence about the task, and no earlier experience with feedback.

Table 4.11

Frequencies for Learner Characteristics as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C

Learner Characteristics	The Number of Participants			
	A	B	C	Total
Resistance to feedback	6	7	5	18
Grade-oriented attitude	9	4	4	17
Uninterest	6	4	3	13
Feeling of failure	6	3	3	12
Fear of teacher reaction	4	6	1	11
Personal traits	4	1	3	8
Feeling of unfair assessment	2	2	3	7
Confident about the task	4	2	1	7
No experience with feedback	2	2	1	5

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

Within learner characteristics, the most frequently mentioned factor was resistance to feedback, with almost half of the participants pointing to it ($f = 18$). It came out that participants resisted feedback for specific reasons. For example, P3 elaborated on how getting demoralized affected their resistance, “*I was getting demoralized due to given feedbacks. After some time, I began to ignore them. I was sitting right at the back of the class and was not giving a flying fudge*” (University A). Similarly, another participant expressed, “*I am not convinced with provided justification for given feedback. I still find myself right*” (P21, University A).

Another code that appeared was “grade-oriented attitude” ($f = 17$). Participants did not engage with feedback as they just focus on grades. Some of them stated that they aimed to pass the course or get a grade in their minds. For instance, P4 from University B elaborated, “*I was result-oriented regarding the exams, so I did not consider receiving feedback necessary. It was the end of the exam. Whatever the result is: AA or BB, it was over. I passed the course.*” If the task did not contribute highly to the grade, students would ignore the feedback. A sample excerpt read, “*I feel like I do not have to pay attention to assignments whose weight is low. Let’s say if the total point of the task is five, I ignore the written feedback*” (P21, University B). Some also underlined

that they did not make any effort on feedback if their grades were high. As P8's statement, *"to be honest, I do not beat my brains on that feedback if my grade is high"* (University A).

Uninterest was another factor underlined by 13 participants. They noted that their engagement with feedback decreased when they did not have any interest in the subject or field of study. As P29 clarified: *"Do you wonder why I specified my plans in ELT instead of linguistics at the beginning of the interview? It is because I am not interested in neither linguistics nor the feedback within its course content"* (University B). In addition, the feeling of failure was addressed by 12 respondents. The respondents noted that they do not engage with feedback when they felt incompetent or unsuccessful due to specific reasons. For instance, P13 specified how s/he felt incompetent due to red marks on the paper, *"I do not act on it ... as you taste of failure. At the forefront, I see that there are thousand red marks. So, I started to believe that I was tied hand and foot"* (University A). Several pointed out their constant focus on negatives. As P7 expressed, *"as I always focus on negative parts of feedback, I feel myself incompetent or unsuccessful. Thus, it takes longer to correct them"* (University A).

Eleven respondents pointed out fear from teacher reaction. Most of them specified that they were afraid that the teacher would misunderstand their attempt to seek feedback. According to P26's explanation, *"we were afraid that s/he might think we did not accept her/his feedback or grading. It was open to misunderstanding, so we could not dare and stepped aside"* (University C). Few also addressed their fear of receiving lower grades. When asked why they had not asked for feedback, one participant responded as *"maybe, we were afraid that s/he would mark down if we asked for a further explanation"* (P19, University A).

Another code was personal traits ($f = 8$). For instance, participants reported shyness as an impeding factor. As P8 expressed, *"I am a little bit shy, so do not take the initiative. Mostly, I observe the feedback delivered in class, but I do not ask for more"* (University A). Another one was the habit of procrastinating. For example, *"I submitted the assignment at the very last minute as I did not understand how to do. Besides, we had lots of tasks. Hence, I could not catch up with delivered feedbacks"* (P36, University

C). One of the respondents underlined their exam anxiety as a detrimental factor to ask for feedback: *I do not remember starting a feedback dialogue on my midterm exams as I have exam anxiety. I forget everything about it right after it is over. I do not want to check or revise the questions. That's a little bit personal* (P28, University C). Another participant noted their stress disorder, *"that's related to teacher feedbacks. I have stress disorder. So, I cannot focus on something when I am stressed as my mind goes blank"* (P32, University C).

Some respondents reported that they ignored feedback when they felt they were not treated fairly in grading or feedback comments ($f = 7$). For example, P34 expressed their opinion about the unfairness of the grading method, *"points were taken off all over the assignment. For a minor vocabulary mistake, five points were taken off. I disapproved this kind of grading as it was not fair. I wish I could have asked"* (University C). Several participants also underlined the feeling of unfairness compared to the grades or feedback given for peers, *"...because they did not comment on that point for the previous presenters. Their activities were also missing. There was a huge difference between our work and theirs. We ignored their criticism towards us"* (P34, University C).

Confident about the task (e.g., assignment, presentation) was another code ($f = 7$). Participants expressed that they trusted in their work and thus ignored the given feedback. For instance, P12 from University A explained that *"I still think my work was good. I went by the book, so did not find that feedback eligible"*. Several also noted that they did not seek feedback when the task was easy, and thus they trusted in their work. As P16 mentioned, *"...because I do not think that I had a major mistake. The task was not challenging or detailed, so was easy to complete. That's why I did not ask"* (University A). Lastly, having no experience with feedback was another facet addressed by two participants. They mentioned that they did not ask for feedback as they had not been given feedback during high school or got used to not taking feedback. For example, P40 expressed, *"I did not think that feedback was to change or act on something back then because I had not received any feedback during high school. That is to say, none of our teachers had provided us feedback"* (University C).

4.6.4. Social Factors

Social factors were the last theme that appeared as an impeding factor for feedback literacy. As presented in Table 4.12, the theme consists of two sub-themes: teacher-related and peer-related factors. Regarding teacher-related factors, responses were summarized under eight codes: negative teacher attitude, mistrust in teacher judgment, lack of teacher guidance, poor relationship with the teacher, indifference to hard work, poor teacher effort, teacher authority, and teacher unavailability. Within peer-related factors, responses across universities were presented under four codes: comparison to peers, mistrust in peer judgment, peer opinion about the teacher, and poor relationship with a peer.

Table 4.12

Frequencies for Social Factors as an Impeding Factor in University A, B, and C

Social Factors	The Number of Participants			
	A	B	C	Total
Teacher-related Factors				
Negative teacher attitude	11	8	4	23
Mistrust in teacher judgment	5	5	3	13
Lack of teacher guidance	5	2	3	10
Poor relationship with teacher	3	3	4	10
Indifference to hard work	3	5	-	8
Poor teacher effort	4	3	1	8
Teacher authority	2	3	1	6
Teacher unavailability	2	2	2	6
Peer-related Factors				
Comparison to peers	7	3	3	13
Mistrust in a peer judgment	2	3	2	7
Peer opinion about teacher	1	2	2	5
Poor relationship with peer	1	-	2	3

Note. $n_A=16$, $n_B=13$, $n_C=10$, and $n_{total}=39$

4.6.4.1. Teacher-related factors

Negative teacher attitude was the most frequently mentioned factor impeding feedback literacy ($f = 23$). Respondents reported that the teacher's unfriendly, rude, pessimistic, and aggressive manner affected their engagement with feedback. As P23 stated: "*at that point, this problem also falls upon teachers. When we ask something, some of them start to attack. We question to learn the correct version, but they think we doubt their judgments. So, I cannot dare to ask*" (University B). Some of them stated that

this attitude was also reflected in their choice of language, *“I mean there is a difference between ‘That’s wrong’ and ‘How could you do make such a mistake?’ When the professor comments as in the latter way, I get stressed and cannot concentrate on the essence of the problem”* (P12, University A).

Thirteen participants brought up their mistrust in teacher judgment. As they did not trust in the teacher’s expertise, they did not pay attention to the given feedback by her/him. To illustrate, P39 elaborated on one of their experiences:

We could not learn anything from that professor, let alone mistakes. They had a very useless way of teaching pronunciation. I have never asked for help as they cannot teach properly. Besides, it was very unprofessional that another professor graded our final presentations. We could not also receive feedback on our presentations nor asked for it (University C).

Moreover, ten referred to the lack of teacher guidance. The respondents noted that they had difficulty in understanding feedback or asking for feedback due to lack of guidance in the meaning of feedback as well as how to complete a task regarding given feedback. As P23 stated, *“I had completed my assignments by trial and error due to lack of someone guiding us. I never understood what to do with that feedback nor knocked at her/his door to ask”* (University B). Another code was “poor relationship with teacher” ($f = 10$). The situation where they did not get along well or have any attachment with the teacher was detrimental to start a feedback conversation. Concerning their relationship with a teacher, P34 expressed, *“if you want to ask for feedback, you should have a strong relationship with a teacher. It would help if you had that attachment, how to say, get the green light, but I did not feel in this way about the professor”* (University C). A similar code was the poor effort of the teacher ($f = 8$). The respondents specified that they attached importance to feedback if they thought the teacher did not put adequate effort. To illustrate, P28 expressed: *“It affects the extent to which I use given feedback. The provided feedback is perfunctory and nonfunctional. In my opinion, they also do not care and thus, give superficial feedbacks. So, why would I ask for more?”* (University C).

Teachers’ indifference to hard work was also addressed by eight participants. The respondents stated that they could not pay attention to feedback when their hard work was not valued or appreciated. For instance, one of the participants expressed:

I made a great effort on that task and worked on it day and night, but all I see is negative comments without any respect for my effort. I cannot help but feeling demotivated or falling into despair. So, I do not feel like reading the comments for some time (P5, University B).

Furthermore, six implied that the unavailability of the teacher to get in touch and to ask questions was detrimental to feedback engagement. As P33 explained:

...as we thought the professor was closed to dialogue. It was very hard to get in touch with them. They or their assistant had never responded to our e-mails throughout the semester. Hence, we did not ask one more time at the end of the term (University C).

Lastly, teacher authority was underlined by six respondents. In their opinion, they could not question the given feedback due to the authority of the teacher. In other words, the common idea was that teacher was always right. For example, P26 elaborated on their acceptance of teacher authority,

It would be like disobedience or resistance to her judgment, not by a long chalk! They are far more knowledgeable than us, so they must be right if they present such feedback. That's why I step back and do not dare to ask (University C).

4.6.4.2. Peer-related factors

The most frequently pointed out factor within peer-related factors was comparing peers ($f = 13$). The respondents noted that they compared their situation to peers' experiences or feedbacks and thus did not need to start a feedback dialogue. For instance, P17 stated that “*when I compare my feedback to others and see that I am the only one who cannot complete a part properly, I feel incompetent and thus, do not ask for an explanation*” (University A). Similarly, P25 mentioned their observation about peers' experience:

One of our classmates asked to see her/his exam paper to get feedback. The professor told her/his that it was not possible as s/he did not have that option. None of us got any feedback. After I heard that, I did not also ask (University B).

Mistrust in peer judgment was mentioned by seven participants. It was stated that poor expertise or poor effort of peers in providing feedback resulted in not taking feedback seriously. Regarding the expertise of peers, P34 highlighted, “*I do not believe that peers can provide professional feedback, so I do not trust in their evaluation to include*

in my work” (University C). Regarding the poor effort of peers, P8 expressed that “you eagerly present your lesson plan, but you see that your classmates do not pay attention to your presentation. So, you realize that their comments are not viable, it is just a showpiece” (University A).

Five participants pointed out how their peers’ opinions about a teacher influence them. They stated that peers’ negative attitudes towards the teacher prevented them from initiating feedback dialogue with the teacher. According to P28’s statement:

...It depends on the teacher and our attitude towards the teacher as a whole class. We keep our distance from the teacher if one of us feels in a certain way. I remember a professor from whom we keep our distance for some reason. I asked my friends whether I should ask for feedback for the part that I had not understood. They advised me not to ask as s/he would not explain anyway. So, I did not ask (University C).

Lastly, poor relationship was another factor having emerged ($f = 3$). The relationship with peers along with the classroom environment had an impact on engagement with feedback. To illustrate, P28 mentioned:

In fact, the professor provided the same kind of feedback in previous and present semesters, but the classroom environment along with my classmates affected me a lot. Hence, if I had been with the same professor in another classroom, I would have made use of the given feedback one by one. However, ... classroom environment caused me to become distant. So, I did not attach importance to given feedback (University C).

4.7. Summary of the Results

The findings for feedback types, defined as means of conveying feedback information, revealed that explicit correction stating the incorrect responses of learners along with its correct version was the most mentioned feedback type. Apart from informing about mistakes, learners were provided with more clarification behind their mistakes. As another way to elaborate on mistakes, participants pointed to clues or sources guiding them to correct answers. It was also reported that teacher feedback asking for elaboration or further explanation was given when the responses on a task were not clear to the teacher. Furthermore, the respondents added the use of rubrics or guidelines presenting them information or judgment about their work in a more structured way. The use of error flagging was another reported feedback type along

with marks without any further explanation. Finally, a warning stating learners to be careful at a certain point was also brought up by respondents.

How soon the feedback information was provided to learners was also investigated. It was found that the timing of feedback depended on assessment methods as well as teacher and task factors. The earliest feedback was stated as just after the presentations preceding within three or four days for exams and within seven days for assignments/projects. Feedback given within one or two weeks and more than two weeks was also mentioned. On the other hand, the latest feedback reported by participants was given at the end of the semester.

The amount of feedback referred to how much feedback information learners had received. This study revealed that the amount of feedback varied depending on assessment methods and learners' number of mistakes. Some participants reported the amount of feedback in terms of duration while some in terms of the number of sentences. Besides, many expressed whether the feedback was detailed or not. Firstly, the most discussed component within assignments/projects and presentations was detailed feedback. Several participants also reported the use of markings without any further explanation or the absence of feedback in assignments/projects and exams. The respondents mentioned feedback in one or two sentences, one paragraph, and one or two pages for assignments and projects. On the other hand, feedback for presentations was frequently stated in minutes, one and five; five and ten; and ten and 20 respectively, though several referred to the number of sentences, five or six; and three or four successively. For exams, feedback in one or two sentences and one paragraph was also brought up.

The indicators of feedback literacy, in other words, how learners made sense of feedback information and used it to improve their learning, were presented beneath four components: appreciate feedback, make a judgment, manage affect, and take action (Carless & Boud, 2018). In appreciating feedback, the majority of the participants indicated that they recognized the value of feedback. In contrast, the others elaborated on their feedback-seeking behaviors in different conditions from multiple sources. Many participants also acknowledged that they should play an active role in the feedback process. Making a judgment was another indicator of feedback literacy.

Most of the participants addressing this component pointed out evaluative judgment about one's own work, while some also referred to evaluative judgment about the quality of feedback and others' work. Understanding criteria to improve future work was another component reported by respondents. Another indicator of feedback literate students was managing affect. The participants mentioned management of challenging emotions (e.g., anxiety, stress, pessimism) and emotional openness to feedback regardless of positive or negative comments received for a task. Taking action was the last indicator of feedback literacy. The majority of the participants pointed to enacting feedback information for future tasks as well as adapting the information to use it in different contexts (e.g., different types of tasks, different courses). Lastly, the respondents also reported that they acted on feedback information for self-improvement or future career.

Enhancing factors were about increasing learners' understanding of feedback information and utilizing it to improve their work. Four main themes appeared in enhancing factors: feedback characteristics, instructional factors, learner characteristics and roles, and social factors (teacher and peer-related factors). Within feedback characteristics, constructive and timely feedback were frequently reported. Constructiveness and timeliness were followed by expected and explicit feedback. Some participants reported detailed and long feedback as an enhancing factor, while some pointed to the necessity of brief feedback; in other words, concise but to the point information about the work. Feedback for a new context (e.g., task, course) was considered as crucial and thus contributed to engagement with received feedback. Similarly, storable feedback was stated to give participants the chance to revisit previous comments for future uses. Feedback information, including clues and sources directing to correct answers were also reported along with the ones honest about the current work. Lastly, few also mentioned individual feedback provided specifically to individuals' work or response.

The second theme that appeared in enhancing factors was instructional factors. The frequently discussed factors enhancing feedback literacy were use of exemplars, rubrics/guidelines, self-evaluation, and peer feedback. The participants also stated that they sought feedback more when the task was difficult. Besides, continuous tasks; in other words, sequential tasks similar to each other or drafted assessment design

enhanced learners' enacting feedback information. Few participants also mentioned providing feedback on mistakes to the whole class instead of individuals in front of the class. The third theme that appeared in enhancing factors was learner characteristics and roles. Self-regulation along with intrinsic and extrinsic motivation were the most discussed factors. Regarding the emotions of learners, feeling of success and valued were also reported. The participants also emphasized their confidence in their work. Finally, engagement with feedback was reported when the learners valued different ideas (e.g., teachers, peers) as a source of feedback.

The last emergent theme within enhancing factors was social factors (teacher and peer-related factors). In reference to the teacher roles, attitudes, and characteristics, the respondents commonly addressed positive teacher attitude, teacher expertise, and guidance. It was also reported that appreciation of hard work or effort by teachers enhanced students' motivation to uptake feedback. Similarly, a strong relationship with teacher and teacher availability contributed to students' disposition to initiate feedback. Among peer-related factors, the most mentioned factors were peer availability, common experiences with peers, and trust in peer expertise. The participants also reported that comparing their performances to those of their peers positively affected their understanding of feedback. Furthermore, strong relationships, positive language, and the perceived effort of peers helped the learners to become more engaged in the feedback process.

Impeding factors referred to components negatively affecting the feedback literacy of learners. The themes were feedback characteristics, instructional factors, learner characteristics, and social factors, including peer and teacher-related factors. The most frequently discussed factors were superficial feedback and empty praise of teachers or peers within feedback characteristics. Besides, participants stated that delayed feedback led to a decay of knowledge, thereby restricting enacting feedback information. Some participants referred to too many corrections as detrimental to the uptake of feedback. At the same time, some pointed to the negative effects of unconstructive feedback focusing on negatives in a discouraging or unfriendly way. Furthermore, feedback posing a threat to identity was reported as the reason behind defensiveness against feedback. The respondents also brought up the negative effects of feedback unexpected to them or irrelevant to their work. On the other hand, the least

mentioned factors were noted as negative feedback in front of the class and written feedback.

Instructional factors appeared as the second theme. Only ambiguity of criteria and discontinuous tasks were reported within these factors. The third theme was learner characteristics. Resistance to feedback and grade-oriented attitudes were mentioned by almost half of the participants. Participants also addressed feelings of failure, unfair assessment, and uninterest in the field of study as reasons behind the disengagement with feedback. In addition, fearing of teacher reaction against questions was also reported by almost half of the participants. Some specified their traits such as anxiety, stress, stubbornness as an obstacle to uptake of feedback. At the same time, some pointed to their confidence in their work as the reason behind ignoring feedback. Lastly, no earlier experience with feedback led students not to seek feedback.

The final theme that emerged within impeding factors was social factors comprised of teacher and peer-related factors. The most frequent teacher factors were negative teacher attitude, mistrust in teacher judgment, and lack of teacher guidance. The respondents also referred to a poor relationship with teachers and poor teacher effort. Furthermore, teachers' indifference to hard work or effort, unavailability, and authority were reported as obstacles to engagement with feedback. About peer-related factors, comparing one's work to that of peers along with mistrust in peer judgment were the most frequently mentioned factors. Although it was not frequent as the former factors, peer opinion about teachers and poor relationship with peers constrained feedback-seeking behaviors.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This chapter aims to present a critical analysis of the results of the current study regarding the results in related literature. Initially, the findings of the present study are compared for further comprehension of the relation between the findings and previous literature. The second section addresses implications for practice within the educational context. Lastly, recommendations for further research are presented.

5.1. Conclusion of Results

The findings unveiled the indicators of feedback literacy for undergraduate students along with enhancing and impeding factors. First of all, feedback types, amount, and timing that learners had reported were presented. In this way, the current study would be able to extend knowledge on facets of feedback. Furthermore, the indicators of student feedback literacy encompassed appreciating feedback, making judgment, managing affect, and taking action (Carless & Boud, 2018). Lastly, the factors both enhancing and impeding feedback literacy comprised of instructional factors, feedback characteristics, learner roles and characteristics, and social factors.

5.1.1. Feedback Types, Amount, and Timing

The current study indicated that the most frequently employed feedback types are explicit correction, providing clarification, clues, and sources. Correspondingly, Shute (2008) compiled the most frequently discussed feedback types in literature and found elaboration referring to the provision of explanation, the guidance of students through prompts, hints, and cues, as well as providing knowledge of the correct answer. Despite being less frequent than the former types, error flagging and only providing grades were reported in the current study. Consistently, error-flagging and verification of correct and incorrect answers or overall percentage of correct answers were discussed within the feedback types mentioned by Shute (2008). The amount of

feedback was reported in sentences, paragraphs, pages, and minutes based on assessment methods and depending on task and teacher. Similarly, quantity-based feedback codes also emerged in Wei et al.'s (2020) study.

5.1.2. Indicators of Feedback Literacy

Considering the indicators of feedback literacy, the present study revealed that students were involved in feedback literacy regarding four main components: appreciating feedback, making judgment, managing affect, and taking action (Carless & Boud, 2018). Within appreciation of feedback, it was unveiled that students recognized their active role in the feedback process. This result was consistent with Hill and West's (2020) findings in students' acceptance of their proactive role. Similarly, Davis (2020) reported that undergraduate students enrolled in Arts and Creative Industry were more open to active participation by starting a feedback dialogue. In one of the case studies (Han & Xu, 2019a), it was found that the participant was inclined to consult to their peers or teachers when they had difficulty in understanding feedback. Students' tendency to seek feedback from their peers along with their teachers also emerged within the current study.

The findings indicated that students' understanding of criteria and evaluative judgment about the quality of feedback and peers' works were among the indicators of making judgment. Similarly, Gravett et al. (2019) also found participants' behavior of making inferences from feedback to understand what is expected. Concerning the evaluative judgment on the quality of peers' works, Fernández-Toro and Duensing (2020) addressed participants' engagement pattern, which was judgment formation in reference to a set of marking criteria within peer review sessions.

Within managing affect, students reported the necessity of being open to feedback regardless of its emphasis on a poor or good performance. Furthermore, management of emotional challenges such as anxiety, resistance, pessimism, stress emerged as an indicator of feedback literacy. Correspondingly, Molloy et al. (2020) revealed that participants' acceptance of their emotions and acting on them to overcome challenges were within the characteristics of feedback literacy.

Regarding taking action, participants underlined using feedback for similar tasks as well as adapting to different concepts. Consistent with the dimension of taking action, enacting feedback information to improve learning was also within the findings of Molloy et al. (2020). Similarly, Sutton's (2012) findings indicated that engaging in the practical dimension of feedback; in other words, reading, interpreting, and acting on feedback yielded feedback literate learners.

5.1.3. Feedback Characteristics

To begin with, feedback characteristics mostly evolved around constructive feedback as an enhancing factor versus unconstructive feedback as an impeding factor. The feedback encouraging students to improve their performances in a friendly manner was stated to have a positive impact on engagement with feedback, while discouraging ones with a direct emphasis on negatives were indicated to result in resistance to feedback. Concerning constructive feedback reported in the current study, Wei et al. (2020) revealed that the participants pointed to constructive feedback as a way to improve their performance and work by using suggested solutions. Explicit and honest feedback was found to promote student feedback literacy due to the ease of acting on such feedback information. As stated by Molloy et al. (2020), several participants expressed their tendency to go after honest comments from others. In addition, feedback with the right amount of detailed information was reported to enhance understanding of feedback information. Some participants reported the right amount as long while the others referred to it as concise. Correspondingly, the participants in another feedback literacy study stated that they highly valued detailed feedback on grammar when they focused on mastery in language learning (Ducasse & Hill, 2019).

In reference to the timing of feedback, it was underlined that timely feedback, either immediate or provided after a short time, facilitated engagement with feedback. In their studies, Corbett and Anderson (2001) demonstrated that immediate feedback provided to correct errors assisted students in immediate learning. However, feedback provided after a long-time led to the decay of knowledge, thereby making it impossible to act on the feedback information. Guo (2021) also addressed the positive impact of immediate or delayed feedback in short intervals on learning and achievement, while delayed feedback in long intervals restricted learning.

In their studies, Gravett et al. (2019) revealed that sources of threat to identity such as discomforting, attacking, hurting feedback led participants not to use the feedback. The present study also found that feedback, including any threat to identity, resulted in ignorance or delay in engaging with feedback. Lastly, praise was discussed to be counterproductive in previous research. For example, Brophy (1981) suggested that praise was effective when it was credible and honest, while insincere praise was unlikely to encourage students to come up with good writing performances. Congruently, empty praise of both teachers and peers exaggerating the presented performance was found useless by the participants of this study.

5.1.4. Instructional Factors

Instructional factors were another theme that emerged as a result of the study. In a three-dimensional model, Chong (2020) also addressed instructional factors to enhance learners' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement with feedback. Within instructional factors, the use of exemplars and rubrics were highlighted as enhancing factors contributing to the evaluative judgment of learners, thereby enacting the inferences. Thanks to exemplars, learners were found to promote the capacity to make academic judgments to take action (Carless & Boud, 2018). In addition, Smith et al. (2013) quantified the influence of assessment literacy intervention (analysis, discussion, and application of assessment rubrics to real student works) on assessment literacy of students. The intervention was found influential in enhancing literacy level in understanding and making judgments along with the use of assessment for learning.

Besides, the practices of self-evaluation and peer evaluation were expressed to be influential on improving evaluative judgment. Concerning the results of their studies, Malecka et al. (2020) underlined the need to include progressive self-assessment and cumulative peer review within the curriculum to promote student feedback literacy. Similarly, Carless and Boud (2018) suggested that peer review had a positive impact on student feedback literacy. Consistent with the results of the current study, Fernández-Toro and Duensing (2020) also revealed that peer review enhanced judgment formation about the works of peers about criteria. Moreover, participants in this study were inclined to constantly be engaged in feedback when continuous tasks were presented, such as sequential tasks similar to each other. Similarly, allowing

students to act upon the provided feedback with two-staged assignment design or multiple drafts was suggested (Carless et al., 2011).

5.1.5. Learner Characteristics

One of the themes that emerged in line with the literature was the enhancing and impeding factors related to learner characteristics. Han and Xu (2019a) pointed to intrapersonal variations, and Chong (2020) addressed individual dimensions such as belief, motivation, metacognition, goals, abilities, and experience to become feedback literate learners while lack of these variations constrains engagement with feedback. Feedback literate learners also showed self-regulatory strategies such as goal setting, attention focusing, self-instruction, self-reflection, in addition to cognitive strategies. Besides, learners' confidence in their work was also addressed. Hill and West (2020) suggested that all the respondents except a few expressed feedback assisted them to achieve higher grades due to self-regulation, self-efficacy, and task-specific behavior. Concerning using different strategies, Molloy et al. (2020) pointed to participants' use of a wide repertoire of strategies (e.g., use of instructions for self-reflection of performance) and monitoring their own progress to elaborate on feedback information.

In the same manner, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation of learners were brought up as enhancing factors. Akin to intrinsic motivation for self-improvement and future career found in the present study, Ducasse and Hill (2019) revealed that learners with the motivation of learning or achieving personal goals improved their uptake of feedback, thereby being encouraged to take an active role in the feedback process. Similarly, learners' self-motivation and intrinsic motivation were suggested as crucial for receiving feedback (Tripodi et al., 2020). Nonetheless, learners' grade-orientation attitude hindered them from seeking or using feedback. In line with grade orientation, Smith et al. (2013) revealed that minimum effort orientation where students were oriented to pass the course requirements negatively correlated with assessment for learning.

Concerning the emotions of participants, respondents referred to the feeling of success and feeling of being valued as reasons behind feedback usage. In contrast, the feeling of failure and unfair assessment restricted the use of feedback. Molloy et al. (2020) reported that some participants pointed to the feeling valued or cared for, which

resulted in being open to receiving comments without defensiveness. Furthermore, learners valued different ideas, thereby using feedback from multiple sources (e.g., peers, teachers) more. Li and Han (2021) also revealed that different tutors and others' ideas resulted in progress in taking teacher feedback. Lastly, Rovagnati et al. (2021) reported that the orientation of learners due to their feedback history might cause the lack of feedback-seeking behaviors. Correspondingly, the current study asserted that no earlier feedback experiences of learners constrained them from seeking feedback.

5.1.6. Social Factors

As Han and Xu (2019a); and Chong (2020) suggested, interpersonal variations where temporal dimensions within the social and cultural environment changed the extent to which students achieved feedback literacy were one of the two characteristics affecting feedback literacy. Social factors depending on changing teacher and peer-related factors were found to enhance or impede feedback literacy. Within social factors, it was found that teachers played a crucial role in promoting feedback literacy, which is consistent with several studies in the literature. As Carless and Boud (2018) noted, the teacher was vital to enable students to generate, employ, and receive feedback. In the same manner, Han and Xu (2019b) reported that multiple functions of the teacher, such as scaffolding and authority, led to enhanced student feedback literacy. Within the current study, teachers' guidance played a significant part in understanding and use of feedback as well. However, teacher authority was underlined as detrimental to feedback literacy, which does not concur with Han and Xu's (2019b) findings within the Chinese context. The reason behind this conflict may result from the context- and culture-specific nature of conditions influencing feedback literacies and the diversity of feedback experiences across universities in different parts of the world (Rovagnati et al., 2021).

Within the present study, a strong relationship with the teacher was found to motivate learners to initiate feedback dialogue, while initiation of feedback dialogue was restricted due to a weak relationship. As a result of Sutton's (2012) study on academics and learners, the relationship between academics and learners was revealed to play an important role in the positive and successful engagement with the feedback, which was congruent with the current study. Again, Sutton (2012) suggested that the language

barrier inhibited acting on feedback and thus feedback literacy. Correspondingly, this study also reported that teacher attitude, including language and facial expressions, played a part in students' attempts or decisions to start feedback conversations.

In an agreement with Li and Han's (2021) findings suggesting the influence of teacher expertise on students' uptake of feedback, the present study successively pointed to trust and mistrust in teacher judgment and expertise as enhancing and impeding factors for engagement with feedback. Concerning trust issues about peers, mistrust in peer judgment hindered the respondents of the current study from taking peer feedback as a reliable source to improve future work. Within their case studies, Han and Xu (2019a) also observed that one of their cases pointed to mistrust in peers and thus, avoided them from directly confronting errors in the writing tasks.

5.2. Implication for Practice

The results of the study provide educators with information and insight about the indicators of student feedback literacy as well as enhancing and impeding factors that can be employed to implement in a real classroom environment.

The current study revealed that certain instructional factors play an important role in promoting student feedback literacy. Therefore, creating an effective instructional context where students have more opportunities to be engaged with feedback is crucial. Concerning the instructional context, the educators are suggested to provide rubric and exemplars prior to a task, which enables students to have a clear understanding of task criteria and, as a result, the reason behind their grades. Besides, ambiguous statements should be avoided to encourage students to pay attention. Another point to reassure students' use of feedback is to present continuous tasks, where they are expected to complete either the first and second draft of a single task or a set of similar tasks sequentially. In this way, feedback dialogue becomes constant. Regarding the involvement of feedback in the instructional context, use of a variety of feedback sources can be embedded in the program. In this way, students get to benefit from the opinions of different peers or teachers and expand their insight. With the inclusion of mutual peer feedback practice, they are also given a chance to improve their evaluative judgment and critical thinking skills. Besides, they can be encouraged to practice self-feedback to promote their self-awareness.

Within the current study, feedback characteristics were also indicated to be key to understanding and using feedback. That is why the effectiveness of feedback content, amount, timing, style, and source should be optimal. At that point, the most underlined feedback characteristic was constructive feedback. Therefore, the educators are suggested to convey the feedback to encourage and support students to improve their poor performance while appreciating their effort and successful works. Therefore, the feedback should be conveyed in a positive manner regardless of the quality of work or performance. Furthermore, providing explicit and honest feedback information where students are clearly and objectively notified about their strengths and weaknesses is vital for students' understanding and acting on feedback. However, too many corrections should be avoided as it might be detrimental to students' motivation to uptake feedback. Concerning the timing and amount of feedback, educators are suggested to design detailed and timely feedback information regularly delivered to students because students are inclined to forget a piece of knowledge in a very short time. As an alternative to avoid the decay of knowledge, feedback can be provided in a format where students can save, store, or track delivered feedback messages.

Aside from instructional context and feedback characteristics, social factors related to peers and teachers are also crucial to engage with feedback and, thus, promote learning. At that point, teachers' characteristics, attitudes, and roles also play a part in student feedback literacy. Hence, educators are suggested to have a positive attitude towards students and their questions. Their choice of language and facial expressions should be friendly, kind, encouraging, and emphatic because students tend to read teachers' expressions and body language to decide on whether they will start a dialogue or not. The excessive use of authority against students should be avoided. Instead, students can be encouraged to freely express their own ideas and styles while balanced guidance is provided to assist them. Furthermore, educators should be open to communication, encouraging students to initiate a feedback conversation with ease. To reassure it, educators can schedule meetings or office hours where students are welcomed to ask their questions or to consult on their problems. In this way, a sense of solid relationship and the feeling of attachment are maintained. Lastly, educators are recommended to create a positive classroom atmosphere where peers interact with each other within the frames of healthy communication.

5.3. Recommendations for Further Research

There are certain recommendations regarding the findings of the present study for further research. To begin with, a longitudinal study to investigate university students' feedback literacy might be conducted. That is to say, undergraduate students' feedback literacy throughout their university education might provide essential information on their progress in understanding and using feedback information and their growth mindset on feedback.

Due to the scarcity of quantitative studies on feedback literacy, the investigation of the construct in reference to a set of quantitative data seems necessary. In this scope, students' literacy levels can be measured utilizing a scale developed for that purpose. Furthermore, the extent to which feedback literacy is correlated to other cognitive constructs (e.g., self-regulation, self-monitoring, metacognition) and affective constructs (e.g., self-efficacy, motivation, anxiety, value) can be investigated.

Concerning the present study, the indicators of feedback literacy along with enhancing and impeding factors are unveiled based on a basic qualitative design. This means a detailed and focused investigation of emergent themes (feedback characteristics, instructional factors, learner roles/characteristics, and social factors) and components beneath each theme do not exist. That is why each theme and the emergent factors might be investigated as a separate research entity.

The present study purposefully employed participants enrolled in ELT undergraduate program in three different universities. However, the feedback literacy of undergraduate students enrolled in other undergraduate programs and enhancing and impeding factors is unknown. Therefore, a qualitative data collection protocol appropriate to the characteristics of students from different disciplines might be developed to obtain data for detailed analysis. Differently, the feedback literacy of students from different disciplines might be compared within a quantitative design.

Furthermore, the current study has focused on the feedback literacy of undergraduate students. However, feedback literacy of university students enrolled in a program at graduate level is open to investigation. In the same manner, further research can focus

on the feedback literacy of K12 students, especially those enrolled in secondary and high school.

Concerning the related literature and this study, the construct of feedback literacy has been mainly examined from the learners' perspective. Notwithstanding, an alternative to student feedback literacy can be teachers' or academics' feedback literacy, which has been scarcely examined before.



REFERENCES

- Abell, S. K., & Siegel, M. A. (2011). Assessment literacy: What science teachers need to know and be able to do? In D. Corrigan, J. Dillon & R. Gunstone, (Eds.), *The professional knowledge base of science teaching* (pp. 205–221). The Netherlands: Springer.
- Adams, P. (2006). Exploring social constructivism: theories and practicalities, *Education*, 34(3), 243–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270600898893>
- Agarwal, P. K., Karpicke, J. D., Kang, S. H., Roediger, H. L., & McDermott, K. B. (2008). Examining the testing effect with open and closed-book tests. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 22, (7), 861–76. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1391>
- Arıkan, S. (2012). *Eğitimde ölçme ve değerlendirme*. Ankara: Elhan Yayınları.
- Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Kulik, C. C., Kulik, J. A., & Morgan, M. T. (1991). The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 213–238. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543061002213>
- Barnett, R. (2007). *A will to learn: Being a student in an age of uncertainty*. Maidenhead: SRHE & OU Press.
- Batchelor, D. C. (2006). Vulnerable voices: An examination of the concept of vulnerability in relation to student voice. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(6), 787–800. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2006.00231.x>
- Beaumont, C., O'Doherty, M., & Shannon, L. (2011). Reconceptualising assessment feedback: A key to improving student learning? *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(6), 671–687. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003731135>
- Bedford, S., & Legg, S. (2007). Formative peer and self-feedback as a catalyst for change within science teaching. *Chemistry Education Research and Practice*, 8(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.1039/B6RP90022D>

- Bee, R. & Bee, F. (1996). *Constructive feedback*. London, UK: Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Birney, R. C., Burdick, H., & Teevan, R. C. (1969). *Fear of failure*. New York: Van Nostrand-Reinhold.
- Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5 (1), 7-74. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
- Boston, C. (2002). The concept of formative assessment, *Practical Assessment Research, Evaluation*, 8(9), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.7275/kmcq-dj31>
- Boud, D., & Molloy, E. (2013). Rethinking models of feedback for learning: The challenge of design. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(6), 698- 712. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2012.691462>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: A practical guide for beginners*. Sage.
- Brearley, F., & Cullen, W. (2012). Providing students with formative audio feedback. *Bioscience Education*, 20(1), 22–36. <https://doi.org/10.11120/beej.2012.20000022>
- Brockner, J. (1979). The effects of self-esteem, success–failure, and self-consciousness on task performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(10), 1732–1741. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.37.10.1732>
- Brookhart, S.M. (2017). *How to give effective feedback to your students*. Second Edition, Alexandria, Virginia.
- Brooks, C., Carroll, A., Gillies, R. M., & Hattie, J. (2019). A matrix of feedback for learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 44(4). <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v44n4.2>.
- Brophy, J. (1981). Teacher praise: A functional analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 51(1), 5–32. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543051001005>

- Brown, E., & Glover, C. (2006). Evaluating written feedback. In: Bryan, C., & Clegg, K. (Eds.) *Innovative Assessment in Higher Education*, (pp. 81–91). London: Routledge.
- Bruner, J. S. (1961). The act of discovery. *Harvard Educational Review*, 31, 21–32.
- Bruner, J. (1985). Models of the learner. *Educational Researcher*, 14(6), 5–8.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X014006005>
- Bostock, S. (2006). *Student peer assessment*. University of Reading.
https://www.reading.ac.uk/web/files/engageinassessment/Student_peer_assessment_Stephen_Bostock.pdf
- Boud, D. (1995). *Enhancing learning through self-assessment*. London, Kogan Page.
- Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2006). Aligning assessment with long-term learning. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31, 399–413.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930600679050>
- Bunce, L., Baird, A., & Jones, S. (2017). The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 1958–1978.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1127908>
- Burford, B., Illing, J., Kergon, C., Morrow, G., & Livingston, M. (2010). User perceptions of multi-source feedback tools for junior doctors. *Medical Education*, 44, 165–176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2009.03565.x>
- Butler, D., & Winne, P. (1995). Feedback and self-regulated Learning: A theoretical synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 65, 245–281.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543065003245>.
- Caffarella, R. S., & Merriam, S. B. (1999). Perspectives on adult learning: Framing our research. In A. Rose (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Adult Education Research Conference*. DeKalb, IL: LEPS Press.
- Carless, D. (2007). Learning-oriented assessment: Conceptual bases and practical implications. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(1), 57–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703290601081332>.

- Carless, D. (2009). Trust, distrust and their impact on assessment reform. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(1), 79–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801895786>
- Carless, D. (2013). Sustainable Feedback and the Development of Student Self-evaluative Capacities. In D. Carless & M. Taras (Eds.), *Reconceptualising Feedback in Higher Education: Developing Dialogue with Students* (pp. 113–122). New York: Routledge.
- Carless, D. (2019). Feedback loops and the longer-term: Towards feedback spirals, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(5), 705–714. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1531108>
- Carless, D. (2020). From teacher transmission of information to student feedback literacy: Activating the learner role in feedback processes, *Active Learning in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787420945845>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315–1324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Carless, D. & Chan, K. K. H. (2016). Managing dialogic use of exemplars, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1211246>
- Carless, D., Salter, D., Yang, M., & Lam, J., (2011). Developing sustainable feedback practices. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36 (4), 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075071003642449>
- Carless, D., & Winstone, N. (2020). Teacher feedback literacy and its interplay with student feedback literacy, *Teaching in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1782372>
- Carpenter, S. K., & Vul, E. (2011). Delaying feedback by three seconds benefits retention of face-name pairs: the role of active anticipatory processing. *Memory & Cognition*, 39, 1211–21. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-011-0092-1>

- Caruso, M., Frascini, N., & Kuuse, S. (2019). Online tools for feedback engagement in second language learning, *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching (IJCALLT)*, 9(1), 58-78. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJCALLT.2019010104>
- Chan, C., & Luo, J. J. (2021). Exploring teacher perceptions of different types of 'feedback practices' in higher education: implications for teacher feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1888074>
- Chang, P., & Schleppegrell, M. (2011). Taking an effective authorial stance in academic writing: Making the linguistic resources explicit for L2 writers in the social sciences. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(3), 140–151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEAP.2011.05.005>
- Chappuis, S., & Chappuis, J. (2008). The Best value in formative assessment. *Informative Assessment*, 65(4), 14-19.
- Chih-Yuan Sun, J., Yu, S. J., & Chao, C. H. (2019). Effects of intelligent feedback on online learners' engagement and cognitive load: the case of research ethics education. *An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology*, 39, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2018.1527291>
- Chong, S. (2020). Reconsidering student feedback literacy from an ecological perspective, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1730765>
- Clariana, R. B. (1990). A comparison of answer-until-correct feedback and knowledge-of-correct-response feedback under two conditions of contextualization. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*, 17(4), 125–129.
- Copley, J. (1992) The integration of teacher education and technology: a constructivist model. In D. Carey, R. Carey, D. Willis & J. Willis (Eds.) *Technology and teacher education* (pp. 617–622). Charlottesville, VA, Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education.
- Corbett, A. T., & Anderson, J. R. (2001). Locus of feedback control in computer-based tutoring: Impact on learning rate, achievement and attitudes. In *Proceedings of ACM CHI 2001 conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 245–252). New York: ACM Press.

Crowther, D. T. (1997) Editorial, *Electronic Journal of Science Education*, 2, 2. <http://www.unr.edu/homepage/jcannon/ejse/ejsev2n2ed.html>

Çabakçor, B. O., Akşan, E., Öztürk, T., & Çimer, S. O. (2011). Types of feedback that were received and preferred by prospective primary mathematics teachers. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education (TURCOMAT)*, 2(1), 46- 68. <https://doi.org/10.17762/turcomat.v2i1.23>

Çapa Aydın, Y., & Çalık, B. (2018). *University students' perceptions toward feedback*. <https://hdl.handle.net/11511/79249>

Daniels, H. (2001). *Vygotsky and pedagogy*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Dann, R. (2019). Feedback as a relational concept in the classroom. *The Curriculum Journal*, 30(4), 352–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585176.2019.1636839>

Davis, K. (2020). An investigation into programme level approaches to feedback: Influences on students' learning and feedback literacy [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Edinburgh Napier University.

Davis, J., Roach, C., Elliott, C., Mardis, M., Justice, E. M., Riesenber, L. (2017). Feedback and assessment tools for handoffs: a systematic review. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*, 9(1), 18-32. <https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-16-00168.1>

Dawson, P. (2017). Assessment Rubrics: Towards clearer and more replicable design, research and practice. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 42 (3), 347–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1111294>.

Delen, E., Liew, J., & Willson, V. (2014). Effects of interactivity and instructional scaffolding on learning: Self-regulation in online video-based environments. *Computers & Education*, 78, 312–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COMPEDU.2014.06.018>

Derry, S. J. (1999). A fish called peer learning: Searching for common themes. *Cognitive perspectives on peer learning*, 197-211.

Desfor, C. (1993) Children's learning: has it improved?, *Education 3–13*, 21(3), 3–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279385200251>

- Diab, N. M. (2016). A comparison of peer, teacher and self-feedback on the reduction of language errors in student essays, *System*, 57, 55-65, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2015.12.014>
- Dihoff, R. E., Brosvic, G. M., Epstein, M. L., & Cook, M. J. (2004). Provision of feedback during preparation for academic testing: Learning is enhanced by immediate but not delayed feedback. *Psychological Record*, 54 (2), 207-231. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03395471>
- Dixson, D. D., & Worrell, F. C. (2016). Formative and summative assessment in the classroom, *Theory into Practice*, 55(2), 153-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2016.1148989>
- Dökmen, Ü. (1982). Farklı tür geribildirimlerin (feedback) öğrenmeye etkisi. *Ankara üniversitesi eğitim bilimleri fakültesi dergisi*, 15(2), 71-79. https://doi.org/10.1501/Egifak_00000000893
- du Toit, E. (2012). Constructive feedback as a learning tool to enhance students' self-regulation and performance in higher education. *Perspectives in Education*, 30(2), 32–40. <https://journals.ufs.ac.za/index.php/pie/article/view/1757>
- Ducasse, A. M., & Hill, K. (2019). Developing student feedback literacy using educational technology and the reflective feedback conversation. *Practitioner Research in Higher Education*, 12 (1), 24-37. <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/4574/>
- Dweck, C. (1999) *Self-theories: their role in motivation, personality and development*. Philadelphia, Psychology Press.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Eraut, M., (2006). Feedback. *Learning in Health and Social Care* 5(3), 111–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-6861.2006.00129.x>
- Erel, S., & Bulut, D. (2007). Error treatment in L2 writing: A comparative study of direct and indirect coded feedback in Turkish EFL context. *Journal of Institute of Social Sciences, Erciyes University*, 23, 397–415. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.570.4069>

- Ernest, P. (1995) The one and the many. In: L. Steffe & J. Gale (Eds.) *Constructivism in education* (pp. 459–486). Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Evans, C. (2013). Making sense of assessment feedback in higher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(1), 70–120.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654312474350>
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Oxford: Polity.
- Faulconer, E., Griffith, J., & Gruss, A. (2021). The impact of positive feedback on student outcomes and perceptions. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1910140>
- Fidan, D. (2015). Learners' preferences of oral corrective feedback: An example of Turkish as a foreign language learner. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10(9), 1311–1317. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2015.2162>
- Fraenkel, J. R, Wallen, N. E. & Hyun, H. H. (2015). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Education.
- Ferguson, P. (2011). Student perceptions of quality feedback in teacher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 36, 51–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930903197883>
- Fernández-Toro, M. & Duensing, A. (2020). Repositioning peer marking for feedback literacy in higher education, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1863911>
- Fisher, S. L., & Ford, J. K (1998). Differential effects of learner effort and goal orientation on two learning outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 51, 397–420.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1998.tb00731.x>
- Fong, C. J., Schallert, D. L., Williams, K. M., Williamson, Z. H., Lin, S., Kim, Y. W., & Chen, L. (2021) Making feedback constructive: the interplay of undergraduates' motivation with perceptions of feedback specificity and friendliness, *Educational Psychology*,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2021.1951671>

- Francis, R. A. (2008). An investigation into the receptivity of undergraduate students to assessment empowerment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 33(5), 547-557. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930701698991>
- Gaynor, P. (1981). The effect of feedback delay on retention of computer-based mathematical material. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*, 8(2), 28-34. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/169360/>
- Getsie, R. L., Langer, P., & Glass, G. V. (1985). Meta-analysis of the effects of type and combination of feedback on children's discrimination learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 55(1), 9-22. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543055001009>
- Gibbs, G., & Simpson, C. (2004). Conditions under which assessment supports students' learning. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*, (1), 3-31. <http://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/3609>
- Goodman, J., Wood, R. E., & Hendrickx, M. (2004). Feedback specificity, exploration, and learning. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 89(2), 248-262. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.2.248>
- Göçer, A., & Şentürk, R. (2019). Türkçe eğitiminde yazma becerilerini geliştirmeye yönelik kullanılabilecek geribildirim türleri. *Yüzüncü Yıl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (43), 123-149. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/yyusbed/issue/44211/545673>
- Grabowski, K. C., & Dakin, J. W. (2014). Test development literacy. In A. J. Kunnan (Eds.), *Companion to language assessment* (pp. 869-889). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, 24(2), 105-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEDT.2003.10.001>
- Gravett, K. (2020). Feedback literacies as sociomaterial practice, *Critical Studies in Education*, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17508487.2020.1747099>

- Gravett, K., Kinchin, M. I., Winstone, N. E., Balloo, K., Haron, M., Hosein, A., Lygo-Baker, S., & Medland, E. (2019). The development of academics' feedback literacy: Experiences of learning from critical feedback via scholarly peer review, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1686749>
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105–117). Sage Publications, Inc.
- Guichon, N., Bétrancourt, M., & Prié, Y. (2012). Managing written and oral negative feedback in a synchronous online teaching situation. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 25(2), 181–197. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2011.636054>
- Guo, L. (2021) Effects of the initial test interval and feedback timing on L2 vocabulary retention, *The Language Learning Journal*, 49(3), 382-398, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1551416>
- Han, Y. (2019). Written corrective feedback from an ecological perspective: The interaction between the context and individual learners. *System*, 80, 288–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.009>.
- Han, Y., & Hyland, F. (2019). Academic emotions in written corrective feedback situations. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 38, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.12.003>.
- Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2019a). Student feedback literacy and engagement with feedback: A case study of Chinese undergraduate students, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1648410>
- Han, Y., & Xu, Y. (2019b). The development of student feedback literacy: The influences of teacher feedback on peer feedback, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1689545>
- Hanley, S. (1994). *On constructivism: Maryland Collaborative for Teacher Preparation*. <http://www.towson.edu/csme/mctp/Essays/Constructivism.txt>

- Hanna, G. S. (1976). Effects of total and partial feedback in multiple-choice testing upon learning. *Journal of Educational Research*, 69(5), 202–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1976.10884873>
- Harlen, W. (2009). Improving assessment of learning and for learning, *Education 3-13*, 37(3), 247–257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270802442334>
- Harlen, W. (2015). Teachers’ summative practices and assessment for learning – tensions and synergies, *Curriculum Journal*, 16(2), 207–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585170500136093>
- Harrison, C. J., Könings, K. D., Molyneux, A., Schuwirth, L., Wass, V., & van der Vleuten, C. P. M. (2013). Web-based feedback after summative assessment: How do students engage? *Medical Education*, 47, 734–744. <https://doi.org/10.1111/medu.12209>
- Hattie, J. A. (1999, August 2). *Influences on student learning*. Inaugural lecture, University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(1), 81–112. doi: 10.3102/003465430298487
- Hein, G. E. (1991) Constructivist learning theory, the museum and the needs of people, paper presented at CECA (*International Committee of Museum Educators*) Conference, Jerusalem, Israel, 15–22 October.
- Henderson, M., Ryan, T., Boud, D., Dawson, P., Phillips, M., Molloy, E., & Mahoney, P. (2019). The usefulness of feedback. *Active Learning in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787419872393>
- Herold, D. M. & Greller, M. M. (1977). Feedback: The definition of a construct. *Academy of Management Journal*, 20, 192–197.
- Heron, G. (2011). Examining principles of formative and summative feedback. *British Journal of Social Work*, 41, 276–95. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcq049>

- Heron, G., McGoldrick, R., & Wilson, R. (2015). Exploring the influence of feedback on student social workers' understanding of childcare and protection. *British Journal of Social Work*, 45 (8). 2317–2334. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcu071>
- Hester, V. (2001) Responding to student writing: locating our theory/practice among communities, paper presented at *the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication*, Denver, CO, 14–17 March.
- Heylighen, F. (1993). *Epistemology: introduction, Principia Cybernetica*. <http://www.pespmc.vub.ac.be/EPISTEMI.html>
- Higher Education Funding Council for England. (2016). *National Student Survey Results 2016*. Retrieved from <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/nss/results/2016/>
- Hill, J., & West, H. (2020). Improving the students learning experience through dialogic feed-forward assessment, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(1), 82-97. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1608908>
- Hoo, H., Deneen, C., & Boud, D. (2021). Developing student feedback literacy through self and peer assessment interventions, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1925871>
- Hounsell, D. (2003). Student feedback, learning and development. In: Slowey, M., & Watson, D. (Eds.) *Higher Education and the Lifecourse* (pp. 67–78). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press
- Huang, S. (2016) Understanding learners' self-assessment and self-feedback on their foreign language speaking performance, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 41(6), 803-820, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2015.1042426>
- Huisman, B., Saab, N., van Driel, J. & van den Broek, P. (2018) Peer feedback on academic writing: undergraduate students' peer feedback role, peer feedback perceptions and essay performance, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(6), 955-968, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1424318>
- Hume, A., & Coll, R. K. (2009). Assessment of learning, for learning and as learning: New Zealand case studies. *Assessment in Education: Principles Policy and Practice*, 16(3), 269-290. <https://hdl.handle.net/10289/3457>

- Hunt, J. B., & Tierney, T. J. (2006). *American higher education: How does it measure up for the 21st century?* San Jose, CA: The National Centre for Public Policy and Higher Education.
- Ilgen, D. R., Fisher, C. D., & Taylor, M. S. (1979). Consequences of individual feedback on behavior in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 64, 349-371. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.64.4.349>
- Jonassen, D. H. (1994). Thinking technology, *Educational Technology*, 34(4), 34–37. <https://www.learntechlib.org/p/171050/>
- Jurma, W. E., & Froelich, D. L. (1984). Effects of immediate instructor feedback on group discussion participants. *Central States Speech Journal*, 35(3), 178–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10510978409368186>
- Kahraman, A., & Yalvaç, F. (2015). EFL Turkish university students' preferences about teacher feedback and its importance. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 199, 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.07.489>
- Karaca, E. (2011). Öğretimde geribildirimın önemi, gerekliliği ve niteliğine ilişkin öğrenci algıları. *E-Journal of new world sciences academy*, 6(2), 1951-1960. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/nwsaedu/issue/19820/212112>
- Kavaklı, N., & Arslan, S. (2019). Towards a continuum from know-how to show-how for developing EFL student-teachers' assessment literacy. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)*, 6(1), 1261-1270. <https://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/593>
- Kealey, E. (2010). Assessment and evaluation in social work education: Formative and summative approaches, *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 30(1), 64-74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08841230903479557>
- Kim, L. E., & Asbury, K. (2020). 'Like a rug had been pulled from under you': The impact of COVID-19 on teachers in England during the first six weeks of the UK lockdown. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology* 90 (4), 1062–1083. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12381>.

- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254–284. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.119.2.254>
- Knight, P. T. (2002) Summative assessment in higher education: Practices in disarray, *Studies in Higher Education*, 27(3), 275-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070220000662>
- Knight, P. T., & Yorke, M. (2003). *Assessment, learning and employability*. Maidenhead, UK: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Kuhn, A. (1975). *Unified social science*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- Kulhavy, R. W. (1977). Feedback in written instruction. *Review of Educational Research*, 47, 211–232. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543047002211>
- Kulhavy, R. W., & Stock, W. A. (1989). Feedback in written instruction: The place of response certitude. *Educational Psychology Review*, 1(4), 279–308. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01320096>
- LeCompte, M. D., & Preissle, J. (1993). *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research* (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press.
- Li, F. & Han, Y. (2021). Student feedback literacy in L2 disciplinary writing: insights from international graduate students at a UK university, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1908957>
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 163 – 188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Liu, N. & Carless, D. (2007). Peer feedback: the learning element of peer assessment, *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(3), 279-290, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600680582>
- Lysakowski, R. S., & Walberg, H. J. (1982). Instructional effects of cues, participation, and corrective feedback: A quantitative synthesis. *American Educational Research Journal*, 19, 559–578. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1162544>
- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form incommunicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 37–66. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263197001034>
- MacDonald, R. B. (1991). Developmental students' processing of teacher feedback in composition instruction. *Review of Research in Developmental Education*, 8(5), 1–5. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED354965>
- MacGilchrist, B. (2003) Primary learners of the future: laying the foundations for lifelong learning in the primary school, *Education 3–13*, 31(1), 58–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270385200101>
- Malecka, B., Boud, D., & Carless, D. (2020). Eliciting, processing and enacting feedback: Mechanisms for embedding student feedback literacy within the curriculum, *Teaching in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2020.1754784>
- Mason, B. J., & Bruning, R. (2001). *Providing feedback in computer-based instruction: What the research tells us*. <http://dwb4.unl.edu/dwb/Research/MB/MasonBruning.html>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2004). Causal explanation, qualitative research, and scientific inquiry in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(2), 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X033002003>
- Maxwell, J. A. (2011). *A realist approach for qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- McConlogue, T. (2012). But is it fair? Developing students' understanding of grading complex written work through peer assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(1), 113–123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2010.515010>

- McLean, A. J., Bond, C. H., & Nicholson, H. D. (2015). An anatomy of feedback: a phenomenographic investigation of undergraduate students' conceptions of feedback. *Studies in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.855718>
- Mellati, M., & Khademi, M. (2018). Exploring teachers' assessment Literacy: Impact on learners' writing achievements and implications for teacher development. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 43(6), 1-18. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n6.1>
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mertler, C. A., & Campbell, C. (2005, April). *Measuring teachers' knowledge and application of classroom assessment concepts: Development of the assessment literacy inventory* [Paper presentation]. American Educational Research Association Conference 2005, Montreal, Canada. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED490355>
- Metcalfe, J., Kornell, N., & Finn, B. (2009). Delayed versus immediate feedback in children's and adults' vocabulary learning. *Memory & Cognition* 37(8), 1077–87. <https://doi.org/10.3758/MC.37.8.1077>
- Meter, P., & Stevens, R. J. (2000) The Role of theory in the study of peer collaboration, *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 69(1), 113-127, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220970009600652>
- Molloy, E., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2020). Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(4), 527-540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955>
- Mory, E. H. (2004). Feedback research review. In D. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 745–783). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Narciss, S., & Huth, K. (2004). How to design informative tutoring feedback for multimedia learning. In H. M. Niegemann, D. Leutner, & R. Brunken (Eds.), *Instructional design for multimedia learning* (pp. 181–195). Munster, NY: Waxman.

- Nash, R. A., & Winstone, N. E. (2017). Responsibility-sharing in the giving and receiving of assessment feedback. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1519. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01519>.
- National Research Council. (1996). *National science education standards*. Washington, DC: Nation.
- National Research Council. (2001). *Classroom assessment and the National Science Education Standards*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press. <http://www.nap.edu/catalog/9847/classroom-assessment-and-the-national-science-education-standards>
- Nelson, M. M., & Schunn, C. D. (2009). The nature of feedback: How different types of peer feedback affect writing performance. *Instructional Science*, 37, 375–401. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-008-9053-x>
- Nicol, D. (2009). Assessment for learner self-regulation: enhancing achievement in the first year using learning technologies. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(3), 335-352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930802255139>
- Nicol, D., Thomson, A., & Breslin, C. (2014). Rethinking feedback practices in higher education: A peer review perspective. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(1), 102–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2013.795518>
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
- Noble, C., Billett, S., Armit, L., Hilder, J., Sly, C., & Molloy, E. (2019). It's yours to take: Generating learner feedback literacy in the workplace. *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 25, 55-77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-019-09905-5>
- O'Brien, H. L. & Toms, E. G. (2008), What is user engagement? A conceptual framework for defining user engagement with technology. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59, 938-955. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20801>

- O'Donovan, B. (2017). How student beliefs about knowledge and knowing influence their satisfaction with assessment and feedback. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0068-y>
- Orrell, J. (2006). Feedback on learning achievement: rhetoric and reality. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11, 441–456. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510600874235>
- Ovando, M. N. (1994) Constructive feedback: a key to successful teaching and learning, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 8(6), 19–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513549410069185>
- Ölmezer-Öztürk, E. (2019). Beliefs and practices of Turkish EFL teachers regarding oral corrective feedback: A smallscale classroom research study. *The Language Learning Journal*, 47, 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2016.1263360>
- Özmen, K. S., & Aydın, H. Ü. (2015). Examining student teachers' beliefs about oral corrective feedback: Insights from a teacher education program in Turkey. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(12), 141-164. <https://doi.org/10.3316/informit.681001963960425>
- Öztürk, G. (2016). An investigation on the use of oral corrective feedback in Turkish EFL classrooms. *Journal of Language & Linguistics Studies*, 12(2), 22-37. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jlls/issue/36115/405539>
- Pardo, A. (2018). A feedback model for data-rich learning experiences. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(3), 428–438. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2017.1356905>
- Pardo, A., Jovanovic, J., Dawson, S., Gašević, D., & Mirriahi, N. (2017). Using learning analytics to scale the provision of personalized feedback. *British Journal of Educational Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.12592>.
- Parkes, M., & Fletcher, P. (2017). A longitudinal, quantitative study of student sttitudes towards audio feedback for assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(7), 1046–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1224810>
- Parsons, H. M. (1974). What happened at Hawthorne? *Science*, 183(4128), 922–932. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.183.4128.922>

- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Piaget, J. (1969). *The language and thought of the child*. Cleveland: Meridian Books.
- Piaget, J. (1971). The theory of stages in cognitive development. In D. R. Green, M. P. Ford, & G. B. Flamer, *Measurement and Piaget*. McGraw-Hill.
- Pitt, E. & Norton, L. (2017) 'Now that's the feedback I want!' Students' reactions to feedback on graded work and what they do with it, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(4), 499-516. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1142500>
- Plakht, Y., Shiyovich, A., Nusbaum, L., & Raizer, H. (2013). The association of positive and negative feedback with clinical performance, self-evaluation and practice contribution of nursing students. *Nurse Education Today*, 33(10), 1264–1268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEDT.2012.07.017>
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2014). *Essentials of nursing research: Appraising evidence for nursing practice* (8th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Wolters Kluwer/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- Popham, W. J. (2009). Assessment literacy for teachers: Faddish or fundamental?, *Theory Into Practice*, 48(1), 4-11, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405840802577536>
- Pridemore, D. R., & Klein, J. D. (1995). Control of practice and level of feedback in computer-based instruction. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 20, 444–450. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03395573>
- Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching. (2017). *2016 Student Experience Survey National Report*. https://www.qilt.edu.au/docs/default-source/gos-reports/2017/2016-ses-national-reportfinal.pdf?sfvrsn=14e0e33c_5
- Qingyang Sun & Zeyang Yang (2021) 'We lose a lot of value': feedback on English for academic purposes speaking skills in online teaching in a UK-China joint-venture university, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1940838>

- Ramaprasad, A. (1983). On the definition of feedback. *Behavioural Sciences*, 28, 4-13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830280103>
- Robinson, S., Pope, D., & Holyoak, L. (2013). Can we meet their expectations? Experiences and perceptions of feedback in first year undergraduate students. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(3), 260–272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.629291>
- Rovagnati, V., Pitt, E., & Winstone, N. (2021). Feedback cultures, histories and literacies: international postgraduate students' experiences, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2021.1916431>
- Roth, W. M. (2000). In McCormick, R. and Paechter, C. (Eds.), *Authentic School Science: Intellectual Traditions, Learning & Knowledge* (pp. 6-20). London, UK: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Rukanuddin, M., Rahman, K. A., Ibna Seraj, P. M., & Hafiz, K. D. (2021). Feedback to student-works: Lifeline of learning. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 17(1), 565-574. <https://doi.org/10.52462/jlls.38>
- Rust, C., Price, M., & O'Donovan, B. (2003). Improving students' learning by developing their understanding of assessment criteria and processes. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(2), 147-164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930301671>
- Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18 (2), 119-144. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00117714>
- Sadler, D. R. (2009). Indeterminacy in the use of preset criteria for assessment and grading. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 34(2), 159-179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602930801956059>
- Saunders, W. (1992). The constructivist perspective: implications and teaching strategies for science, *School Science and Mathematics*, 92(3), 136–141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1949-8594.1992.tb12159.x>
- Schafer, W. D. (1993). Assessment literacy for teachers. *Theory Into Practice*, 32(2), 118-126. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849309543585>

- Schmulian, A. & Coetzee, S. A. (2019) Students' experience of team assessment with immediate feedback in a large accounting class, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 44(4), 516-532, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1522295>
- Schroth, M. L. (1992). The effects of delay of feedback on a delayed concept formation transfer task. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 17(1), 78-82. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X\(92\)90048-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-476X(92)90048-4)
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R. W. Tyler, R. M. Gagné & M. Scriven (Eds.), *Perspectives of curriculum evaluation* (Vol. 1, pp. 39-83). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Shepard, L.A. (2003). Reconsidering large-scale assessment to heighten its relevance to learning. In J.M. Atkin and J.E. Coffey (Eds.), *Everyday Assessment in the Science Classroom*. Arlington, VA: National Science Teachers Association
- Shepard, L. A. (2000). The role of assessment in a learning culture. *Educational Researcher*, 29 (7), 4-14. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X029007004>
- Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research* 78 (1), 153-189. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795>
- Siegel, M. A., & Wissehr, C. (2011). Preparing for the plunge: Preservice teachers' assessment literacy. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 22(1), 371-391. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10972-011-9231-6>
- Silcock, P. (2003) Accelerated learning: a revolution in teaching method?, *Education* 3-13, 31(1), 48-52. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004270385200081>
- Sinclair, H. K., & Cleland, J. A. (2007). Undergraduate medical students: Who seeks formative feedback? *Medical Education*, 41, 580-582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2007.02768.x>
- Smith, C., Worsfold, K., Davies, L., Fisher, R., & McPhail, R. (2013). Assessment literacy and student learning: The case for explicitly developing students 'assessment literacy', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 38(1), 44-60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2011.598636>

- Stiggins, R. (1991). Assessment literacy. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7), 534-539.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/20404455>
- Stabler-Havener, M. L. (2018). Defining, conceptualizing, problematizing, and assessing language teacher assessment literacy. *Working Papers in Applied Linguistics & TESOL*, 18(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.7916/salt.v18i1.1195>
- Storch, N. (2018). Written corrective feedback from sociocultural theoretical perspectives: A research agenda. *Language Teaching*, 51(2), 262–277.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444818000034>
- Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. *College Composition and Communication*, 31 (4), 378–388.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/356588>.
- Supporting a Diverse Student Body: Assessment Literacy of Staff and Students – An Interview with Margaret Price. (2018). In N.Auferkorte-Michaelis & F.Linde (Eds.), *Diversität lernen und lehren – ein Hochschulbuch* (pp. 44-52). Opladen; Berlin; Toronto: Verlag Barbara Budrich.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvbkjx58.6>
- Sutherland, R., Armstrong, V., Barnes, S., Brawn, R., Breeze, N., Gall, M., Matthewman, S., Olivero, F., Taylor, A., Triggs, P., Wishart, J. & John, P. (2004). Transforming teaching and learning: embedding ICT into everyday classroom practices, *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 20, 413–425.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2004.00104.x>
- Sutton, P. (2012). Conceptualizing feedback literacy: knowing, being, and acting, *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 49(1), 31-40.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2012.647781>
- Tai, J., Ajjawi, R., Boud, D., Dawson, P., & Panadero, E. (2018). Developing evaluative judgement: Enabling students to make decisions about the quality of work. *Higher Education* 76(3), 467–481. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0220-3>
- Taras, M. (2009). Summative assessment: the missing link for formative assessment, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 33(1), 57-69.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03098770802638671>

- Taşdemir, M. S., & Yalçın, A. F. (2018). Feedback preferences of EFL learners with respect to their learning styles. *Cogent Education*, 5(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1481560>
- Tedick, D., & Gortari, B. (1998). *Research on error correction and implications for classroom teaching* (The Bridge, ACIE Newsletter, Vol. 1). Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota. <http://www.carla.umn.edu/immersion/acie/vol1/May1998.pdf>
- Tenenbaum, G., & Goldring, E. (1989). A meta-analysis of the effect of enhanced instruction: Cues, participation, reinforcement and feedback and correctives on motor skill learning. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 22, 53–64.
- Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Times Higher Education (2019). *Teaching intelligence: How to improve feedback conversations*. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/teaching-intelligence-how-improve-feedback-conversations#survey-answer>
- Tripodi, N., Feehan, J., Wospil, R., & Vaughan, B. (2020). Twelve tips for developing feedback literacy in health professions learners, *Medical Teacher*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0142159X.2020.1839035>
- To, J. (2016). ‘This is not what I need’: Conflicting assessment feedback beliefs in a post-secondary institution in Hong Kong. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 21 (4), 447–467. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596748.2016.1226588>
- van der Kleij, F. M. (2019). Comparison of teacher and student perceptions of formative assessment feedback practices and association with individual student characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 85, 175–189. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.010>.
- van der Mescht, H. (2004). Phenomenology in education: A case study in educational leadership, *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 4(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20797222.2004.11433887>

- Voerman, L., Meijer, P. C., Korthagen, F. A. J., & Simons, R. J. (2012). Types and frequencies of feedback interventions in classroom interaction in secondary education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8), 1107–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TATE.2012.06.006>
- Vrasidas, C. (2000). Constructivism versus objectivism: Implications for interaction, course design, and evaluation in distance education. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 6(4), 339–362. <https://vrasidas.com/wp-content/uploads/2007/07/continuum.pdf>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Interaction between Learning and Development. In M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman (Eds.), *Mind and Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (pp. 79-91). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: MA, MIT Press.
- Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu [Council of Higher Education] (2018). *İngilizce öğretmenliği lisans programı*. Ankaray, Turkey. https://www.yok.gov.tr/Documents/Kurumsal/egitim_ogretim_dairesi/Yeni-Ogretmen-Yetistirme-Lisans-Programlari/Ingilizce_Ogretmenligi_Lisans_Programi.pdf
- Wager, W., & Wager, S. (1985). Presenting questions, processing responses, and providing feedback in CAI. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 8(4), 2–8. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02906047>.
- Walberg, H. J. (1982). What makes schooling effective? *Contemporary Education Review*, 1, 1–34.
- Wang, L, Bruce, C. S., & Hughes, H.E. (2011). Sociocultural theories and their application in information literacy research and education. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*. 42(2), 296-308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00048623.2011.10722242>
- Watkins, C. (2001) Learning about learning enhances performance, *National School Improvement Network (NSIN)*, 13, 1–7. <https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10002803/1/Watkins2001Learning.pdf>

- Wei, W., Sun, Y., & Xu, X. (2020). Investigating the impact of increased student feedback literacy level on their expectations on university teachers' feedback, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1846017>.
- Wheatley, G. H. (1991) Constructivist perspectives on science and mathematics learning, *Science Education*, 75(1), 9–21. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/sce.3730750103>
- Wiggins, G. P. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Wiggins, G. (2012). Seven Keys to Effective Feedback. *Feedback for Learning*, 70 (1), 10–16. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/seven-keys-to-effective-feedback>
- Wilkinson, S. S. (1981). The relationship of teacher praise and student achievement: A meta-analysis of selected research. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 41(9–A), 3998. <https://ufdc.ufl.edu/AA00048518/00001>
- William, D. (2007), Keeping learning on track. In F. Lester Jr. (Eds.), *2nd handbook of research on mathematics teaching and learning* (pp. 1053-1098), Information Age Publishing.
- Williams, J., & Kane, D. (2009) Assessment and feedback: Institutional experiences of student feedback, 1996 to 2007. *Higher Education Quarterly* 63(3), 264–286. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2009.00430.x>
- Winne, P. H., & Butler, D. L. (1994). Student cognition in learning from teaching. In T. Husen & T. Postlewaite (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of education* (2nd ed., pp. 5738–5745). Oxford, UK: Pergamon.
- Winstone, N. E., Barloo, K., & Carless, D. (2020). Discipline-specific feedback literacies: A framework for curriculum design, *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00632-0>
- Winstone, N. E., Mathlin, G., & Nash, R. A. (2019). Building Feedback Literacy: Students' perceptions of the developing engagement with feedback toolkit, *Assessment, Testing and Applied Measurement*, 4(39), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00039>

- Winstone, N. E., & Nash, R. A. (2016). *The developing engagement with feedback toolkit (DEFT)*. York: Higher Education Academy.
- Winstone, N. E., Nash, R. A., Rowntree, J., & Parker, M. (2017). 'It'd be useful, but I wouldn't use it': barriers to university students' feedback seeking and recipience. *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 2026–2041. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1130032>
- Woo, Y., & Reeves, T. (2007). Meaningful interaction in Web-based learning: A social constructivist interpretation. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 10, 15-25. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2006.10.005>
- Wood, J. (2021). A dialogic technology-mediated model of feedback uptake and literacy, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2020.1852174>
- Xu, Y., & Brown, G. T. L. (2017). University English teacher assessment literacy: A survey-test report from China. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment*, 6(1), 133-158. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316952944_University_English_teacher_assessment_literacy_A_survey-test_report_from_China
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R., Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self regulation* (pp. 13-39). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

GÖRÜŞME SORULARI

1. Kendinizi kısaca tanıtır mısınız? (yaş, kayıtlı olduğu üniversite/bölüm, sınıf, genel not ortalaması, vb.)
 - a. Kendinizi başarılı bir öğrenci olarak görüyor musunuz?
 - b. Alanınızı seviyor musunuz?
 - c. İleride alanınızla ilgili bir şeyler yapmayı düşünüyor musunuz?
2. Pandemi öncesi dönemi düşündüğünüzde, derslerinizde sıklıkla kullanılan değerlendirme yöntemleri nelerdir? (sınav, ödev/proje, rapor, sunum/mikroöğretim, portfolyo, quiz, vs.)
3. Değerlendirme sürecinde ne gibi dönütler (*teyit edici, düzeltici, açıklayıcı, teşhis edici ve genişletici/ekleyici*) aldınız?
4. Hocalarınız dönüt sağlamada hangi yöntemleri kullandı? (yazılı, sözlü, birebir, online, ses kaydı, video)

İkinci soruda verdiği cevaplara göre, aldığınız dönütler değerlendirme yöntemine göre nasıl farklılık gösterdi?

- a. Sınavlarda?
- b. Ödevler/Projeler için?
- c. Sunumlar/Mikroöğretimler için?

5. Yaptığın bir ödevinle ilgili dönüt alma süreci genel olarak nasıl olur anlatır mısın? (farklı farklı olabilir ama en çok olan durum ne?) Ödevi yapıp teslim ettikten sonra ne oluyor?
6. Değerlendirme sürecinde ne zaman dönüt aldınız? (hazırlık aşamasında/sonrasında) Zamanlaması değerlendirme yöntemine göre nasıl farklılık gösterdi?
7. Ne kadar süre sonra dönüt aldınız? Süresi değerlendirme yöntemine göre nasıl farklılık gösterdi? Sürenin değişmesi sizin dönüt kullanımınızı nasıl etkiledi?
8. Aldığınız geri dönüt miktarı nasıldı? Miktarı değerlendirme yöntemine göre nasıl farklılık gösterdi? Miktarının değişmesi sizin dönüt kullanımınızı nasıl etkiledi?
9. Bir ödevden/projeden, sınavdan, sunumdan/mikroöğretimden başarılı olmak için sizden beklenen kriterlerin neler olduğunu nasıl anlamıştınız? *(hoca tarafından detaylı açıklama, detaylı rubrik, örnek veya model ödev/proje)* Örnek verebilir misiniz?
10. Sizce iyi bir dönüt nasıl olmalıdır?
11. Sizce dönütler gelişim için neden önemli? En çok ne tür dönüt size fayda sağladı? Neden? Bu anlamda aldığınız dönütler ile ilgili aklınıza gelen bir anınız var mı?
12. Dönüt sürecinde öğrencinin rolü sizce nasıl olmalıdır?
13. Teslim ettiğin ödev vb. için dönüt alamadığın zamanlar oluyor mu? Bu durumda neler yapıyorsun?
14. Herhangi bir hocanızdan dönütü yetersiz bulduğunuzda ekstradan dönüt talebinde bulunduğunuz oldu mu? Hangi durumlarda? Nasıl bir dönüt istediniz? Neden?

15. Genel olarak yerinde dönütler aldığınızı düşünüyor musunuz? (yoksa sizin ve dönüt veren hocanızın değerlendirmeleri arasında çok fark oluyor mu? Eğer oluyorsa, ne gibi farklılıklar oluyor? Bu durumda ne yapıyorsunuz?
16. Aldığınız dönütlerin size nasıl yardımcı oluyor?
- a. Bir ödevden/projeden, sınavdan veya sunumdan aldığınız dönütü bir sonraki/diğeri için kullanıyor musunuz? Nasıl?
 - b. Eğer kullanmıyorsanız, bunun nedeni nedir?
17. Aldığınız dönütü anlamadığınızda ne yapıyorsunuz? (*hocanızla/akranınızla iletişim*) Anlamak için ne kadar süre harcıyorsunuz?
18. Dönüt aldığınızda nasıl hissediyorsunuz? Sizi nasıl etkiliyor? (*motivasyon, kendinize güven*)
- a. Dönütün olumlu olması sizi nasıl etkiliyor? Neden?
 - b. Dönütün olumsuz olması sizi nasıl etkiliyor? Neden?
19. Pandemi başladıktan sonra online eğitimle birlikte kullanılan değerlendirme yöntemlerinde ne gibi değişiklikler oldu? Verilen dönütlerde (*dönüt miktarı, veriliş formatı ve zamanlaması*) ne gibi değişiklikler oldu?
- a. Bu değişiklikler sizin dönüt kullanma sıklığınızı veya yönteminizi etkiledi mi? Nasıl?
 - b. Bu değişiklikler size nasıl hissettirdi?
20. Diğer görüş ve önerileriniz

APPENDIX B: APPROVAL OF METU HUMAN SUBJECTS ETHICS COMMITTEE

UYGULAMALI ETİK ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ
APPLIED ETHICS RESEARCH CENTER



ORTA DOĞU TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

DUMLUPINAR BULVARI 06800
ÇANKAYA ANKARA/TURKEY
T: +90 312 210 22 91
F: +90 312 210 79 59
ueam@metu.edu.tr
www.ueam.metu.edu.tr

Sayı: 28620816 /

20 Mayıs 2021

Konu : Değerlendirme Sonucu

Gönderen: ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu (İAEK)

İlgi : İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu Başvurusu

Sayın Yeşim ÇAPA AYDIN

Danışmanlığını yaptığınız Ceren KARA'nın "Türkiye'deki Yükseköğretim Kurumlarında Geri Bildirim Okuryazarlığı" başlıklı araştırması İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu tarafından uygun görülmüş ve **166-ODTU-2021** protokol numarası ile onaylanmıştır.

Saygılarımızla bilgilerinize sunarız.

Dr.Öğretim Üyesi Şerife SEVİNÇ
İAEK Başkan Vekili

APPENDIX C: LIST OF THEMES AND DEFINITIONS OF CODES

Categories	Themes	Codes	Definitions
Feedback Types		Asking for Elaboration	Feedback asking for more information or detail as the task is not sufficiently detailed
		Error Flagging	Putting certain signs to show the location of incorrect answer without telling the correct version
		Explicit Correction	Feedback informing students as “correct” or “incorrect”
		Marks	Feedback given as only marks without any further explanation
		Only Grades	Providing only grades without any explanation
		Providing Clarification	Telling the correct answer with its explanation or with an elaboration on it
		Providing Clues/Sources	Encouraging students to discover on their own by providing clues or sources
		Rubrics/Guidelines	Feedback provided within a rubric or guidelines in a structured and organized way
Timing of Feedback		Warning	Giving notice of possible mistakes, errors, or misunderstandings beforehand
	Assignments/Projects		
		Within seven days	Feedback provided to students for their assignments/projects within seven days
		One or two weeks	Feedback provided to students for their assignments/projects within one or two weeks
		More than two weeks	Feedback provided to students for their assignments/projects in more than two weeks
		At the end of the term	Feedback provided to students for their assignments/projects at the end of the semester

Presentation		
	Right after presentation	Feedback provided to students right after their presentation
Exams		
	Within four or five days	Feedback provided to students for their exams within four or five days
	One or two weeks	Feedback provided to students for their exams within one or two weeks
	More than two weeks	Feedback provided to students for their exams in more than two weeks
	At the end of the term	Feedback provided to students for their exams at the end of the semester
-		
	Task	Timeliness of feedback provided to students depending on task
	Teacher	Timeliness of feedback provided to students depending on teacher
Amount of Feedback		
Assignments/Projects		
	Detailed	When the feedback provided to students for their assignments is detailed
	Not detailed	When the feedback provided to students for their assignments is not detailed
	One or two pages	Feedback provided to students for their assignments in one or two pages
	One paragraph	Feedback provided to students for their assignments in one paragraph
	One or two sentences	Feedback provided to students for their assignments in one or two sentences
	Markings	Feedback provided to students as marks on assignment paper
	No Feedback	When there is no feedback provided to students for their exams
Presentations		
	Detailed	When the feedback provided to students for their presentations is detailed

	Not detailed	When the feedback provided to students for their presentations is not detailed
	Between ten and 20 mins	When the feedback provided to students for their presentations takes between ten and 20 minutes
	Between five and ten mins	When the feedback provided to students for their presentations takes between five and ten minutes
	Between one and five mins	When the feedback provided to students for their presentations takes between one and five minutes
	Five or six sentences	The feedback provided to students for their presentations in five or six sentences
	Three or four sentences	The feedback provided to students for their presentations in three or four sentences
Exams		
	One paragraph	The feedback provided to students on their exam papers in one paragraph
	One or two sentences	The feedback provided to students on their exam papers in one or two sentences
	Detailed	When the feedback provided to students for their exams is detailed
	Not detailed	When the feedback provided to students for their exams is not detailed
	Markings	Feedback provided to students as marks on exam paper
	No feedback	When there is no feedback provided to students for their exams
-		
	Number of mistakes	Amount of feedback provided to students depending on mistakes

**Indicators of
Feedback
Literacy**

Appreciate Feedback

Understanding Their Active Role	Students' being aware of their active role in feedback process by taking responsibility for it
Seeking Feedback	Students' being in need of feedback for their works, and

		tendency to initiate a feedback dialogue with teacher
	Recognizing Value of Feedback	Students' acknowledging that feedback is a valuable source of information for their learning
Make Judgment		
	Understanding Criteria	Easy use of feedback upon understanding the criteria of a task
	Evaluative judgment	Making judgment on the quality of feedback, peers' work or exemplars against a set of evaluation criteria
	Self-evaluation	Making judgment on the quality of one's own work or progress against a set of criteria
Manage Affect		
	Managing Emotional Challenges	Finding strategies to get over emotional challenges such as self-talk to get relaxed upon experiencing challenging emotional conditions such as anxiety, stress, pessimism etc. due to provided feedback
	Emotional Openness to Feedback	The learners' being open to negative or positive feedback from the very beginning of the process, so not experiencing any challenging emotions due to negative feedback
Take Action		
	Adapting to Different Contexts	When the feedback given for a task is different from another task, the learners' adapting the feedback to different content or structure of the new task
	Self-improvement	Use of feedback to improve oneself in their field (e.g., linguistics, literature, curriculum etc.)
	Following Tasks	Use of feedback for the following tasks whose format is similar to previous one
	Future Career	Use of feedback for their future career, thereby applying it to their school practice sessions or expressing that they will use the provided feedback as a teacher.

Enhancing Factors		
Feedback Characteristics		
	Brief Feedback	Feedback that is concise and to the point enhances uptake of feedback
	Expected Feedback	When the ideas of the learner and the teacher about a tasks' quality are congruent, and the feedback information is as expected
	Constructive Feedback	When the feedback is constructive, it encourages students to continue with their good performances while offering ways to improve poor performance in a friendly manner
	Detailed and long Feedback	Feedback focusing on the skills or abilities of students rather than their knowledge encourages the use of feedback
		Feedback provided in detail and lengthy format enables learners to be engaged in feedback more.
	Explicit Feedback	Each detail is indicated so clearly that it does not lead to any ambiguity, confusion, or misunderstanding.
	Feedback within New Context	If the students complete a type of task for the first time, they tend to be careful about the feedback given for that task.
	Honest Feedback	Feedback honestly presenting both strengths and weaknesses increases the uptake of feedback
	Individual Feedback	Feedback is provided specific to presented response, task, performance, or individual. Thus, it is considered as more beneficial and easier to apply.
		Students think that they need individual feedback specifically provided for them because they have difficulty in adapting general feedback to their situation.
	Providing Clues/Sources	Students are not directly provided with correct answer or correct way of completing a

task. Instead, they are encouraged to discover on their own by presenting clues, hints, prompts, or sources.

	Storable Feedback	Feedback provided in a storable format enables learners to review them any time they want. In this way, they can easily use the feedback information
	Timely Feedback	Feedback provided on time enables learners to benefit from it
Instructional Factors		
	Continuous Tasks	If a type of task is continuous (e.g., first-second draft, 5 reflection papers, 3 micro-teaching within a semester), the students take feedback into consideration more
	Task Difficulty	If the students have difficulty in understanding or completing a task, they are inclined to start a feedback dialogue
	Use of Exemplars	Presenting an exemplar enhances making judgment about criteria
	Use of Peer Feedback	Feedback given by peers motivates learners to take and use the feedback. This happens generally right after a presentation occasionally for an assignment rarely informal dialogue among peers
	Use of Rubric	Presenting rubric enhances making judgment about criteria
	Use of Self-evaluation	When the learners are given the opportunity to evaluate or give feedback to themselves, they are engaged in feedback more. This is observed during: Orally right after presentations Written after a presentation or an assignment
	Whole Class Feedback	Negative points are directed to whole class, not to individuals. In this way, students feel comfortable and

		do not have negative feelings about feedback.
	Written Feedback/Private Meetings	Feedback that is given privately either in written form or in private meetings
Learner Characteristics/Roles		
	Extrinsic Motivation	Students have the motivation to have higher grades and thus, seek and use feedback Students use feedback to please teacher. They just need the appreciation of the teacher. They infer from feedback information about what teacher likes and adapt their tasks in that way.
	Feeling of Success	When students feel successful, they get motivated to use and act on feedback When the students get high grades, they get motivated to use feedback more
	Feeling Valued	If the learners feel that they are valued due to the given feedback (language, manner of teacher, specificity, or just existence of feedback), they tend to take it more.
	Intrinsic Motivation	Students believe that making mistakes are natural and a good way to learn (as a result, they seek feedback and use it for their learning process) Students have the motivation to seek feedback in each situation (good performance/poor performance- It does not matter). Students have motivation to be successful in their future career. Thus, they are engaged in feedback. Students are interested in subject matter or field of study, thereby being engaged in feedback.
	Self-regulation	Learners have the ability to understand a phenomenon and

	then, manage their behaviors. Thus, they can easily understand and use feedback. Sometimes, they take notes to remember and use feedback for another task or performance. When the students are aware that their performance is poor, they do not get surprised. They expect negative feedback and thus, take and act on it. In this way, they easily accept and use feedback because it is expected. When learners are aware that their performance is good, they get motivated to use feedback When students have a goal related to their tasks, they tend to act on it. They set the goal to get higher grades on rubric, to correct a specific part within a given time and to form the structure of the task
Value for Different Ideas	Being open to feedback from different teachers and peers due to its value for the student enhances engagement with feedback

Social Factors

Teacher-related Factors

Appreciation of hard-work	When the teacher recognizes and appreciates the hard-work or effort of students, students become more motivated to take feedback into consideration
Availability of Teacher	When the teacher is available for communication, feedback dialogue, and scaffolding, students get motivated to use feedback
Effort of Teacher	When the students observe and recognize that teachers put an effort on their tasks/feedback/lessons, they become more willing to consider feedback

	Guidance of Teacher	When teacher guides students on how to complete a task, use given feedback, and understand the meaning of feedback, they pay attention to feedback information more
	Positive Teacher Attitude	Teacher's language of expressing feedback in a positive, kind, friendly, emphatic, encouraging, and motivating manner motivates learners to be engaged in feedback Teachers' attitude or way of behaving positively, friendly, and kindly motivates learners to be engaged in feedback When teachers' reflection of gestures, mimics, feelings, and facial expression are perceived positively by students, engagement with feedback increases
	Strong Relationship with Teacher	Having a good relationship or getting along well with teacher motivates learners to start feedback dialogue
	Teacher Expertise	If the students think that the teacher has sufficient expertise in the field, they pay attention to feedback, thereby using it more
Peer-Related Factors		
	Common Experiences	The situation where every student has common experiences, generally with classmates or rarely with senior students, about a task or feedback increases feedback dialogues The situation where everyone does not understand a point enables learners to feel more relaxed and ask for feedback
	Comparison of Peer Performance	Students' comparing their tasks to those of their peers while seeking feedback enhances their evaluative judgment and feedback seeking behaviors

	Effort of Peers	When the students observe and recognize that peers pay attention to their tasks, they take peer feedback into consideration
	Language of Peers	When peers' way of expressing something is positive, friendly, kind, motivating, and encouraging, students become motivated to use peer feedback
	Peer availability	When students do not understand teacher feedback, they negotiate it with their peers to make sense of it
	Strong Relationship with Peers	Having a good relationship or getting along well with peers increases attempts to initiate feedback dialogue with peers
	Trust in Peer Expertise	Students trust in peers' expertise and thus, use the feedback coming from them
Impeding Factors		
Feedback Characteristics		
	Delayed Feedback	The feedbacks given at the end of the term or too late results in decay of knowledge and thus, prevents feedback usage
		When the feedback is provided only after the submission of the task, it does not motivate students to use feedback
	Empty Praise	When the teacher and peers only talk about positive sides of a task or exaggerate them, learners do not pay attention to feedback
	Unexpected Feedback	When the ideas of the learner and the teacher about a task's quality are incongruent or the feedback information is unexpected, students do not initiate feedback dialogue
	Insufficient/ Superficial Feedbacks	When the students find the feedback insufficient or superficial, they do not use feedback
	Irrelevant Feedbacks	When the feedback is not related to submitted task's content, it restricts feedback usage

	Negative Feedback in Class	When the negative feedback is given to an individual in front of the whole class, the student gets hurt and don't want to use that feedback
	Threat to Identity	If the feedback criticizes the characteristics of individual in a personal way, it becomes detrimental to engagement with feedback
	Too Many Corrective Feedback	When corrective feedback is a lot in amount, students tend not to take it into consideration/ to ignore it If the feedback is about only minor mistakes, students do not pay attention to it
	Unconstructive Feedback	When only negative points are expressed or the feedback information starts with negatives, it constrains feedback engagement When the feedback is given about the knowledge of student rather than their performance, it demotivates students
	Written Feedback	When the feedback is provided in written format, students do not initiate feedback dialogue
	Instructional Factors	
	Ambiguity of Criteria	When the criteria of the task are ambiguous, students have difficulty with the task and thus, refrain from asking questions to start feedback conversation
	Discontinuous Tasks	When the task does not have any follow-up or there is not any similar task, students tend not to pay attention to it
	Learner Characteristics	
	Confident in own work	When the learner is confident about her or his abilities or own work, s/he ignores feedback

	Fear of Teacher Reaction	Students fear that the teacher will misunderstand her/him when s/he asks questions (e.g., teacher's idea that s/he is asking questions for grade). Thus, students do not initiate feedback conversation
	Feeling of Failure	When the students feel that they are unsuccessful or incompetent, they do not use feedback Individuals sometimes focus on negative parts of their tasks so much that they cannot ask for feedback or use it. Sometimes, they also get ashamed of their mistakes.
	Feeling of Unfair Assessment	When the student feel that they are not treated fairly in grading or in comments, they do not believe that given feedback is worth to use
	Goal-oriented Attitude	The only aim of the student is to pass the course. Thus, when they get enough grades, they do not seek feedback or use it. Students have a target grade in their mind and thus, act accordingly. This leads them not to be engaged in feedback because the only aim is to complete the task with minimum effort. When the students have higher grades, they do not seek feedback or initiate a dialogue
	No Experience with Feedback	When the students have previous experience with conditions where no feedback was provided, they do not seek feedback

Social Factors Teacher-related Factors	Personal Traits	When the students are shy due to their characteristics, they refrain from initiating feedback conversation Being defensive against completing a task or using feedback due to stress disorder prevents feedback engagement When the students are anxious about exams, they do not want to see the given feedback. They just ignore it.
	Resistance to Feedback	When the students have resistance not to use feedback due to specific reasons, it is detrimental to engagement with feedback
	Uninterest	When the student does not have any interest in lesson or field, they do not pay attention to given feedback
	Indifference to hard-work	Indifference of teacher to students' hard-work restricts engagement with feedback
	Lack of Teacher Guidance	Teacher does not guide students on how to complete a task, use given feedback, and understand the meaning of feedback. Hence, students do not initiate feedback dialogue
	Mistrust in Teacher Judgment	Students think that teacher does not have sufficient expertise in the field and thus, do not need his/her feedback
	Negative Teacher Attitude	Teachers' rude, negative, unfriendly, and aggressive way of behaving/ manner is detrimental to uptake of feedback Teachers' language of expressing feedback in negative, rude, and unfriendly way is detrimental to uptake of feedback
	Poor Relationship with Teacher	Students have a weak relationship with teacher. This is reciprocal. Thus, they are not able to initiate feedback conversation

Poor Teacher Effort	When the students observe that teachers do not put an effort on their tasks/feedback/lessons, they do not start feedback dialogue
Teacher Authority	Not questioning the feedback of teacher due to his/her status restricts feedback dialogues as students believe that teacher is always right
Teacher Unavailability	When the teacher is not available to get in touch or to communicate, students do not attempt to initiate feedback dialogue
Peer-related Factors	
Comparison to Peers	Comparing their feedback to peer's feedback taken from teacher leads students not to initiate feedback dialogue with teachers
	Observing peer experiences and acting accordingly leads to restriction of feedback dialogue with teacher
Mistrust in Peer Judgment	When the peers are believed to have insufficient expertise in the field, learners ignore their feedback
	When the peers do not pay attention to the student's task or performance as a feedback provider, learners ignore their feedback
Peer Opinion about Teacher	When the peers have negative attitude towards teacher, the student gets influenced and do not initiate any feedback dialogue.
Poor Relationship with Peers	Students have a weak relationship with peers. This is reciprocal. Thus, they do not initiate feedback conversation

APPENDIX D: TURKISH SUMMARY / TRKE ZET

YKSEKGRETİMDE GERİ BİLDİRİM OKURYAZARLIĞI ZERİNE NİTEL BİR ARAŞTIRMA: GERİ BİLDİRİM OKURYAZARLIĞINI ARTTIRAN VE AZALTAN FAKTRLER

GİRİŞ

Geri bildirim zerinde sıklıkla alıřılan kritik konulardandır ve ğrenme srecine katkıda bulunan gl aralardan biridir. Bu yzden, etkili geri bildirim saėlamının nemi artmıř ve bunun ğrenme srecine katkı saėladığı birok alıřma tarafından ortaya koyulmuřtur (rneėin; Diab, 2016; Liu ve Carless, 2007; van der Mescht, 2004). Ancak, sadece etkili geri bildirim saėlamak 21. yzyılın ėrenci profilinin farklılařan ğrenme ihtiyaları dřnldėnde tek bařına yeterli olmayabilir (Hunt ve Tierney, 2006). Bu ihtiyatan dolayı, ėrencilerin aktif bir rol oynadıkları bu srete geri bildirimin ėrenenler tarafından nasıl algılandığının ve uygulandığının anlařılmasının nemi artmıřtır (Boud ve Molloy, 2013; Henderson vd., 2019). Ancak, ėrencilerin kendilerine verilen geri bildirimleri anlama ve uygulama konusunda sıkıntı yařadıkları birok alıřmada ortaya koyulmuřtur (Brown ve Glower, 2006; MacDonald, 1991; Times Higher Education, 2019). ėrencilerin kendilerine saėlanan geri bildirimleri neden kullanmadıkları sorusunun cevabı ise Sadler (1989) tarafından nerilen ve ėrencilerden beklenen kriterler ile ėrencilerin mevcut performansları arasındaki farkı azaltmaya ynelik  bileřen ile aıklanabilir: ėrencilerin bir performansın amacını anlaması, kendi performanslarını kriterlerle karřılařtırması ve performanslarında deėiřiklik yapmak amacıyla kendilerine ynlendirilen geri bildirimi kullanması. O halde, ėrencilerin geri bildirim okuryazarlıkları yani verilen geri bildirimi anlayabilme, deėerlendirici karar verebilme ve geri bildirimi sonraki alıřmalarda ğrenmeye katkı saėlamak amacıyla kullanabilme kapasiteleri ve eėilimleri (Carless ve Boud, 2018) bu srete nemli bir rol oynamaktadır.

Araştırmanın Amacı

Bu araştırma, üniversite öğrencilerine verilen geri bildirim türlerini, zamanlamasını ve miktarını ortaya koymayı hedeflemiştir. Buna ek olarak, geri bildirim göstergelerinin yanı sıra geri bildirim arttıran ve azaltan faktörleri ortaya koymayı amaçlamıştır.

Araştırmanın Önemi

Geri bildirimin ve geri bildirimin öğrenci tarafından bir sonraki çalışmalarda uygulanmasının öğrencinin öğrenme süreci ve başarısı üzerinde önemli bir rolü vardır. Bu yüzden, geri bildirimin öğrenme ve başarıya olan etkisi göz önünde bulundurulduğunda öğrencilerin geri bildirim anlama ve uygulayabilme kapasitelerinin, algılarının ve eğilimlerinin (Carless ve Boud, 2018) anlaşılması eğitim ve geri bildirim alanyazınında büyük önem taşımaktadır.

Bu talep ile doğru orantılı olarak geri bildirim üzerine birçok çalışma yapılmıştır. Gravett vd. (2019) ve Molloy vd. (2020) geri bildirim okuryazarlığının bileşenleri ve rollerini ortaya koymuştur. Öte yandan, geri bildirimin eğitim programına entegrasyonu ve disiplinlere göre farklılıkları da daha önce ele alınmıştır (Malecka vd., 2020; Noble vd., 2019; Li ve Han, 2021; Winstone vd., 2020). Akran geri bildiriminin ve bireyin kendine geri bildirim sağlamanın geri bildirim okuryazarlığına etkisi de birçok çalışma kapsamında araştırılmıştır (Fernández-Toro ve Duensing, 2020; Hoo vd., 2021; Wood, 2021).

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığı çalışmaları genel olarak ülkelerin öğrenci anketleri bulgularını temel alarak oluşturulmuştur (Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching, 2017; Higher Education Funding Council for England, 2016). Bu yüzden, ulusal öğrenci anketleri doğrultusunda hareket eden ülkelerde öğrencilerin bakış açıları ve tecrübeleri doğrultusunda geri bildirim çalışmalarının yapılması eğitim gündeminde yer almaktadır ve büyük önem arz etmektedir. Ancak, Türkiye'deki yükseköğretim bağlamında durum bu şekilde değildir ve öğrencilerin geri bildirim anlama ve kullanma üzerine yapılan çalışmalar sınırlı sayıdadır. Türkiye'de bu alanda yürütülmüş çalışmalar ise genel olarak şu başlıklarda yürütülmüştür: geri bildirim önemi ve etkililiği (Arıkan, 2012; Karaca, 2011), geri bildirim türleri (Dökmen, 1982),

öğrencilerin geri bildirim tercihleri (Çabakçor, vd., 2011, Fidan, 2015: Taşdemir ve Yalçın Arslan, 2018), geri bildirim türlerinin farklı alanlardaki etkililiği (Çabakçor vd., 2011; Göçer ve Şentürk, 2019; Özmen ve Aydın, 2015) ve öğrencilerin geri bildirim algıları (Çapa Aydın ve Çalık, 2018).

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığı yükseköğretimde öğrencilerin geri bildirim anlama ve değerli görme, değerlendirme ve karar verme, duygu yönetimi ve harekete geçmesi şeklinde kavramsallaştırılmıştır (Carless ve Boud, 2018). Fakat, Türkiye’deki üniversite öğrencilerinin geri bildirim okuryazarlıkları bu kavramlar doğrultusunda araştırılmamıştır. Bu yüzden, bu öğrencilerin geri bildirim okuryazarlığını gösteren, arttıran ve azaltan faktörler henüz bilinmemektedir. Bu sebeplerden ötürü, bu araştırma literatürde belirtilen boşluğu doldurmayı ve Türkiye’deki geri bildirim alanyazınına katkı sağlamayı hedeflemektedir.

YÖNTEM

Araştırma Soruları

Araştırmaya yön veren araştırma soruları şu şekildedir:

1. İngilizce Öğretmenliği öğrencileri geri bildirim türlerini, miktarını ve zamanlamasını ne şekilde algılamaktadırlar?
2. İngilizce Öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin geri bildirim okuryazarlığı göstergeleri nelerdir?
3. İngilizce Öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran faktörler nelerdir?
4. İngilizce Öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin geri bildirim okuryazarlığını azaltan faktörler nelerdir?

Araştırmanın Deseni

Araştırmada İngilizce Öğretmenliği öğrencilerinin, geri bildirim algıları ve geri bildirim okuryazarlığı hakkında detaylı bilgiye sahip olmak amacıyla temel nitel araştırma yöntemi (Merriam, 2009) kullanılmıştır.

Araştırmanın Bağlamı

Bu araştırma İngilizce Öğretmenliği programında eğitim gören üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf lisans öğrencileriyle gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırmanın gerçekleştirildiği İngilizce Öğretmenliği programı, Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından belirlenen ve iki devlet üniversitesi ile birlikte bir özel üniversite tarafından sunulan dört yıllık bir programdır. Bu programın amacı ise öğretmen adaylarının alanları ile ilgili profesyonel bilgi ve becerilere sahip olacak nitelikte eğitilmesidir.

Bu araştırma için veriler üç farklı üniversiteden toplanmıştır ve gizlilik ilkesinin sağlanması amacıyla üniversiteler A, B ve C olarak adlandırılmıştır. Üniversite A ve B devlet üniversitesi iken Üniversite C özel bir üniversitedir. Bu üniversitelerin hepsi Yükseköğretim Kurulu tarafından yayınlanan İngilizce Öğretmenliği programını kullanmaktadır. Bu program Üniversite A, B ve C’de sırasıyla 77, 39 ve 12 senedir uygulanmaktadır ve bu yüzden bu üniversitelerde uygulanan İngilizce Öğretmenliği programının köklü ve iyi yapılandırılmıştır.

Bağlam hakkında daha detaylı bilgi sağlamak amacıyla katılımcılardan derslerinde kullanılan değerlendirme yöntemlerini ve geri bildirim formatlarını raporlamaları istenmiştir. Katılımcıların verdikleri bilgiler doğrultusunda, pandemiden önce tüm üniversitelerde sınavların, sunumların, ödevlerin ve projelerin uygulandığı sıklıkla ifade edilmiştir. Aynı şekilde, tüm üniversitelerdeki katılımcılar dönüt formatının bireysel sözel ve yazılı olduğunu sıklıkla belirtmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra, elektronik yazılı dönüt Üniversite B ve C için raporlanırken elektronik sözel dönüt sadece Üniversite B katılımcıları tarafından belirtilmiştir.

Pandemi dönemi için ise, tüm katılımcılar ödevlerin, projelerin ve sunumların uygulandığını sıklıkla ifade etmişlerdir. Yüz yüze eğitimdeki kadar olmasa da hala sınavların da uygulandığı raporlanmıştır. Benzer bir şekilde, tüm katılımcıların verdiği cevaplara göre elektronik yazılı ve eş zamanlı sözel dönütün sıklıkla kullanıldığı raporlanmıştır. Sadece Üniversite B’de eş zamanlı olmayan sözel dönüt formatı kullanılmıştır.

Katılımcılar

Bu araştırma için seçkisiz olmayan örnekleme yöntemlerinden olan amaçsal örnekleme kullanılmıştır. Çalışma için veri çeşitliliğinin ve detaylı veri analizinin sağlanması (Patton, 2002) amacıyla geri bildirim bağlamının zengin olduğu bölümlerden biri olan İngilizce Öğretmenliği seçilmiştir (Kahraman ve Yalvaç, 2015) seçilmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra, birinci ve ikinci sınıf öğrencilerinin geri bildirimleri uygulama konusunda yeterli ve çeşitli tecrübeleri olmadığı düşünüldüğünden, üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencileri seçilmiştir.

Toplamda Ankara'daki iki devlet üniversitesinde ve bir özel üniversitede kayıtlı 39 İngilizce Öğretmenliği lisans öğrencisi çalışmaya katılmıştır. Bu katılımcıların ise 16 tanesi Üniversite A, 13 tanesi Üniversite B ve 10 tanesi Üniversite C öğrencilerinden oluşmaktadır.

Veri Toplama Araçları

Veri toplamak amacıyla oluşturulan görüşme protokolü yapılandırılmış ve yapılandırılmış sorulardan oluşmuştur. Yapılandırılmış sorular ile katılımcılar hakkında genel bilgi edinmek amacıyla katılımcıların yaş, üniversite, sınıf ve genel not ortalaması gibi bilgilerinin öğrenilmesi hedeflenmiştir. Yarı yapılandırılmış sorular için ise ilk olarak uzman görüşleri alınmıştır ve pilot çalışması yapılmıştır. Uzman görüş önerileri ve pilot çalışması doğrultusunda içerik ve format olarak gerekli görülen düzenlemeler yapılmıştır. Bu düzenlemeler doğrultusunda, görüşme soruları genel olarak şu konulara değinmiştir: derslerde kullanılan değerlendirme yöntemleri, geri bildirim türleri ve formatları, geri bildirimin zamanlaması ve miktarı, geri bildirimin değeri, kişilerarası geri bildirim bağlamı ve duygu yönetimi. Görüşme protokolü ise uygulamaya hazır hale getirilmiştir.

Veri Toplama Süreci

Etik izin başvurusu ve onayından sonra araştırma için veriler 2020-2021 öğretim yılının bahar döneminde toplanmıştır. Görüşme öncesi her katılımcı ile bir randevu oluşturulmuş olup, randevu gün ve saatinde görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Katılımcılar ile bireysel görüşmeler çevrimiçi yürütülmüştür.

Veri Analizi

Verilerin analizi için MAXQDA 2020 nitel veri analizi programı kullanılmıştır. Veri analizi yöntemi olarak da nitel ve tümevarımsal içerik analizi yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Kodlar temel olarak araştırma sorularına odaklanılarak oluşturulmuştur. Bunun yanı sıra, bu araştırma için oluşturulan kodlar prensip olarak literatürdeki geri bildirim okuryazarlığı modelleri (Carless ve Boud, 2018; Sutton, 2012) ve geri bildirim okuryazarlığı alanında yapılmış nitel araştırmaları (Fernández-Toro ve Duensing, 2020; Gravett vd., 2019; Han ve Xu, 2019a; Li ve Han, 2021; Chong, 2020; Wei vd., 2020) temel almıştır. Güvenilirliğin sağlanması amacıyla her bir üniversiteden birer tane olmak üzere üç çözümleme eğitim alanında çalışmalar yürüten bir araştırmacı ve farklı bir transkript ise yine bir diğer eğitim alanındaki araştırmacı tarafından kodlanmıştır. Sonuçlar karşılaştırılmış ve farklılıklar tartışılmıştır. Oluşturulan kodlar ise eğitim alanında çalışmalar yürüten bir tez danışmanı ile tartışılmıştır ve bazı kodlar tek bir kod altında birleştirilirken bazıları ise çıkarılmıştır. Bu sürecin sonunda, kodlardan aralarında benzerlik ve farklılıklara göre kategoriler oluşturulmuştur ve bu kategoriler temalaştırılmıştır.

BULGULAR VE TARTIŞMA

Uygulanan görüşmeler doğrultusunda bulgular geri bildirim türlerini, miktarını ve zamanlamasını; geri bildirim okuryazarlığı göstergelerini; geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran ve azaltan faktörleri ortaya koymuştur. Geri bildirim miktarı ve zamanlaması değerlendirme yöntemleri (sınavlar, ödevler/projeler ve sunumlar) temaları çevresinde şekillenmiştir. Geri bildirim okuryazarlığı göstergeleri ise geri bildirimi anlama ve değerli görme, değerlendirme ve karar verme, duygu yönetimi ve harekete geçmesi temalarından oluşmuştur (Carless ve Boud, 2018). Son olarak, geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran ve azaltan faktörler şu temalar çevresinde şekillenmiştir: geri bildirimin nitelikleri, öğretim ile ilgili faktörler, öğrencinin rolleri ve özellikleri ve sosyal faktörler. Sadece sosyal faktörler iki alt temadan oluşmaktadır: akran ve öğretim üyesi ile ilgili faktörler.

Geri Bildirim Türleri, Miktarı ve Zamanlaması

Geri bildirim türü geri bildirim mesajını aktarma yolu olarak adlandırılır. Katılımcılar tarafından en çok belirtilen geri bildirim türü ise direkt düzeltici yani yanlış cevabın doğrusuyla birlikte verildiği geri bildirimdir. Öğrencilerin yanlış cevaplarının belirtilmesinin yanı sıra, yanlış cevaplar ile ilgili olarak daha fazla açıklama sağlayan veya kaynaklar ve ipuçlarıyla doğru cevaba yönlendiren geri bildirim türleri de raporlanmıştır. Öğretim üyeleri aynı zamanda, öğrencilere daha fazla detaylı açıklama talep ettikleri geri bildirimler yönlendirmişlerdir. Buna ek olarak, geri bildirim değerlendirme kriterleri ile doğru orantılı olarak yönerge veya rubrikler aracılığıyla da öğrencilere iletilmiştir. Son olarak ise, yanlış cevabın doğrusu verilmeden yanlış cevabın sadece yerini gösteren veya belli bir noktada dikkatli olunması gerektiğine işaret eden geri bildirimler de raporlanmıştır. Benzer şekilde, Shute (2008) literatürde sıklıkla kullanılan geri bildirim türlerinin detaylandırma, ipuçları vasıtasıyla rehberlik etme, doğru veya yanlış cevabı onaylama ve yanlış cevabın doğrusunun verilmeden ikaz edilmesi olduğunu derlemiştir.

Geri bildirim ne kadar yakın zamanda sağlandığı da araştırılmıştır. Katılımcıların cevaplarına göre, geri bildirim zamanlaması değerlendirme yöntemlerine (sınav, ödev/proje ve sunum), öğretim üyesine ve verilen görevlere göre değişiklik göstermektedir. Zamanlama olarak en erken verilen geri bildirimler “sunum” teması altında “sunumdan hemen sonra” olarak raporlanmıştır. “Sınav” teması için en erken verilen geri bildirim “üç veya dört gün içinde” iken “ödev/proje” teması için bu “yedi gün içinde”dir. Katılımcılar, sınavlar ve ödevler/projeler için “bir veya iki hafta içinde” ve “iki haftadan daha fazla bir süre sonra” geri bildirim verildiğini de ifade etmişlerdir. En geç verilen geri bildirim ise yine sınavlar ve ödevler/projeler için “dönem sonunda” olarak belirtilmiştir.

Bu araştırma kapsamında, öğrencilere ne kadar geri bildirim verildiği de incelenmiştir. Geri bildirim miktarının değerlendirme yöntemlerine (sınav, ödev/proje ve sunum) ve yanlışların miktarına göre farklılık gösterdiği bulunmuştur. Bazı katılımcılar geri bildirim miktarını süre olarak belirtirken bazıları ise cümle sayısı ile ifade etmiştir. Bunun yanı sıra, katılımcıların çoğu geri bildirimlerin detaylı olup olmadığını belirtmiştir. İlk olarak, ödev/proje ve sunum temaları altında en çok

ifade edilen bileşen detaylı geri bildirim olmuştur. Fakat, detaylı olmayan geri bildirim çok az katılımcı tarafından ifade edilmiştir. Buna ek olarak, bazı katılımcılar ödevler/projeler ve sınavlar için geri bildirimin sadece puanlama ve işaretleme şeklinde iletilildiğini raporlanmıştır. Ödevler/projeler için geri bildirim miktarı genel olarak “bir veya iki cümle”, “bir paragraf” ve “bir veya iki sayfa” olarak belirtilmiştir. Diğer yandan ise, sunumlar için geri bildirim miktarı çoğunlukla dakika olarak (bir veya beş dakika, beş veya on dakika, on veya 20 dakika) belirtilirken, bazı katılımcılar sunumlar için geri bildirim miktarını cümle sayısı (beş veya altı cümle, üç veya dört cümle) şeklinde belirtmiştir. Son olarak, sınavlar için geri bildirimin genellikle “bir veya iki cümle” ve “bir paragraf” olduğu da vurgulanmıştır. Bu araştırmadaki bulgularla doğru orantılı olarak, Wei vd. (2020) de çalışmalarında öğrencilerin geri bildirim algılarının miktar temelli olarak ortaya çıktığını belirtmişlerdir.

Geri Bildirim Okuryazarlığının Göstergeleri

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığı göstergeleri, diğer bir deyişle öğrencilerin geri bildirimini nasıl anladıkları ve öğrenme süreçlerine katkı sağlamak amacıyla nasıl kullandıkları dört bileşenden oluşmaktadır: geri bildirim anlama ve değerli görme, değerlendirme ve karar verme, duygu yönetimi ve harekete geçme (Carless ve Boud, 2018). İlk olarak, geri bildirim anlama ve değerli görme teması çerçevesinde öğrencilerin geri bildirimin değerini anlama, geri bildirim sürecinde kendi aktif rollerini kabul etme ve geri bildirim arayışında olma gibi davranışlar sergilemişlerdir. Aynı şekilde, öğrencilerin geri bildirim sürecindeki aktif rollerini kabul edişleri, Hill ve West (2020) tarafından da ortaya koyulmuştur. Değerlendirme ve karar verme ise raporlanan temalardan biridir. Bu kapsamda, öğrencilerin geri bildirimin niteliğinin yanı sıra akranlarının ve kendilerinin çalışmaları hakkında değerlendirmeci karar verme davranışında bulundukları raporlanmıştır ve bu değerlendirmeler sayesinde katılımcılar değerlendirme kriterlerini de anlayabilmişlerdir. Fernández-Toro ve Duensing (2019) ise aynı şekilde çalışmalarındaki katılımcıların belli bir kriter listesine göre karar verme ve değerlendirme davranışlarında bulunduklarının altını çizmiştir. Bir diğer geri bildirim okuryazarlığı göstergesi ise duygu yönetimidir. Bu noktada, katılımcılar ise zorlayıcı duyguların (kaygı, stres, kötümserlik vb.) üstesinden gelebilmelerinden bahsetmişlerdir. Bazı katılımcılar ise geri bildirimin

olumlu veya olumsuz olmasına bakılmaksızın geri bildirim duygusal olarak açık olduklarının altını çizmişlerdir. Molloy vd. (2020)'e göre de, öğrencilerin duygusal zorlukları kabul etmeleri ve bunların üstesinden gelmek için çaba harcamaları geri bildirim okuryazarlığının bir özelliğidir. Son geri bildirim okuryazarlığı göstergesi ise harekete geçmedir. Bu doğrultuda, katılımcıların çoğunluğu verilen geri bildirimin bir sonraki benzer görevler için kullanıldığını dile getirmişlerdir. Bazıları ise geri bildirimin farklı bağlamlarda (farklı tür görevler, dersler vb.) kullanmak amacıyla geri bildirim uyarladıklarını vurgulamışlardır. Son olarak ise, geri bildirimin öz gelişim ve gelecekteki kariyer için kullanımı da raporlanmıştır. Molloy vd. (2020)'nin çalışmalarında da aynı şekilde geri bildirim mesajının öğrenmeye ve gelişmeye katkı sağlamak için kullanıldığı yer almaktadır.

Geri Bildirim Okuryazarlığını Arttıran Faktörler

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran faktörler dört tema altında incelenmiştir: geri bildirimin nitelikleri, öğretim ile ilgili faktörler, öğrencinin rolleri ve özellikleri ve sosyal faktörler. Sadece sosyal faktörler öğretim üyesi ve akran ile ilgili alt temalardan oluşmuştur.

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran bir faktör olarak geri bildirimin nitelikleri ilk tema olarak ortaya çıkmıştır ve katılımcılar tarafından sıklıkla yapıcı bir şekilde ve zamanında verilen geri bildirimler belirtilmiştir. Wei vd. (2020) de yapıcı geri bildirimlerin önerilen çözümlerin kullanımını arttırdığından dolayı performansı da arttırdığını bulmuştur. Öğrencilerin beklentileriyle doğru orantılı olan ve açık bir şekilde verilen geri bildirimler de geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran faktörler olarak raporlanmıştır. Katılımcıların bazıları detaylı ve uzun geri bildirim dikkat çekerken bazıları ise kısa, öz ve nokta atışı yapan geri bildirimleri belirtmişlerdir. Bu bulgu da, öğrencilerin detaylı geri bildirim önem verdiklerini gösteren çalışmalarla örtüşmektedir (Ducasse ve Hill, 2019). Aynı zamanda, yeni bir bağlam için (örneğin; ders, görev) verilen geri bildirim önemli olarak görülmüştür ve geri bildirimle etkileşime katkı sağladığı bulunmuştur. Saklanabilen geri bildirim formatı ise öğrencilerin daha önce verilen yorumlara dönüp tekrar bakmasına olanak sağlamıştır. İpuçları veya kaynaklar yardımıyla doğru cevaba yönlendiren geri bildirimlerin yanı sıra sunulan çalışmanın olumsuz ve olumlu yanlarını açık bir şekilde ortaya koyan

geri bildirimler de geri bildirimle etkileşimi arttıran unsurlar olmuştur. Son olarak az sayıda bir katılımcı geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran bir faktör olarak bireysel geri bildirimlerin altını çizmiştir.

Öğretim ile ilgili faktörler geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran ikinci bir tema olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu tema altında katılımcılar tarafından en sık belirtilen faktörler örnek/model, rubrik/yönerge, öz değerlendirme ve akran geri bildirim kullanımlarıdır. Benzer bir şekilde, Smith vd. (2013) rubrik kullanımının ölçme ve değerlendirme okuryazarlığını arttırdığını bulmuşlardır. Ayrıca, öz değerlendirme (Malecka vd., 2020), akran değerlendirmesi (Fernández-Toro ve Duensing, 2020) ve örneklerin sunulmasının (Carless ve Boud, 2018) da geri bildirim okuryazarlığına pozitif etkilerinin olduğu bulunmuştur. Bunların yanı sıra, öğrencilerin bir ödev/görev zorlayıcı olduğunda geri bildirim arayışına girdikleri raporlanmıştır. Birbirini tamamlayan veya birbirine benzer sıralı ödevlerin de geri bildirim kullanımını arttırdığı belirtilmiştir. Yine Carless vd. (2011) iki aşamalı değerlendirmenin veya çoklu taslakların kullanımının geri bildirim kullanımını arttırdığını öne sürmüşlerdir. Son olarak az sayıda katılımcı ise yanlışlar hakkında geri bildirim bireylere verilmesinden tüm sınıfa yönelik verilmesini faydalı bulmuşlardır.

Öğrencinin rolleri ve özellikleri bir diğer tema olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Geri bildirim anlama ve uygulamaya katkı sağlayan faktörler olarak, öz-düzenlemenin yanı sıra iç ve dışa yönelik motivasyonun katılımcılar tarafından en çok belirtilen öğeler olduğu bulunmuştur. Molloy vd. (2020) de farklı ve çeşitli stratejilerin (öz-yansıtma, hedef belirleme vb.) geri bildirim detaylandırmak için geri bildirim okuryazarlığı yüksek öğrenciler tarafından kullanıldığını belirtmişlerdir. Aynı şekilde, öz ve içsel motivasyonun geri bildirim etkileşimi için önemli bir faktör olduğu bulunmuştur (Tripodi vd., 2020). Dışsal motivasyonla bağlantılı olarak da Smith vd. (2013), minimum çaba yönelimiyle yani öğrencilerin sadece sınıfı geçmek veya belirli bir notu almak amacıyla hareket ettiklerinde öğrenmenin bu durumdan negatif etkilendiğini öne sürmüştür. Öz güven, değer görme ve başarılı olma hissi de geri bildirim etkileşimini arttırmıştır. Son olarak, farklı fikirlere değer verme ve bu fikirlerin dikkate alınıp uygulandığı da ifade edilmiştir.

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığını arttıran son tema sosyal faktörler olmuştur. Öğretim

üyesi ile ilgili faktörler çerçevesinde, katılımcılar sıklıkla pozitif öğretmen tutumu, alan uzmanlığı ve rehberliği gibi faktörleri belirtmişlerdir. Sutton (2012) tarafından da belirtildiği gibi, güçlü öğretmen-öğrenci ilişkisi geri bildirim okuryazarlığında önemli bir rol oynamıştır. Bunun yanı sıra, öğretim üyesinin verilen emeği takdir etmesi ve geri bildirim sağlama konusunda çaba sarf etmesi öğrencilerin geri bildirim etkileşimini arttırmıştır. Benzer bir şekilde, öğretim üyesi ile iyi bir ilişkiye sahip olma ve kendisinin halihazırda ulaşılabilir olması öğrencilerin geri bildirim diyalogu başlatma motivasyonlarını arttırmıştır. Akran ile ilgili faktörler çerçevesinde ise, en çok belirtilen faktörler ortak tecrübelerle sahip olma ve akran uzmanlığına güvenme olmuştur. Ayrıca, öğrencilerin kendi performanslarını akranlarınınkini ile karşılaştırması da geri bildirim anlaşılmaya katkı sağlamıştır. Son olarak, akranlar ile iyi ilişkiler, akranların pozitif bir dil kullanması ve geri bildirim sağlama sürecinde çabaladıklarına inanılması da geri bildirim etkileşimini arttırmıştır.

Geri Bildirim Okuryazarlığını Azaltan Faktörler

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığını azaltan faktörler dört tema altında incelenmiştir: geri bildirim nitelikleri, öğretim ile ilgili faktörler, öğrencinin özellikleri ve sosyal faktörler. Sadece sosyal faktörler öğretim üyesi ve akran ile ilgili alt temalardan oluşmuştur.

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığını azaltan ilk faktör olarak, geri bildirim nitelikleri teması ortaya çıkmıştır. Bu tema çerçevesinde, sıklıkla bahsedilen nitelikler yüzeysel geri bildirim ve akranların/öğretmenlerin abartılı övgülerde bulunması olmuştur. Övgü ile ilgili olarak, Brophy (1981) övgünün yalnızca dürüst ve güvenilir olması durumunda etkili olduğu ama gerçekleri yansıtmadığı noktada öğrencileri cesaretlendirmesinin mümkün olmadığını belirtmiştir. Ertelenmiş geri bildirim ise ödevde veya sınavda yazılan cevabın unutulmasına neden olduğundan geri bildirim kullanımını sınırlandırmıştır. Corbett ve Anderson (2001)'un çalışmalarına göre de uzun bir süre sonra sağlanan geri bildirimlerin bilginin unutulmasına ve öğrenmenin gerçekleşmemesine sebep olmuştur. Bazı katılımcılar çok fazla düzeltmelerin geri bildirim anlamayı ve kullanmayı engellediğini belirtmiştir. Yapıcı olmayan bir şekilde yanlışlar üzerine yoğunlaşan veya cesareti kıran geri bildirimlerin de geri

bildirim etkileşimini azalttığı raporlanmıştır. Aynı şekilde, öğrencilerin kişiliklerine tehdit olarak algıladıkları geri bildirimlerden de uzak durdukları belirtilmiştir. Gravett vd. (2019) de bu konu ile ilgili olarak rahatsız edici ve kırıncı geri bildirimlerin kişiliğe tehdit olarak algılandığından dolayı geri bildirim kullanımını engellediğini ortaya çıkarmışlardır. Son olarak, kişilerin beklemedikleri geri bildirim almaları, geri bildirim kişilerin çalışmaları ile alakasız olması veya olumsuz geri bildirim kişiye sınıf önünde verilmesi geri bildirim okuryazarlığını azaltmıştır.

Öğretim ile ilgili faktörler ikinci tema olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Katılımcılar ödev veya görevler için kriterlerin belirsiz olmasının sağlanan geri bildirim anlaşılması engellediğini belirtmişlerdir. Ayrıca, ödevlerin devamlı olmaması da geri bildirim etkileşimini azaltmıştır.

Öğrencinin özellikleri de geri bildirim azaltan diğer bir tema olarak ortaya çıkmıştır. Geri bildirim karşı dirençli olma ve not odaklı olma en çok belirtilen öğeler olmuştur. Katılımcılar aynı zamanda başarısızlık, adil olmayan değerlendirme hissi ve alana ilgisiz olma gibi faktörlerin geri bildirim etkileşimini azalttığını belirtmişlerdir. Öğrencilerin öğretim üyesinin tepkisinden korktukları için de geri bildirim arayışından kaçındıkları raporlanmıştır. Ayrıca, kaygılı, stresli, utangaç ve inatçı olma gibi kişisel özelliklerin de geri bildirim dikkate alınmamasının sebebi olarak belirtilmiştir. Benzer bir şekilde, kişilerin çalışmalarına olan güvenleri de geri bildirim göz ardı edilmesine sebep olmuştur. Son olarak, katılımcılar geçmişte geri bildirim tecrübelerinin olmadığını ve bu yüzden geri bildirim sağlanmadığında geri bildirim arayışına girmediklerini ifade etmişlerdir. Rovagnati vd. (2021) de ifade ettiği gibi, kişilerin daha önce deneyimledikleri geri bildirim tecrübeleri geri bildirim arayışında olmamalarına sebep olabilir.

Son tema olarak, sosyal faktörlerin geri bildirim azalttığı bulunmuştur. Öğretim üyesi ile ilgili faktörler içinden en çok belirtilenler negatif öğretmen tutumu, alan uzmanlığına güvensizlik ve öğretim üyesinin rehberlik etmemesi olmuştur. Sutton (2012) da ifade ettiği gibi, dil engeli geri bildirim kullanımını ve bu yüzden de geri bildirim okuryazarlığını sınırlandırmıştır. Katılımcılar aynı zamanda, öğretmenle ilişkinin zayıf olması ve öğretmenin geri bildirim sağlama konusunda çaba harcamaması gibi faktörlerin geri bildirim diyalogu başlatmalarını engellediklerini

belirtmişlerdir. Bunların yanı sıra, öğretim üyesinin öğrencinin emeğini takdir etmemesi, halihazırda ulaşılır olmaması ve otorite faktörünün geri bildirim etkileşimini zayıflattığı raporlanmıştır. Akran ile ilgili faktörler çerçevesinde ise, kişinin çalışmalarını akranlarınıninkiyile karşılaştırmasının ve akranlarının kararlarına güvenmemesinin geri bildirimin göz ardı edilmesine ve geri bildirim arayışına girilmemesine sebep olmuştur. Literatürdeki çalışmalarda da akranların karar verme ve değerlendirmelerine güvenilmemesinin yanlışlarla yüzleşilmesini engellediği ortaya koyulmuştur (Han ve Xu, 2019a). Bir önceki faktörler kadar sık ifade edilmese de akranların öğretmen hakkındaki fikirleri ve akranlar ile zayıf ilişkilerin olması öğretmen veya akranlar ile geri bildirim diyaloguna girilmesini engelleyen faktörlerden olmuştur.

Öneriler

İleride yürütülecek olan geri bildirim okuryazarlığı çalışmaları için belirli önerilerde bulunmak mümkündür. İlk olarak, üniversite öğrencilerinin geri bildirim okuryazarlıkları boyamsal araştırma ile incelenebilir. Bu şekilde, öğrencilerin geri bildirim anlama ve kullanma davranışlarının nasıl geliştiği ile ilgili bilgiler elde edilebilir.

Geri bildirim okuryazarlığı, literatürde genel olarak nitel araştırmalar vasıtasıyla incelenmiştir. Ancak, geri bildirim okuryazarlığının nicel veriler doğrultusunda araştırılması ihtiyacı ortaya çıkmıştır. Bundan dolayı, öğrencilerin geri bildirim okuryazarlığı seviyesini belirleyen bir ölçek geliştirilebilir ve bu ölçek sayesinde geri bildirimin bilişsel öğeler ile ilişkisi araştırılabilir.

Bu araştırma kapsamında, geri bildirim okuryazarlığını etkileyen faktörler dört farklı tema çevresinde şekillenmiştir. Fakat, her tema kendi içinde detaylı bir şekilde araştırılmamıştır. Gelecekteki araştırmalarda ise, bu çalışmada ortaya çıkan temalar tek bir araştırma konusu olarak daha detaylı bir şekilde incelenebilir. Ayrıca, bu araştırmadaki katılımcılar İngilizce Öğretmenliği lisans öğrencilerinden oluşmuştur. Diğer lisans veya lisansüstü programlarda eğitimine devam eden öğrencilerin de geri bildirim okuryazarlıkları araştırılabilir. Literatürde her ne kadar öğrencilerin geri bildirim okuryazarlığına odaklanılmış olsa da, öğretmenlerin veya akademisyenlerin okuryazarlıklarının araştırılması gelecekteki çalışmalar için önerilmektedir.

APPENDIX E: THESIS PERMISSION FORM / TEZ İZİN FORMU

(Please fill out this form on computer. Double click on the boxes to fill them)

ENSTİTÜ / INSTITUTE

- Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences ☐
- Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Social Sciences ☒
- Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Applied Mathematics ☐
- Enformatik Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Informatics ☐
- Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü** / Graduate School of Marine Sciences ☐

YAZARIN / AUTHOR

Soyadı / Surname : Kara
Adı / Name : Ceren
Bölümü / Department : Eğitim Bilimleri, Eğitim Programları ve Öğretim/ Educational Sciences,
Curriculum and Instruction

TEZİN ADI / TITLE OF THE THESIS (İngilizce / English): A QUALITATIVE STUDY OF FEEDBACK LITERACY
IN HIGHER EDUCATION: UNCOVERING ENHANCING AND IMPEDING FACTORS

TEZİN TÜRÜ / DEGREE: Yüksek Lisans / Master ☒ Doktora / PhD ☐

1. **Tezin tamamı dünya çapında erişime açılacaktır.** / Release the entire work immediately for access worldwide. ☐
2. **Tez iki yıl süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for patent and/or proprietary purposes for a period of **two years**. * ☐
3. **Tez altı ay süreyle erişime kapalı olacaktır.** / Secure the entire work for period of **six months**. * ☒

* Enstitü Yönetim Kurulu kararının basılı kopyası teze birlikte kütüphaneye teslim edilecektir. /
A copy of the decision of the Institute Administrative Committee will be delivered to the library
together with the printed thesis.

Yazarın imzası / Signature

Tarih / Date

(Kütüphaneye teslim ettiğiniz tarih. Elle doldurulacaktır.)
(Library submission date. Please fill out by hand.)

Tezin son sayfasıdır. / This is the last page of the thesis/dissertation.