KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY * INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

MASTER'S PROGRAM IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

AN INVESTIGATION OF TWO TEACHER WRITTEN FEEDBACK PROCEDURES IN EFL CLASSES: FORM-FOCUSED AND CONTENT-FOCUSED FEEDBACK

MASTER'S THESIS

Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU

MAY-2019

TRABZON

KARADENİZ TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY * INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

DEPARTMENT OF WESTERN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

MASTER'S PROGRAM IN APPLIED LINGUISTICS

AN INVESTIGATION OF TWO TEACHER WRITTEN FEEDBACK PROCEDURES IN EFL CLASSES: FORM-FOCUSED AND CONTENT- FOCUSED FEEDBACK

MASTER'S THESIS

Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Naci KAYAOĞLU

MAY-2019

TRABZON

APPROVAL

Upon the submission of the dissertation, **Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU** has defended the study **"An Investigation of Two Teacher Written Feedback Procedures in EFL Classes: Form-Focused Feedback and Content-Focused Feedback"** in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics at Karadeniz Technical University, and the study has been found fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis by **unanimous / majority** on **17.06.2019**

Committee Member		Decision		Signature
Title - Name and SURNAME	**Mission**	**Accept**	**Refuse**	
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustafa Naci KAYAOĞLU	Supervisor	☑	☐	
Prof. Dr. İbrahim YEREBAKAN	Member	☑	☐	
Asst. Prof. Dr. Öznur SEMİZ	Member	☑	☐	

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Yusuf SÜRMEN

Director

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I, **Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU,** hereby confirm and certify that;

- I am the sole author of this work and I have fully acknowledged and documented in my thesis all sources of ideas and words, including digital resources, which have been produced or published by another person or institution,

- this work contains no material that has been submitted or accepted for a degree or diploma in any other university or institution,

- all data and findings in the work have not been falsified or embellished,

- this is a true copy of the work approved by my advisor and thesis committee at Karadeniz Technical University, including final revisions required by them.

- I understand that my work may be electronically checked for plagiarism by the use of plagiarism detection software and stored on a third party's server for eventual future comparison,

- I take full responsibility in case of non-compliance with the above statements in respect of this work.

20.05.2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

May, 2019   Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU

CONTENTS

CHAPTER TWO

CHAPTER THREE

ÖZET

Yazma derslerinde ürün odaklı yaklaşımların yerini süreç odaklı yaklaşımların alması ve bu tür yaklaşımların yaygınlaşmasıyla, hem öğrenciler hem de eğitmenler tarafından değer verilen yazılı öğretmen dönütü, eğitim araştırmalarının yanı sıra, öğrenme bağlamlarında da giderek daha fazla dikkat çekmeye başlamıştır. Öğretmenler, öğrenci yazılarına geri bildirim vermek için kayda değer bir zaman harcamaktadır. Bununla birlikte, çeşitli türlerdeki yazılı öğretmen dönütlerinin etkinliği, halen araştırılan ve çelişkili sonuçlar veren bir araştırma alanıdır. Öğrencilerin yazma becerisini kazanmalarına yardımcı olmak için, öğretmen dönütlerinin en iyi uygulamaları araştırılmaktadır. Çalışma, form odaklı ve içerik odaklı yazılı dönüt türlerinin yabancı dil öğrencilerinin genel yazma performansları, yazma tutumları ve yazma anksiyeteleri üzerindeki etkilerini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma ayrıca öğrencilerin yukarıda belirtilen geri bildirim prosedürlerine ilişkin algılarını da incelemektedir. Bu çalışmada yarı deneysel bir tasarım kullanılmıştır. Yabancı Diller Bölümünde iki grup oluşturuldu: içerik odaklı dönüt alan deneysel bir grup ve form odaklı dönüt alan bir kontrol grubu. Araştırmada hem nitel hem de nicel veri toplama yöntemleri kullanılmış; veriler yazma sınavı, yazmaya yönelik tutum anketi, ikinci dilde yazma kaygısı envanteri ve yarı yapılandırılmış görüşmelerle toplanmıştır. Çalışmanın sonuçları, her iki grubun da yeni yazılarda anlamlı olarak geliştiğini fakat öğrencilerin yazma tutumları ve kaygı düzeylerinde anlamlı bir farklılık olmadığını ortaya koymuştur. Nitel analiz, öğrencilerin hala yazma becerisini dilbilgisinin hizmetinde olan bir olgu olarak algıladıklarını, dilbilgilerini geliştirmeyi hedeflediklerini ve yazılarındaki mesaja odaklanan dönüt prosedürüne mesafeli bir tutum sergilediklerini göstermiştir. Çalışma yabancı dil öğretmenleri ve karar vericiler için bazı çıkarımlar sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Form odaklı dönüt, içerik odaklı dönüt, yazılı öğretmen dönütü, yazma performansı

ABSTRACT

As process-oriented approaches have become common practice and replaced product-oriented approaches in writing classes, written teacher feedback which is valued by both learners and instructors has attracted more attention in teaching and learning contexts as well as in educational research. Writing instructors seem to spend a lot of time providing feedback. However, the effectiveness of various kinds of written teacher feedback is a research area which is still investigated and the results yield conflicting results. In a quest to help students with acquiring writing skill, best practices of teacher feedback are researched. The study aims to investigate the effects of form-focused and content-focused feedback on EFL students' overall writing performance, their writing attitudes and the writing anxiety that they experienced in writing classes. The study also examines students' perceptions towards the aforementioned feedback procedures. A quasi-experimental design was employed for this study. Two groups at the School of Foreign Languages were formed: an experimental group which was provided with content-focused feedback and a control group which was provided with form-focused feedback. A combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods was used in this investigation and data were collected through writing tests, a writing attitude questionnaire, second language writing anxiety inventory and semi-structured interviews. The results of the study revealed that both groups improved significantly in new pieces of writing, while writing attitudes and anxiety levels of learners did not differ significantly. The qualitative analysis showed that students still perceive writing at the service of grammar, aim to improve their grammar accuracy and show some persistence to the feedback procedure which focused on communication of information in their writings. The study has some implications for EFL teachers and decision-makers.

Key Words: Form-focused feedback, content-focused feedback, written teacher feedback, writing performance

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF ABBREVATIONS

CF   : Corrective Feedback

EFL   : English as a Foreign Language

ESL   : English as a Second Language

KTU   : Karadeniz Technical University

L1   : First Language

L2   : Second Language

SLA   : Second Language Acquisition

SLWAI: Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory

SPSS   : Statistical Package for Social Sciences

WAT   : Writing Apprehension Test

WCF   : Written Corrective Feedback

INTRODUCTION

Writing, a basic skill for the speakers of a foreign language that needs to be learned, has always been in the syllabus of English language teaching. Writing can serve various purposes ranging from reinforcing grammar to a major syllabus strand which aims to teach writing effectively. In the first case, students write mainly to enhance their command of grammar and vocabulary by resolving the problems they have and reinforcing the language. That is called writing for learning role. Writing for writing, on the other hand, mainly aims to teach students how to get better writers and to compose texts in different genres with various registers. It is inevitable to develop general language development in that process, but it is not the main purpose (Harmer, 2004: 31).

Being able to write effectively is not only an essential skill for the native speakers of a language but also for non-native speakers who are trying to master that language as a second or foreign language. Writing, one of the most important major language skills, is also fundamental for academic success. When assessing student success, most exams, irrespective of what they are testing, depend on students' writing proficiency to measure their knowledge (Harmer, 2004: 3). In Turkish context, in most English-medium universities, it is also highly important for students to master writing skill as they will need it for academic purposes.

Teacher written feedback has an indispensable role in the learning process of students in EFL writing classrooms. As process writing has become a commonly practiced method in writing classes, the importance attached to feedback has gained prominence. Instructors offer feedback to learners to show them how successful they are at accomplishing the goals of the writing activities. Learners may realize their weaknesses and strengths and consequently they are equipped with the guidance and instruction on how to write better (Bitchener, 2018: 1).

The deviation from product approaches and emergence of process approaches in writing made it necessary for writing instructors to modify the way they respond to students' papers. Product approaches giving little importance to writing as a skill consider writing a skill at the service of grammar. Writing has a supporting role for grammar and focuses on sentence structure, syntax and form. By imitating a model test, writers gain knowledge of the structure of a language. It is an area where grammar forms can be practiced for proficiency. Process approaches, on the other hand, by focusing on the processes writers go through instead of the final and finished product, attach emphasis on the recursive nature of writing. Feedback in the writing process is

indispensable as writing is shaped by the guiding help of it within this recursive nature. Revision, which is a central element to process approaches, occurs as a reaction to feedback that is provided by the reader. The writer, with the help of feedback from the reader on multiple drafts, is guided through the experience of writing and reach the final product (Keh, 1990). Traditionally, the teaching of writing has been dominated by a focus on product, which requires learners to practice writing by studying the language used in it, rather than the writing process (Harmer, 2004: 11).

A wide range of feedback variations exists in the related literature and practice. There have been numerous attempts to decide which strategies are effective when providing feedback to student writing. Written feedback varies in terms of its focus: form-focused feedback and content-focused feedback. While form focused feedback focuses on sentence level revision by changing words and correcting grammar and spelling mistakes, content-focused feedback focuses on the bigger picture of writing such as ideas and organization (Al-Jarrah, 2016: 99; Grami, 2005: 11).

When process writing became common practice in writing classes, the importance attached to written feedback received more attention. However, responding to student writing is a disappointing, tough and tedious activity on the part of writing teachers. Giving written feedback on student papers is seen crucial and as the main duty of the teacher. The rationale behind this belief is that feedback enables the teacher to attend students individually and communicate with students personally which is not always possible in classes and has an essential role in encouraging the learners (Ferris et al. 1997: 155).

A recipe for written corrective feedback is difficult to achieve, regarding its complex nature. The quest for the right way to practice written corrective feedback would also be illogical as the contexts and settings with their specific features differ greatly. One strategy which is quite effective in a context can be useless in another (Ellis, 2008: 106). How to give effective feedback is still a challenge for many writing teachers in varying contexts and there are a lot of questions about effective feedback that need to be answered (Hyland, 2009: 72). In a study in Turkish context, 850 EFL teachers were requested to reply to a piece of student writing which had various kinds of mistakes and it was found written teacher feedback mainly focused on grammatical accuracy of the student papers (Unaldı, 2017). Similarly, it was found, students expect their teachers to provide feedback regarding grammatical accuracy rather than other aspects of writing such as organization and style of writing. Teachers, it was found, paid more attention to surface level errors and they failed to deal with global errors or semantic errors (Kahraman and Yalyaç, 2015).

Teachers tend to think that providing feedback to students will result in improved performance in writing and in higher grades as they have something to work on. Some teachers are concerned mainly with surface level issues when responding to student papers. That practice, in turn, leads students to think a good piece of writing consists of grammatically correct sentences,

undervaluing content and organization which are in fact essential elements of writing. Focusing on the mechanical aspects of writing may create the impression that these are the most critical aspects of writing. Instead, the purpose, the meaning intended to be conveyed, the organization of the writing, and the arguments presented to serve the purpose should be viewed as important and will contribute to students' development of writing skills. Grammar may be a byproduct of writing but not the main goal of it (Sommers, 1982).

The debate regarding how effective corrective feedback was started with Truscott's well-known paper (1996) which claimed error correction was ineffective and called for total abolishment of it. Since then, studies have been carried out in an effort to find out whether this claim is rightful but yielded inconsistent results. Many studies yield conflicting results in literature. More research on the focus of feedback and writing quality is needed to better understand the relationship between these issues considering the fact that no conclusive evidence exists that shows clearly which kind of feedback should be preferred (Al-Jarrah, 2016: 99).

Considering the scarcity of research undertaken on "what supervisors provide feedback on, (i.e., what they say they provide feedback on and what they actually provide feedback on), how they provide the feedback, and what the students think about the feedback they receive" (Bitchener, 2018: 1), it is clear that there exists a need to further investigate these issues. The present study is inspired by these facts and sets out to research whether the type of written feedback prep school students receive produces an effect on their writing performance, attitudes to writing and writing anxiety in an EFL context, in a state university in Turkey.

Writing instruction has been generally dominated by an emphasis on form, in other words, mechanics and grammar for many years and generating content and ideas students express have been treated as if they were not important. When students have a command of various forms and structures in their writings, it is thought that they will automatically be ready to write. However, this command of form does not guarantee the strategies to develop ideas and skills to deal with subject matter. Although research proves the opposite, instruction on form in writing classes is still prevalent. This obsession with form is questioned and it is suggested that focus be somewhere else (Hillocks, 2005: 238).

Teachers tend to respond mainly to local issues such as errors in grammar and mechanics, forgetting the main reason of writing which is to communicate with others. However, writing has a communicative purpose in its heart. Writing does not only involve forming a number of sentences with correct use of grammar, but also students' ideas and opinions which show their understanding and reasoning. The message of a piece of writing should speak louder than the grammar of it. So attending to the content of work should be considered besides surface level problems in writing classes (Baghzou, 2011).

The situation in Turkey does not look much different. Writing classes are heavily dominated by a focus on syntactic aspects of writing. However, the communicative aspects of writing is attached little importance even though language teachers, with their best intentions, set out to teach writing in a process-oriented way (Kayaoğlu, 2009: 49). In a study to examine the actual feedback practices of written feedback in a Turkish university writing center, Qin and Karabacak (2013) reported that teachers provided a great deal of feedback on grammar errors and neglected more global aspects of writing. One of the reasons that make this study necessary is the need to create awareness on the writing teachers' practices and it is expected to contribute to the area in that sense.

To this end, this study aims to explore the effectiveness of receiving two types of written teacher feedback on EFL students' overall writing performance by comparing the effects of content-focused written feedback and traditional form-focused written feedback on student papers. Another aim of the study is to explore students' ideas about the two aforementioned written feedback strategies. Additionally, the study investigates whether the two feedback strategies have an impact on student attitudes towards writing and writing anxiety that they experience although that was not the main aim of the study.

The study attempts to answer one major and five minor research questions below:
1. What is the role of form-focused and content-focused written teacher feedback on improving EFL preparatory school students' writing abilities?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between the writing performance of students receiving form-focused feedback and those receiving content-focused feedback based on the type of feedback they receive?
3. Are there any attitudinal differences between form-focused feedback group and content-focused feedback group towards writing in English based on the type of feedback they receive?
4. Are there any differences between the control group and experimental group in terms of writing anxiety experienced by students based on the type of feedback they receive?
5. What are the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of form-focused written teacher feedback?
6. What are the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of content focused written teacher feedback?

The study will provide understanding towards the ongoing debates about the effectiveness of corrective feedback on students' writing performance. An understanding of which level of feedback, content level or surface level, is crucial to promoting improved writing.

It is also hoped that by changing the focus of written feedback and focusing on more global issues in students writing, students will change their ideas about writing which assumes that writing is a means of grammar practice and it is usually employed at the service of grammar. Realizing that there is a bigger picture, which is the message and the content of the piece of writing, will contribute to getting students to pay more attention to communicative role of writing.

The understanding of learners' stance towards teacher feedback may also present considerations for writing instructors for future implementations of feedback. Teachers who are informed about the needs and preferences of learners towards written teacher feedback may make better informed decisions about the best way of feedback provision.

The results of the study will also hold some implications for decision makers of feedback strategies at educational institutions. Schools can change their stance towards providing feedback which puts emphasis over mechanical aspects of writing based on the results of this study.

There is an ongoing debate about the effectiveness of different kinds of written teacher feedback and consensus on the need for further research. This study, inspired by that situation, aims to investigate the effects of two different kinds of written teacher feedback, namely form-focused feedback and content-focused feedback, on student writing proficiency, student perceptions towards these procedures, students' attitudes towards writing and writing anxiety. The study also aims to examine the differential effects of those different written teacher feedback strategies. It is assumed that by changing the traditional strategy of providing feedback on student writing, which is form-focused feedback, perceptions to teaching writing can be changed and student performance is expected to alter in a positive way. It is further hoped that writing, which is often considered a dull activity as it is more demanding than receptive skills, will be experienced as a more pleasant task by both teachers and students when writing is considered a means of communication, not only a set of grammatically correct sentences.

The present study, through a quasi-experimental design, aims to find out which type of the above-mentioned feedback strategies creates any improvement on the writing performance of students in general, helps to improve their attitudes to writing and lowers their writing anxiety.

The study took place at the Department of Foreign Languages at a state university, in Trabzon, Turkey. The study is unable to encompass the entire population of EFL learners. The sample size of the study is limited to 35 B1-level preparatory level students; therefore, the results could not be generalized to larger populations of EFL learners. The sampling procedure may also pose problems for generalizations. The study employs convenience sampling procedure as the researcher had limited resources and chose the classes she taught. The participants were 35 students from two intact classes. It was not possible to select participants randomly for the groups. Another

potential problem is that it is not totally possible to draw conclusions from the results of the study to lower or higher proficiency levels as the study includes only B1 proficiency level students. The conclusions may not be representative of all the EFL learners in Turkey. Finally, the duration of the study may be another concern. Since the study lasted 10 weeks, it may be difficult to draw conclusions regarding longer term effects of the implementations of feedback on students' writing.

The following are the operational definitions of the terms used throughout the study.

Feedback: Feedback is defined (Keh, 1990: 294) as a reader's any kind of evaluation, suggestion, comment and question to a writer with the purpose of providing the writer with the necessary guidance to revise their work.

Written corrective feedback (WCF): Written corrective feedback involves giving written feedback on students' writings to solve surface level problems of the work such as word order, word choice, capitalization, punctuation and spelling. Grammar is paid careful attention in order to achieve a good command of linguistic accuracy.

Form-focused feedback: Form-focused feedback draws students' attention to sentence level language problems focusing on local and mechanical errors such as errors of grammar, spelling, and vocabulary (Al-Jarrah, 2016: 99).

Content-focused feedback: Content feedback can be defined as message-related comments which concentrate on information conveyed by the author. The focus of the feedback is communicating the meaning. Expressing meaning has supremacy in language learning and the main objective in writing. This type of feedback identifies no errors, but responds to student writing on sentence and paragraph level in a meaningful way (Kepner, 1991).

Second language writing anxiety: Second language writing anxiety can be defined as a language-skill specific anxiety which is connected with writing (Cheng et al. 1999).

Writing performance: Writing performance refers to accomplishing a given task which demands language use rather than tests on language use. Any test that requires the test taker to perform actual writing rather than doing a test that consists of multiple-choice questions, for instance, can be regarded a performance test because the written work serves as a performance of writing (Weigle, 2000: 46, 47).

This study consists of three chapters. Prior to the first chapter, an introduction to the study which describes setting of the study and states the purpose and research questions that guide the

study along with limitations of the study are provided. The rest of the introduction establishes the outline of the study.

The first chapter begins with a brief discussion of the nature of writing and its distinct features. A brief overview of the recent history of writing approaches is presented. It will then go on to explain written teacher feedback and corrective feedback strategies used in practice. This chapter also reviews literature on feedback studies and writing anxiety.

The second chapter is concerned with the methodology employed for this study. It includes information on research design, setting, participants and procedure of the study. It also describes qualitative and quantitative methods which were employed to collect and analyze the data in detail.

The third chapter presents the findings from the data obtained from writing test, Writing Attitude Questionnaire, Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory and interviews along with discussion of these findings. The results of quantitative data are presented first, followed by qualitative findings focusing on the themes that become apparent.

The last chapter summarizes the conclusions drawn from the findings of the study and presents limitations of the study besides some pedagogical implications.

CHAPTER ONE

1. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1.1. Introduction

This chapter documents the relevant theoretical background and related studies on written teacher feedback. First, approaches to L2 writing are given in detail. Later, written feedback strategies are presented and research related to written teacher feedback is examined. Finally, research on student attitudes to written teacher feedback and writing anxiety are discussed.

1.2. Second/Foreign Language Writing

Writing skill is believed to be a difficult skill to acquire. Brown (2001: 334) makes use of a simile to explain the difficulty of acquiring writing skill. He notes that writing and swimming are similar in the way that both of the skills only develop when learned. People learn to walk and talk naturally but writing does not happen without explicit teaching. He maintains that writing is even difficult for native speakers of the language. For this reason, "just as there are non-swimmers, poor swimmers, and excellent swimmers, so it is for writers" (Brown, 2001: 334). Similarly, Horning (1987: 5) describes students learning to write as "strangers in a strange land" and suggests their affective filters can be lowered by the help and guidance of teachers. Robert L. Allen (cited in Horning, 1987: 13) compares written English to a second language suggesting that developing an ability to write is as hard as learning a second language. Then, what makes writing so difficult? Probably, comparing it to speaking may make the situation clearer. Horning (1987: 7) makes a distinction between spoken and written language. Referring to previous studies, he summarizes as follows:

- One's linguistic competency is more accurately presented by their written form of language. The written language does not only present the language itself more completely, but also shows the writer's capacity of writing.
- Writing is unique in terms of language structures used, the mental processes employed, the distance between the audience and the writer and the role of editing.
- The distance between the audience and the writer makes it more difficult to understand each other. In contrast to spoken language, where the speakers are present and can make use of non-verbal means when communication fails, in written language the writer does not have the chance to check comprehension, which makes writing even more difficult.

- Written texts require editing for perfection; however, conversation does not. Basic writers who do not have editing skills for precision of meaning may experience difficulty (Horning, 1987: 7-13).

Brown (2001: 335) explains the complex picture of writing for foreign language students: "The permanence and distance of writing, coupled with its unique rhetorical conventions, indeed make writing as different from speaking as swimming is from walking." According to Brown (2001: 341), a written text tends to be permanent. Unlike spoken language, writers no longer have the opportunity to correct their writing or to clarify meaning once the final form of the text is composed. Therefore, student writers may feel anxious handing written work to their teachers. Writing has also a decontextualized context. The writer only has words to convey meaning across. Readers cannot ask questions for clarification as in speaking. Linguistic differences between spoken language and written language also make writing difficult. For example, writing makes use of longer sentences connected by subordinating clauses and more complicated sentence structures. Moreover, the written language tends to use richer vocabulary and usually more terms than spoken language as writers have more time to write and they want to be more precise. Lastly, writing has a more formal tone than speaking. Different forms of writing must obey certain rules, in other words, writing conventions.

In academic contexts where an international language is used, writing and writing skill attract a lot of attention because written texts are indicators of student proficiency in exams, papers and assignments (Cumming, 2006: 10). Teaching writing, which is a central element in different educational contexts, has attracted a lot of attention and there have been numerous but often opposing ideas on the best ways of teaching it. Three main ways of teaching writing are: teaching practices which focus on form of the text, on the writer and on the reader. Influenced by these perspectives, product approaches, process approaches and genre approaches are the three dominant movements in the field of teaching writing. Hyland (2009: 7) highlights three prominent approaches to writing which are theories concerning texts, theories on the processes employed to create texts and theories on readers who add a social dimension to writing.

Theories towards writing in L2 have been around since ESL/EFL writing appeared as an area of study in education in the 1980s. A new theory does not replace a previous one. Instead, they are considered to be complementing each other to understand students' learning needs and teachers' responsibilities to provide effective writing teaching (Hyland, 2003: 2). It would be wrong to define rigid categories for approaches, actually these three approaches have some similarities and differences which enable them to complete each other (Hyland, 2008: 1).

1.3. Approaches to Writing

1.3.1. Product Approach to Writing

As described by Pincas (1982, cited in Badger and White, 2000: 153) product approaches consider that writing should be mainly about grammatical knowledge, correct use of vocabulary, and arrangement of words and connectors in a sentence. Learning to write is described as assisted imitation in which a stimulus is presented by the teacher for students to respond to. A product approach includes four steps. In the first stage, familiarization, students realize specific features of a text by studying a sample. In the controlled and guided writing sections, students practice writing skills to get ready for the next step. In the last step, free writing, students are expected to produce a final product using their writing skills.

Text oriented approaches see writing as textual products. Writing classes aim to train students to be accurate in grammar and writing is considered to be "an extension of grammar teaching" (Hyland, 2009: 8). Inspired by structuralism and Chomsky's Transformational Grammar, this approach considers texts as context free objects, words, sentences and clauses combined orderly by grammatical rules and they can be interpreted without the context, writer or reader. Influenced by this approach, teachers in that case tend to give error correction on grammar mistakes when responding to student papers, giving priority to accuracy and neglecting the communicative purpose of writing (Hyland, 2009: 8-10). However, Susser (1994: 36) criticize writing instruction which is heavily dominated by grammar instruction which highlights the correct form rather than communication of ideas. Many textbooks, he argues, promote only controlled writing and error correction for lower levels of proficiency.

Hyland (2008: 3) criticizes product oriented approaches to writing because grammatically accurate writing is only one aspect of good writing; however, it does not guarantee communication which is the main purpose of writing. If grammatically correct texts could ensure communication, there would be no interpretation problems over legal documents or different understandings of the same text. The mission of the teacher cannot be teaching students accuracy as the text itself will not be adequate to transfer the ideas.

1.3.2. Process Approach to Writing

Murray (1972: 14) is critical of the teaching writing as a product since most English teachers are trained to teach in that way and suggests that teachers teach "unfinished writing and glory in its unfinishedness" (Murray (1972: 15) by enabling students to discover the world through language. Murray (1972: 15) maintains that learners should be respected for their pursuit of truth, not for the final product they produce, or for the grade given to that product. Readers have to listen attentively

for writers' words and voices. Teachers are motivators and designers of settings where learners could involve in writing process for themselves.

Process approach rose as a reaction to product approach in writing. Educational activities devote time and energy mainly to rhetorical forms, and students silently pass their assignments to teachers in class (Susser, 1994: 34). Instead of focusing on only the final product, students discover ideas, plan, draft, revise and edit their work in process-oriented approaches. Unlike product approaches in writing, process approaches put less emphasis on grammar and text structure knowledge while mostly being concerned with stages writers go through such as planning, drafting, and editing in writing. The role of the teacher is to facilitate writing by helping students to realize their potential (Badger and White, 2000: 153). The writing teacher should give guidance to students in the writing process, by aiding them to develop strategies, to generate drafts and refine ideas (Hyland, 2003: 12).

There are numerous "incarnations of this perspective" (Hyland, 2003: 10) but its primary emphasis is on cognitive processes to writing and it stresses student abilities to plan, compose, revise and evaluate their writing (Hyland, 2003: 10). This process is not a rigid linear sequence but an iterative one so students can move forward and backward to stages and revisit the stages to make necessary changes while composing the text (Tribble, 1996: 39). Steele (2004, cited in Hasan and Akhand, 2010: 79) highlights eight stages of process writing:

1. Brainstorming stage: Students generate ideas through brainstorming and discussing.
2. Planning stage: Students write down ideas and decide whether the ideas discussed in the previous stage are useful.
3. Mind-mapping stage: Students arrange their ideas by means of a mind map to see the relationship between these ideas.
4. Composing the first draft stage: Students produce the initial draft of their writings.
5. Peer feedback stage: Students exchange drafts to read each other's papers. In his stage students realize they have an audience for what they write and may improve their own writing.
6. Editing stage: Students receive their papers and improve their papers using peer feedback.
7. Final draft stage: Students write the final draft.
8. Evaluation and teacher feedback: The teacher evaluates students' final drafts and gives feedback.

1.3.3. Genre Approaches to Writing

Genre approaches may bear some similarity to product approaches as both approaches regard writing as largely linguistic. However, they differ in their emphasis on social contexts in which

writing changes with respect to different situations. Different genres call for different kinds of knowledge and skills (Badger and White, 2000: 155). Genre is a term which classifies a group of texts together. Readers realize if a text is a recipe or an article at once and may be able to write a parallel text (Hyland, 2008: 4). Hyland (2009: 15) provides a detailed definition of genre: Genre is a term that groups texts and shows the way writers adapt their language to recurring situations. The elements of a particular genre make it distinct from other genres. Different genres have different purposes, formats, linguistic features and styles. The texts and contexts where they appear are categorized by genre (Hyland, 2009: 15).

Purpose is the most important issue in genre writing. Different genres are produced to achieve different purposes such as recipes, personal letters, and song lyrics. Except for purpose, audience, tone, and organization of the writing are of significance in genre approaches (Badger and White, 2000: 155). Writing instructors who adopt a genre approach surpass content structure of the composition and processes employed to produce that work and regard writing as a pursuit to reach readers. Consequently, instructors' role is to teach inexperienced writers how to use specific and different patterns in order to produce compositions. Writers do not only write for the sake of writing, rather they try to accomplish a purpose (Hyland, 2003: 18).

The main stages of genre approach suggested by Hyland (2008: 6) are as follows:
1. Understanding the purpose of the genre and the setting it is situated in.
2. Providing a model of the genre and analyze the key features of the specific genre such as the main tenses used and the vocabulary specific to that genre.
3. Students work collectively and write a parallel text based on the model text.
4. Students construct their text independently while the teacher is monitoring them.
5. The teacher relates the text to other genres.

1.4. Feedback and the Role of Teacher Feedback in Writing

A number of definitions exist for teacher feedback. Hattie and Timperley (2007: 100) define it simply as information coming from a parent, teacher, peer, parent, or book which covers aspects of performance or understanding. It usually follows instruction that presents knowledge and skills. According to Keh (1990: 294) feedback is an essential feature of process approach and is the information readers give to writers to guide them for the revision of the text.

Giving feedback to student papers is one of the main tasks of teachers in any learning context. Instructing and evaluating students' progress are among teacher responsibilities. Feedback is a tool which teachers can utilize to show how successful students are at meeting the expectations and the ultimate goals of the activities they have participated in. Feedback can give students an idea

about their strengths and weaknesses, what they have already accomplished and what they need to accomplish, and guidance and instruction on how to do so (Bitchener, 2018: 1).

Information processing perspectives in SLA maintain that language learning and acquisition can take place when declarative knowledge changes into procedural knowledge with the help of input and feedback on written work (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012a: 12). Second language information processing models see second language acquisition as "a building up of knowledge systems that can eventually be called on automatically by learners" (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012a: 12). Learning occurs when controlled knowledge turns into automatized knowledge with practice and repeated activation. Explicit instruction and corrective feedback have an important role in the controlled phrase and make it possible for learners to move to automatization stage (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012a: 12-13).

Based on the socio-cultural perspective, language learning takes place through social interactions among individuals. When individuals have the chance to interact with other individuals who are more knowledgeable than them such as teachers and learners with higher levels of language proficiency, they increase their chances to develop their language. Corrective feedback provided by teachers or peers can lead to higher level of knowledge (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012a: 18).

1.5. Hypotheses that Support the Vital Role of Feedback in Language Learning

Three hypotheses which emphasize the facilitative role of feedback in language learning process from cognitive perspectives are Noticing Hypothesis, Output Hypothesis and Interaction Hypothesis.

1.5.1. Noticing Hypothesis

Noticing Hypothesis, as identified by Schmidt (1990, 2001 cited in Schmidt 2012: 27), maintains that language learning takes place when input is consciously noticed. People tend to learn something more when they direct their attention to that specific thing and fail to learn much if they do not pay attention. Schmidt (2012: 27) maintains that when input from the environment is noticed, it turns into intake in language acquisition. It advocates that negative feedback, by enabling learners to see the difference between their inter-language and target language, helps learners to improve their current state. Noticing Hypothesis proposes that attending to and realizing "linguistic features of the input" (Schmidt, 2012: 30) is crucial to transform these forms into intake for learning. Simply correcting the learner's mistakes will not yield any positive results when the learner is not aware that s/he is corrected. Learners need to compare their own output to target input

to eliminate errors. Conscious attention to form is needed to acquire grammatical forms. Noticing the gap between their product and the targeted forms is the initial step of fixing errors (Schmidt, 2012: 30). Feedback has a facilitative role in assisting learners to become aware of the inconsistencies between what they have already achieved and what needs to be achieved. Corrective feedback by highlighting learners' individual problems related to language serves as a tool for noticing as feedback prompts learners to realize the gap between their language use and the correct forms which, in turn, brings about restructuring of learners' grammatical forms (Kim, 2004: 3).

1.5.2. Output Hypothesis

Swain (1985) suggests Comprehensible Input Hypothesis by Krashen cannot completely explain language acquisition, and input on its own is not sufficient to develop target-like forms in productive skills. Swain noticed that even learners were exposed to comprehensible input for years and were quite similar to their native counterparts in listening and reading; they were behind in speaking and writing. She concludes that comprehensible input was not able to explain the whole picture of language learning and besides comprehensible input, learners need to produce the language and modify their output for accuracy and fluency. Learners need to change the output when they notice the message does not get across precisely and coherently (Swain 1985, 1995 cited in Birkner, 2016: 20). Swain and Lapkin (1995: 373-374) explain the proposal developed by Swain: Learners may become aware of the problems with their language use through internal or external feedback. The problems encountered are not an end in themselves but are a springboard which will make the learners change their output. The learner activates mental processes that are needed to modify the output rather than the ones that are needed to understand product.

Swain (2005) mentions three functions that output has in language learning:
1. It helps learners to realize the gap between what message they intend to convey and what they actually can achieve.
2. It may serve as a medium by which learners can experiment whether their hypotheses are correct.
3. It may assist learners to develop a deeper understanding of how second language functions along with knowledge about forms and grammar rules.

Feedback is considered valuable in language acquisition as learners produce faulty language because of their incorrect hypotheses and wrong generalizations about language in language learning process. Learners' attention is drawn to deficiencies in their performance by means of feedback. Learners notice the problem in their output through either internal or external feedback, which in turn leads learners to assess their language production and produce alternatives (Swain and Lapkin, 1995: 384, 386). Feedback and output are closely linked in a way that feedback which

is provided as error correction or metalinguistic information assists learners to improve accuracy of their language production (Donesch-jezo, 2011: 14).

1.5.3. Interaction Hypothesis

Interaction Hypothesis by Long (1996) advocates that second language acquisition can be facilitated by interaction. While interacting, learners are provided with feedback which will lead them to modify their utterances to negotiate meaning. "Negotiated interaction can occur when two speakers work together to arrive at mutual understanding of each other's utterances" (Mackey *et al*, 2000: 471).

Language learners, when producing the target language, receive messages about correctness and incorrectness of their discourse from their interlocutors. When breakdowns in their communication occur, the language learner tries to modify her/his language to achieve negotiated meaning and resolve the misunderstanding. The efforts to overcome the problems in their communication may lead to language learning by drawing learners' attention to erroneous parts of their language and making them informed of the discrepancies between their language production and the correct use of language. Corrective feedback, one way to negotiate the meaning, motivates students to alter their language production to convey the message, which in turn aids language development (Long, 1996 cited in Kregar: 2011).

1.6. Feedback Strategies

The research literature and practice is abundant with a broad range of feedback variations. The differences in the feedback practice can be roughly categorized under six variables: type of the feedback (direct or indirect), focus of the feedback (form-focused or content-focused), tone of the feedback (criticism or appraisal), mode of the feedback (oral, written or computer-mediated), source of the feedback (teacher-, self-, peer- or computer-generated) and comprehensiveness of the feedback (focused versus unfocused feedback) (Biber et al., 2011: 7-9).

1.6.1. Type of Feedback (Direct versus Indirect Feedback)

Direct feedback, which is explained by Bitchener and Ferris (2012b: 131,132), may include identifying the position of the error, providing a correct form, crossing out the erroneous form, adding items instead of the omitted ones and/or providing metalinguistic explanation for the error. An example of direct feedback practice can be seen below:

Figure 1: An Example of Direct Feedback Practice

has   at least   lives
Everyone ~~have~~ been a liar^ once in their ~~life~~. People who lie intentionally to

harm others are bad people ^and their lies are harmful too. However, there are lies
told
that are ~~done~~ with good intentions. So, there are times that lies are appropriate.
The only person who can
A lie is either a good or bad one based upon the liar's intention. ~~Only one person~~
~~can~~ really tell whether a lie is intended to harm or do good is the one who told
the lie.

Source: Bitchener and Ferris (2012b: 148)

In indirect feedback, errors are identified in the text but corrections or solution to the problem are not provided. It is expected that the learner will correct the erroneous forms or structures. Underlining, circling and highlighting can be used to indicate the error. The number of errors can be also written in the margin of the text to inform students of errors without telling exactly where the mistakes are (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012b: 132). There is an example of indirect feedback practice below. In that example, feedback is provided by underlining the grammatically problematic parts in the writing. The learner is expected to attend to the feedback and correct the errors:

Figure 2: An Example of Indirect Feedback Practice

Everyone <u>have</u> been a liar once in their life. People who lie intentionally to harm others are bad <u>people and</u> their lies are harmful too. However, there are lies that are <u>done</u> with good <u>intention</u>. So, there are times that lies are appropriate. A lie is either a good or bad one <u>base</u> upon the liar's intention. Only one person can really tell whether a lie is intended to harm or do good.

Source: Bitchener and Ferris (2012b: 149)

Lee (2017: 69) presents an inclusive list of direct and indirect written corrective feedback strategies. Direct feedback strategies may involve locating errors directly by underlining, pointing, providing the correct form, locating the error, providing the correct answer and/or providing metalinguistic explanation. Indirect feedback can be provided by locating the error directly, by locating the error and providing an error code, by placing a mark on the margin of the paper to indicate there is an error without pointing or underlining the error, by writing the number of errors in the margin, and /or by providing a metalinguistic clue without implicitly locating and correcting the error.

Figure 3: Written Corrective Feedback Strategies

Example	Locate error directly	Provide correct answer	Provide metalinguistic clue (error code)/explanation
Direct WCF			
(A) Yesterday I was went to church.	✓	✓	X
to	✓	✓	X
(B) Yesterday I went church.			
∧			
went	✓	✓	X
(C) Yesterday I go to church.			
went	✓	✓	✓
(D)Yesterday I go to church.			
Explanation			
You should use the simple past tense here because you are describing a past event.			
Indirect WCF			
(E)Yesterday I go to church.	✓	X	X
V	✓	X	✓
(F)Yesterday I go to church.			
❶	✓	X	✓
(G) Yesterday I go to church.			
❶ You should use the simple past tense here because you are describing a past event.			
(H) Yesterday I go to church. *	X	X	X
(An asterisk in the margin means that there is one error in that line)			
(I) Yesterday I go for church.2	X	X	X
(2 = 2 errors in that line)			
(J) Yesterday I go to church. V	X	X	✓
(V = one "verb" error in that line)			

Source: Lee (2017: 69)

The research on which kind of feedback is more effective in the written accuracy of learners is inconclusive. Several studies have suggested that indirect written corrective feedback worked more effectively than direct written corrective feedback (Lalande, 1982; Rahimi and Asadi, 2014; Ghandi and Maghsoudi, 2014; Ferris 2006). Other studies have demonstrated that learners benefited more from direct feedback (Ellis *et al*, 2008; Chandler, 2003; Bitchener *et al*, 2005, Bitchener, 2008). There are also studies which found no significant difference between the two feedback strategies (Robb et al., 1986; Ferris and Roberts, 2001).

1.6.2. Focus of Feedback (Focus on Form versus Focus on Content)

Written teacher feedback may also vary in terms of its primary focus. Montgomery and Baker (2007: 83) mention a comparison between global and local feedback depending on what written feedback focuses on in the text. Local feedback deals with issues related to form such as grammar, mechanics, spelling and punctuation while global feedback refers to issues related to ideas, content and organization. A similar distinction is made by Al-Jarrah (2008: 99): Form-focused feedback

draws students' attention to sentence-level language problems focusing mainly on errors of grammar, spelling, and vocabulary. However, content-based feedback prioritizes the quality of content and organization in writers' texts. The focus of teachers is the parts of the writing which fail to convey meaning and logical inconsistencies in texts. Therefore, they provide comments to writers for revision but ignore grammatical errors as they have doubts about the effectiveness of error correction (Park, 2006: 6).

Teacher feedback may focus on global issues of writing, some of which are content, development of ideas and global structure of the writing, while it can also aim to improve local issues of writing such as local structure, word order and accuracy (Ferris, 2003: 12).

Form-focused feedback, in other words grammar correction, has been a commonly exploited method in writing classes. Written teacher feedback is provided on the grammatical features of students' works and it aims to make students aware of their grammatical errors and prevent reoccurrence of those grammar errors in their future writings. The effectiveness of the form-focused feedback was questioned by a number of researchers. Instead of paying attention to local issues of writing such as grammar, it was suggested that focus be more on global issues of writing such as content, organization and development of ideas. The feedback which focuses on global features of writing is called content-focused feedback, in other words, meaning-focused feedback (Park, 2006: 2).

Kepner (1991) defines content feedback as message-related comments to assess global meanings expressed by the author. The focus of the feedback is communicating meaning. Expressing meaning is the main motivating drive in language learning. This type of feedback identifies no errors, but responds to student writing on sentence and paragraph level.

Zamel (1987: 700) reports that L2 writing teachers are likely to read and respond to student writing as "a series of separate pieces at the sentence level or even clause level, rather than as a whole unit of discourse". Teachers are so absorbed in language-related issues that they attend to these errors, failing to notice that there exist more serious meaning-related problems that they pay no attention to.

1.6.3. Tone of Feedback (Criticism or Appraisal)

Another area of research is the attitude and stance of the feedback provider, the tone, when they are providing feedback. Tone of the feedback expresses the message, in other words, the reader's stance towards the piece of writing. While it may be encouraging and positive, it may be negative and demotivate the writer. The tone is reflected through word choice and style. When

giving feedback, choosing the words which create a feeling that learners are the composers of the text and mistakes are welcomed in learning process are important (Brookhart, 2017: 33).

Opting the suitable language and style to accomplish to achieve goals such as giving information and building relationships with writers is clearly influential when responding to student papers. Although students appreciate positive comments, they expect to receive constructive critical comments rather than commonplace sayings as shown by research. Most teachers know the potential detrimental impacts of negative comments on students' motivation and self-confidence and this understanding may lead teachers to avoid some issues which call for criticism directly (Hyland and Hyland, 2006a). It is suggested by Hyland and Hyland (2001) that teachers look for ways to lessen their heavy criticism and suggestions by using more indirect ways to point out their mistakes such as hedging and using question forms. However, this indirectness can sometimes result in misunderstanding and confusion for students. It is, then, relatively important to keep in mind that being positive when criticism is needed is not always a good idea because students may think their incorrect use of language and concepts are correct. Another important point is that students may have an assumption that any work they produce, good or bad, is acceptable, should be praised and that they do no need to improve their work. They may even think their teacher is not smart enough to realize their mistakes (Brookhart, 2017: 34, 35).

1.6.4. Mode of Feedback (Oral, Written and Computer-Mediated Feedback)

It is possible to deliver teacher feedback in various modalities. Feedback can be provided written, spoken or written and spoken together (Nation, 2008: 139).

Written feedback can be given in various forms such as statements, questions, requests, imperatives, advice, positive or negative comments, corrections, hedges, general or text-specific comments and so forth. Written commentary can also be provided as marginal notes or end comment (Ferris, 1997: 231). Written feedback, due to its lasting nature, provides a better picture of student progress and acts as a reminder for future writings (Nation, 2008: 139).

"Feedback dialogues" which include exchanging opinions, comments and questions between teachers and students can be conducted in a spoken or written way. This communication is useful in a way that it makes it possible for students to narrow the gap between teachers' and students' understanding. Students can ask for clarification for the feedback the teacher gave (Lillis and Swann, 2005: 121, 122). Ferris (2014) highlights that oral feedback in teacher-student writing conferences is advisable to answer individual student needs as students will have a chance to ask questions and meaning-related problems. Ambiguities are discussed as well. In these one-to-one conferences, students can diagnose their strengths and weaknesses; furthermore, they may generate ideas to revise their paper effectively (Lee, 2017: 71). Oral feedback creates a dialog between the

learner and the source of feedback. Oral feedback may draw learner's attention better and more effectively than written feedback (Nation, 2008: 139).

Computer-mediated feedback can be realized in two ways: synchronous writing or asynchronous writing. In synchronous writing, learners and teachers connect in real time through discussion software. On the other hand, in asynchronous writing, the interaction between students and teachers takes place in a delayed way. E-mail is an example of how asynchronous writing is employed in learning. Computer-mediated communication makes the classes more student-centered and increases student participation (Hyland and Hyland, 2006b: 93).

1.6.5. Source of Feedback (Teacher, Self-Correction, Peer and Computer-Generated)

When we think of written feedback, we tend to think immediately of teachers as the source of feedback. However, written feedback may come from a range of different sources: teachers, classmates, self-evaluation or it can even be automated (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012b: 154). The teacher is believed to be the most reliable and important source which provides feedback (Lee, 2017: 58). Peer feedback can lighten the teacher's work load. Moreover, peer feedback is appreciated as it creates a sense of audience for writers and boosts "metacognitive awareness of writing process and the qualities of good writing" (Nation, 2008: 139).

Feedback can come from peers in writing classes. Through peer feedback, students can get involved in feedback activities and have a role of providing feedback instead of only receiving it. With meaningful and productive feedback, students help their friends improve their writing while developing an ability to revise, criticize and assess their own writing. Here, the teacher is not considered as the only provider of feedback (Lee, 2017: 90). Students have the power to provide feedback and control their own writing. This, in turn, leads students to become more autonomous and self-regulated in their learning process (Lee, 2017: 90). Utilizing peer feedback may reduce the teacher's load and is also very valuable in assisting student writers have a sense of audience (Nation, 2008: 139). The peers who read their friends' writings have opportunities to learn more about writing by assessing others' compositions (Keh, 1990: 296). Similar benefits of peer feedback have been mentioned by Ferris (2013: 15) as well. Although there exists doubt and concern about teacher feedback among scholars, peer feedback is widely appreciated in writing classes. Ferris (2013: 15) suggests that exposing students to a more diverse and authentic audience is possible through peer feedback. Peer feedback has a number of pedagogical benefits: assessing peers' writings improves students' critical thinking skills, helps them to evaluate their own writing, creates a less threatening atmosphere and it certainly decreases the work load of the teacher (Ferris, 2013: 15).

Another advantage of peer feedback is that feedback from peers is more likely to be at the student's own level regarding their language development (Keh, 1990: 296). The significance of peer feedback can be better explained with Vygotsky's sociocultural theory that argues that "learners can only acquire information within their zone of proximal development" (Lundstrom and Baker, 2009: 31).

In EFL writing classes, written feedback usually comes from teachers as teachers are considered to be authorities who have the capacity to correct student errors in the classroom. However, students themselves can be the source of the feedback as well. Self-revision or self-correction which requires students to revise and edit their own writings without feedback from the teacher or their peers peer is thought to be another promising area for foreign language writing since it requires leaners to be cognitively active and produce a product at the same time (Ortega, 2009: 239). "The use of self-assessment encourages metacognitive awareness of the writing process and the qualities of good writing" (Nation, 2008: 139). After reviewing previous research, Ferris (2003: 82) concludes that rereading and rewriting activities on their own are not expected to result in great changes, however they can help learners to improve their writing.

Checklists can assist students to evaluate and improve their work by reminding them of things to consider in writing. Nation (2008: 144) suggests a checklist for self-evaluation to use in formal writing:

- Is your main argument clearly stated?
- Is it presented very early in the writing?
- Are the supports for this argument clearly signaled?
- Are there enough sub-headings?
- If you look only at the sub-headings, do they cover the main ideas in the assignment?
- Have you checked carefully for spelling and grammar errors?
- Are all the references in your text also in the list of references?
- Are your references complete and do they follow a consistent format?
- Have you kept within the word limits of the assignment?

Computer-generated feedback has emerged as a substitute to feedback provided by teachers or peers since responding to student writing takes a massive amount of time and entails problems. Automated writing evaluation programs such as *Criterion* and software such as *Grammarly* which give feedback on language issues are available to learners (Lee, 2017: 60). Ellis (2009: 103) proposes advantages of computer generated, electronic feedback as follows: It reduces the dependence on the teacher since the teacher is not the only one who has right and ability to give feedback in the class and as the teacher's judgment of student mistakes may be fallible, it may provide more systematic and reliable feedback.

1.6.6. Comprehensiveness of the Feedback (Focused versus Unfocused Feedback)

Feedback which targets "specific error types or patterns" (Ferris, 2011: 30) is described as focused feedback. Error categories may be determined before the feedback provision. The number of categories can change from two or three error types to fifteen. The errors students frequently make can be a basis in deciding which errors to focus on. On the other hand, unfocused feedback can be described as feedback which deals with the "correction of any and all problems observed in the text without a preconceived feedback approach in mind" (Ferris, 2011: 30).

One disadvantage of unfocused feedback over focused feedback is that adopting a comprehensive method and focusing on all student errors is likely to overload students with lots of information to manage and consequently dealing with feedback can be a daunting task for students (Bitchener 2008: 109). Besides, when the number of error categories is kept small, noticing and understanding the feedback on students' part will be easier (Ellis et al., 2008). However, providing feedback on only limited error categories is likely to impede student progress on various types of errors that they make and adopting a more unfocused approach to written feedback may give students more advantage in the long run (Ferris, 2011: 30). Learners' language level may be taken into consideration in deciding which approach to employ. An unfocused approach in written corrective feedback can be preferred with advanced students who do not have many errors in writing while it is recommendable to have a more focused approach and be selective with lower level students so that students can benefit more from teacher feedback to develop linguistic accuracy (Bitchener and Ferris, 2012, cited in Lee 2017: 67). Another factor which influences the decision on whether to be selective or comprehensive while giving feedback is the type of the error. Ferris (2011: 36) categories errors as treatable and untreatable. Treatable errors are "related to linguistic structure that occurs in a rule governed way" (Ferris, 2011: 36), e.g. verb form, verb tense, subject-verb agreement and article errors. They are considered treatable because learners may be directed to a grammar book or they may be provided rules to fix the error. On the other hand, untreatable errors are "idiosyncratic and the student will need to utilize acquired knowledge of the language to self-correct it" (Ferris, 2011: 36). Examples of untreatable errors are errors of word choice and word order. Teachers tend to give indirect feedback when errors are treatable by students themselves and teachers are inclined to give direct feedback when the errors are untreatable.

1.7. Effective Feedback

Despite the fact that language teachers spend a large amount of their time reading and giving feedback to student writings, disappointment of students and the teacher and uncertainty about the effectiveness of the feedback still prevails that area (Ferris, 2014: 6). Focusing only on errors students make would not have any positive effect on students' confidence and would not motivate

students. Generic comments are also unlikely to help students as students do not understand how well they are doing and how to fix the problems in their writing. The written product as well as the writing process should be valued (Lee, 2017: 57).

Traditionally, teachers allocate a lot of their valuable time to responding to errors on student writing, pushing content, organization, genre and style into the background. It is necessary to transform traditional feedback activity to improve learning, to encourage them to write and to help them become independent writers and, in line with this aim, teachers should not only correct errors but also give mediated learning experience through formative feedback (Lee, 2017: 57).

The number one reason why teachers give written feedback is that they aim to reduce the gap between present understanding of learners and target forms. Feedback can be considered effective if it tells the learners what they try to achieve, whether they are on the right path to achieve and what needs to be done to achieve (Hattie and Timperley, 2007: 86).

Lee (2017: 75-78) suggests eight principles for effective feedback:

- Less is more: Instead of focusing on every error on a student's paper, teachers need to be selective as a lot of teacher feedback is not helpful and cannot be processed by the students. The decision about what to focus on can be made according to student needs and instructional goals.
- Responding to errors selectively: Teachers must attend to the most frequently recurring errors and the errors which students can correct on their own after receiving feedback.
- Using feedback to detect strengths and weaknesses: Feedback should inform students of areas that need improvement and strengths in writing, as well.
- Having a balanced approach: Teacher feedback should not be only error focused. It should also cover content, language, organization and style.
- Being clear and constructive: When feedback is clear and constructive, it is possible for students to evaluate their own writing better.
- Providing individualized feedback: The needs of students may determine the best practices of the feedback in the writing classes. While stronger students may prefer unfocused feedback, weaker students may find hedges confusing.
- Using feedback to motivate students: Sandwiching the negative comments with positive feedback will make it possible to build positive relationships between students and the teacher, and they will have a higher level of motivation.
- Integrating teaching, learning and assessment by means of feedback: Feedback provided should be in line with the instruction learners received, tell them what to do to improve their subsequent writing and lead learners to revise.

1.8. Research on the Effectiveness of Written Teacher Feedback

Corrective feedback is still a disagreeable topic in second language writing research. Although considerable research has been conducted on the effectiveness of written corrective feedback (henceforth WCF) including different types of feedback, agreement on whether WCF is really effective and if so what the best practices of it are to improve students' written performance (Liu and Brown, 2015: 66).

Truscott (1996) published a controversial paper on the effectiveness of corrective feedback. He asserts that corrective feedback needs to be abandoned in the language classrooms as it is ineffective to improve students' accuracy and has detrimental effects on students. Truscott claims that correcting students' errors is a futile activity. Teachers correct students' grammar mistakes believing it will improve their accuracy in their future writings. He provides some reasons why it does not work. One of the reasons he puts forward is that language learning is a complex phenomenon and language teachers do not completely understand why students make these specific mistakes. They cannot provide adequate explanations for the error because it is difficult even for natives of the language to discuss the underlying rules. Another reason is that even if they receive feedback on the error, students may not understand the principle underlying the rule and continue doing the same mistake in the subsequent writings. He also claims that second language acquisition follows a natural order. The grammar correction does not respect that sequence of acquisition. Grammar points corrected by the teacher are usually beyond students' level. When giving corrective feedback, teachers do not consider the current stage of students in terms of grammar. Grammar structures are acquired gradually by students and it is not a "sudden discovery" (Truscott, 1996). He further notes that studies conducted in L1 showed that grammar correction does not necessarily lead to correct use of grammar structures in subsequent writings. Moreover, grammar correction has a detrimental effect on students' attitudes and takes time and energy in writing classes. Additionally, seeing their mistakes demotivates students. He states that correction also affects how complex students' writings are based on studies of Kepner (1991) and Sheppard (1992). In order to write correct sentences, student write simple sentences. Truscott concludes that grammar correction does not have a place in writing classes.

Truscott's paper criticizing grammar correction caused a large number of discussions among scholars. Ferris (1999) evaluated the points suggested by Truscott one by one and concluded that Truscott's claim that grammar correction needs to be left is "premature and overly strong" (Ferris, 1999: 1). He indicates that Truscott's article does not have a clear definition of grammar correction. It is vague what type of grammar correction Truscott was discussing. There are many different ways of grammar correction. Some of them may be ineffective but certainly, as research shows, there are effective methods to correct grammar. Ferris further claimed that Truscott over-stated the

negative findings of the previous research on grammar correction to support his own arguments (Ferris, 1999: 4, 5)

Ferris (1999: 8) provides three reasons why teachers should continue correcting errors of their students:

1. Students favor error correction. They value receiving correction from teachers.
2. The grammar errors on students' papers also impact the overall quality of their papers.
3. Providing feedback on linguistic errors helps students become more autonomous in editing their work.

A multitude of research has focused on manipulating the type of written feedback learners receive to find out which type of WCT is effective in improving students' writing. That strand of research is related to the present study which investigates the effectiveness of two types of written teacher feedback. A number of studies have revealed that WCT has positive impacts on student writing (Ashwell, 2000; Hyland, 2003; Fathman and Whalley, 1990; Ferris, Bitchener 2008; Buckinham and Ekinci 2017; Ferris, 1995; Ferris et al., 2000).

In a case study, Hyland investigated 6 ESL students at an English proficiency course at a university in New Zealand to find the amount of teacher feedback that focused on form, how learners attended to feedback and whether they improved the areas addressed by feedback. She studied the effects of form-focused written teacher feedback on revised student papers. Two classes including students from different backgrounds and proficiency levels were chosen for the study and were observed for 14 weeks. The results of the study suggest that the majority of teacher written feedback focused on form although teachers' perceptions of their approaches were different. Interviews with teachers revealed that teachers valued process and genre approaches with a focus on writing rather than grammar. The study also showed students relied on teacher written form-focused feedback while revising their paragraphs and they were successful at correcting their mistakes in three error categories. The feedback which focused on errors proved to have positive short term effects on students' writings (Hyland, 2003).

Fathman and Whalley (1990) examined intermediate level ESL students from different language backgrounds, mainly Asian and Hispanic, to see the effectiveness of teacher written feedback which focused on grammatical errors and the teacher feedback which focused on content in improving students' writing in rewrites. The students were assigned randomly into 4 groups. Each group received a different kind of feedback treatment: the first group received no feedback, the second group received grammar feedback only, the third group received content feedback only, and the fourth group received grammar and content feedback simultaneously. It was observed that all the groups, irrespective of the feedback treatment, had fewer grammar errors in the rewrites. However, students improved significantly only when they received feedback on grammar errors.

The groups, irrespective of the feedback type, also made progress in the content of their writings in the rewrites. However, students improved the content more if they received feedback on content. It was also found grammar feedback and content feedback affected student writing positively, no matter whether each type of feedback was given one at a time or the two types of feedback were given simultaneously.

In a similar attempt, Ashwell (2000) manipulated the order in which students receive teacher written feedback to test whether the recommended content-then-form feedback is the most effective way to improve student writings. 50 students in two writing classes in a Japanese university took part in the study. Students were assigned to one of four groups: The first group was the content-then-form group, the second group was the form-then-content group, the third group was the form and content group, and the fourth group was the no feedback group. The three groups which received feedback were required to produce 3 drafts for a single writing topic. Form feedback was given as indirect feedback and errors were identified without overt correction. Content feedback was given on global issues such as ideas, organization, paragraphing and connecting ideas. Both accuracy and content quality of the drafts were assessed. The comparisons of accuracy scores and contents scores of the groups revealed that no major differences existed among the three groups which received feedback. The order in which students received feedback was not found to make a difference in improving their formal accuracy or the content of their writing. It was also found that students' accuracy improved better when feedback on form was provided when compared to no feedback group. However, improvement of content was less likely to be influenced by feedback as no feedback group showed improvement in content in subsequent drafts. It was also observed that students attended to form feedback more than they did to content feedback.

Chandler (2003) carried out a quasi-experiment to find out whether error correction improved grammatical accuracy and fluency of students in subsequent writings. The participants were 31 international undergraduate students from music majors. Two groups were instructed by the same teacher in the same manner. The experimental group had to revise their paper and correct the errors indicated by the teacher before starting the next assignment. The control group, however, was not required to revise the writings upon teacher feedback and wrote the second drafts of the assignments at the end of the term. The accuracy of the student writings was determined by counting the number of errors, and the fluency of the students was determined by the number of words written in a given time. The experimental group which received error feedback and was required to correct their errors improved significantly while the control group which did not correct errors after teacher feedback did not write more accurately. Having students correct their errors proved to be effective in that study as students improved in terms of accuracy and fluency in rewrites. Both of the groups improved significantly in fluency over the semester. In a follow-up study, the researcher compared direct and indirect treatments of corrective feedback. Although the

majority of the students felt that direct teacher correction is the easiest way to revise their papers, students believed that they benefited more from indirect correction - teacher indicating and describing the errors - in the long term.

Ferris and Roberts (2001) examined the effects of coded, uncoded and no feedback on students' editing success. 72 ESL students at the learning skills center at university were assigned into three groups. The groups who received coded and uncoded feedback outperformed the group who received no feedback in editing texts. Students stated that they wanted to receive error correction.

Buckinham and Ekinci (2017) investigated the effects of indirect feedback in the form of correction codes on revision and students' response to feedback in a process oriented classroom. 32 EFL students participated in the study at a Turkish state university. Students expressed positive ideas towards coded feedback and found revising with correction codes useful. It was found that the majority of the students reduced errors on four error categories - morphological, syntactic, lexical, and orthographic - in final drafts. Coded feedback helped students to notice their errors and enabled them to resolve them.

The studies which have been discussed so far have focused on immediate/short term effects of feedback on students' writing, mainly on accuracy. The studies examined the effect of text revisions, not new pieces of writing. However, improving writing in the long run is considered more important than just revising correctly. Written teacher feedback in revising is not considered to have a positive effect on language learning but it is claimed simply to be an act of student revising rather than real learning (Truscott, 2007).

Truscott and Hsu (2008) carried out a study comparing a group of students who had all their errors corrected with a similar group who received no feedback. 47 EFL graduate students in a university in Taiwan participated in the study which lasted 14 weeks. All the grammar errors of the students in the experimental group were underlined and papers were returned to students for revision. The control group received no feedback on errors. It was observed students in the experimental group had fewer errors in the revisions. There was a significant difference between the groups in favor of feedback group. However, when students were tested on a similar writing test two weeks later, it was found that the groups were nearly identical regarding the number of errors they had. Truscott concluded that even though corrective feedback had a positive effect on student errors in the revisions of the writings, corrective feedback was not effective in developing students' writing in the long run.

Bitchener (2008), realizing the shortcoming of the previous studies, employed a pretest, posttest and delayed posttest design to investigate the delayed effects of different options of

corrective feedback on accuracy in new pieces of writing. The targeted linguistic features were the definite article and indefinite articles. He found that the groups which received direct corrective feedback improved in accuracy significantly and they retained accuracy in the delayed posttest. Additionally, the groups which received direct written feedback outperformed the group which received no feedback.

However, Chandler (2003) endeavored to see whether the error reduction can be regarded as improvement in writing. For this reason, holistic scores of students' first drafts of the first task and first drafts of the final task were compared. However, they did not make progress in terms of overall writing quality which was assessed by holistic ratings of student papers.

Ji (2015) conducted an experiment which lasted one semester to test long-term effects of two types of error correction on student accuracy. In the error code group, student errors from seven categories were underlined and correction codes were provided relating to the error type. Student errors from seven categories were only underlined in the error position group. A pretest-posttest-delayed posttest design was adopted. In the posttest, students were required to revise the pretest and for delayed posttest, they wrote a new piece of writing. The accuracy was calculated counting the number of errors and the results were compared. Besides, posttests were examined to see whether students corrected the errors they made in the pretests. It was found that student errors in both groups decreased significantly from pretest to delayed posttest indicating that both indirect correction methods assist students to improve accuracy. It was also observed that the rate of successful correction in posttest was below 40 percent and the rate of uncorrected errors was above 60 percent, implying indirect error correction methods did not help students to make successful revisions. Student perceptions revealed that students preferred coded indirect feedback.

Although extensive research has been undertaken on effectiveness of written corrective feedback, the findings whether teacher response improves L2 development and accuracy is inconclusive and remains a controversial issue (Junqueira and Payant, 2015: 20).

Zamel (1985) analyzed feedback provided by 15 ESL teachers on student writings. He found ESL teachers were inconsistent in their responses, a piece of writing liked by a teacher could be criticized by another. Further, they gave vague feedback and hardly ever make content-focused comments. They behaved as language teachers rather than writing teachers focusing on linguistic features of the writing and ignoring the text as a whole and meaning related problems. He suggested that teachers need to suppress their "reflex-like reactions to surface level concerns" and prioritize meaning. Otherwise, students will think the most important aspect of writing is accuracy, not meaning (Zamel, 1985: 85, 96).

Semke (1984) looked into effects of four methods of feedback provision on students' performance. In a language school in Germany, group 1 received comments related to content of their writing. Group 2 received corrected forms of their errors. Group 3 received a mix of content and form feedback. In group 4, student errors were indicated without correction. The groups were tested on writing accuracy, writing fluency and general language proficiency before and after the treatment. It was found that the group which received comments on content increased fluency significantly and made significant progress on general language proficiency. However, none of the groups improved writing accuracy significantly. The researcher concluded that correction did not result in improved fluency or accuracy and it was not effective increasing general language proficiency of students.

Baghzou (2011) investigated the effects of content feedback on students writing performance in an experimental study of 60 EFL students at an Algerian University. While control group received no feedback, the experimental group received coded feedback on content of their writings over three months. Data consisted of a pretest and posttest and a questionnaire on student and teacher opinions of teacher feedback. The researcher reported finding a significant difference between groups at the end of the study in favor of the experimental group. Additionally, more than 80 % of students showed preference for teacher feedback either directly or indirectly. More than 70 % of students mentioned that they valued content feedback.

1.9. Research on Student Attitudes towards Feedback

Another area of research on feedback includes studying student response to different types of teacher written feedback on their writings. Students' opinions about the effectiveness of different feedback procedures have been asked and it has been noted that student opinions differ across contexts. Besides, students' individual goals and preferences are some of the factors affecting their use of feedback while revising their writings (Hyland, 2003).

It is necessary to understand students' preferences and views about feedback provision. Listening to students and providing justification for teacher preferences about feedback may improve student motivation in writing and may increase the credibility of teachers in the eyes of their students. Research on student opinions can also help teachers to understand the problems student experience and misunderstandings in feedback procedures. For example, the feedback technique the teacher adopts may turn out to be less effective than the teacher has thought or it may be unhelpful for students. Another possibility is that students may not understand the feedback at all. Asking students for their opinions is advantageous in certain ways. It increases students' motivation, assists the teacher to understand the feedback process, and establishes better communication between the teacher and the students (Ferris, 2003: 92, 93).

Research on student opinions about teacher written feedback explores the following questions:

- What kinds of feedback do teachers give students and on what areas of writing does the feedback focus?
- What are the favored types of teacher written feedback on the part of students?
- How do students react to the feedback given by the teacher?
- What kind of problems do students experience with understanding and implementing teacher feedback?
- What are the perceived effects of the teacher feedback on the development of students' writing skills (Ferris, 2003: 94).

Enginarlar (1993) explored students' attitudes towards teacher feedback in a Turkish context. 57 EFL university students at a state university participated in the study. The students were generally in favor of teacher feedback. Students reported that feedback focused both on local areas, such as linguistic errors as well as global issues such as content, quality of writing and composition skills.

Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) compared 247 EFL and ESL university students in terms of their reactions to teacher feedback and investigated how their reactions influenced their writing processes. ESL students stated they received feedback on content and form while EFL students reported they received feedback on grammar and vocabulary. The results indicated that students were not happy with teacher markings with red pen and were positive towards correction codes to some extent. The two groups of students differed greatly in writing motivation and attitudes towards writing. While EFL students favored feedback on grammatical features, ESL students valued feedback on content.

Cohen and Cavalcanti (1990) found that students held positive views to teacher feedback and desired feedback on all areas of writing. However, students reported that teacher feedback was mostly on linguistic features, which showed the misfit between the teachers' practices and students' preferences.

Montgomery and Baker (2007) examined actual teacher practices and beliefs related to feedback and student perceptions. 15 writing teachers and 284 students at a language center participated in the study. Results indicated that teachers were less inclined to provide feedback on global areas of writing and generally tended to provide feedback on grammar, vocabulary and mechanics in the first and second drafts. It was also found that there was a discrepancy between what teachers thought they gave feedback on and the actual practices of them. Teachers tended to think they gave feedback on global issues but in reality they gave more feedback on linguistic

errors. The results also indicated that students thought the feedback amount was adequate and they seemed contended with the amount of feedback provided on local and global issues. Accordingly, it may be concluded that students mostly preferred feedback on local areas rather than global areas.

Leki (1991) surveyed 100 ESL learners to find out their preferences for error correction practices. The results indicated that students thought that error-free writing was a primary concern in writing classes and the majority of the students expected the teacher to focus on all the mistakes, major and minor, found in their writings. Indirect correction in the form of locating errors and providing clues on how to correct errors were preferred by more than 60% of the students instead of direct correction. A high majority of the students claimed that revising papers with teacher correction would help them avoid making the same mistakes in the future.

1.10. Second Language Writing Anxiety

Anxiety is, as described by Spielberger (2010: 1), "an emotional state that includes feelings of apprehension, tension, nervousness, and worry accompanied by physiological arousal". Horwitz et al. (1986) noted that foreign language anxiety is a distinct variable in language learning process and highlighted the negative effects of anxiety in language classes in many ways. The researchers identified language learning anxiety as a specific anxiety reaction experienced in specific situations, that is foreign language learning, which is different from other general types of anxiety. This distinct anxiety inhibits learners when they are trying to produce the language and prevents them from achieving the targeted goals.

Anxiety is also considered a skill-specific construct as it may be experienced when learners are expected to read, write, speak and listen in foreign language classes. Foreign language writing anxiety is found to both be related to as well as distinct from other language anxiety types such as L1 writing anxiety and second language writing anxiety (Rodrigez et al., 2009: 28). Writing is not only a cognitive activity but also an emotional one since writers feel and write in the process of writing. Discomfort and uneasiness felt by language learners related to writing have been named differently by different researchers. It was termed "writing apprehension" by Daly and Miller (1975) and was called "writing anxiety" by Cheng (2004). Writing apprehension was termed by Daly and Miller (1975: 244) as a general anxiety to writing which affects a great deal of students, causing them to avoid writing and to fail when they are demanded to write as they fear being evaluated. The researchers developed an instrument, the Writing Apprehension Test (henceforth WAT) to measure writing anxiety experienced by learners. Cheng (2004), referring to previous research related to WAT, summarized pitfalls related to sub-dimensions of the test and the construct validity of WAT, and developed Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory (henceforth SLWAI) to measure skill-specific language anxiety in second language writing. The main argument of the researcher was the need for a valid and reliable instrument to measure

second/foreign language writing anxiety as Daly and Miller's WAT (1975) was originally a scale developed for L1 learners.

Cheng (2004) conceptualized writing anxiety as having three components: somatic anxiety, cognitive anxiety and avoidance behavior. Bodily reactions such as nervousness, tension, trembling and heart pounding are typical symptoms of somatic anxiety. Cognitive anxiety makes students have negative expectations about their performance and concerns about other people's evaluations of their work. Avoidance behavior can be seen in learners' tendency to procrastinate the act of writing and avoid the writing situations.

Cheng confirmed that students' self-efficacy beliefs about their foreign language writing competence was closely related to anxiety experienced while writing in a foreign language (Cheng et al., 1999, Cheng 2002: 653). Kurt and Atay (2006) examined second language writing anxiety levels of prospective teachers of English and elicited perceptions towards second language writing anxiety. Participants expressed that their previous writing experiences and writing teachers were the main reasons of writing anxiety. It was found that the source of feedback on writing classes has a positive effect on reducing anxiety experienced by students along with other benefits. Feedback when received from peers was helpful to create an environment for learning which provoked less anxiety (Kurt and Atay 2007).

There are numerous studies which have shown that anxiety affects learners' writing ability in a negative way (Faigley et al., 1981; Liu and Ni, 2015; Erkan and Saban, 2011; Zhang, 2011; Hassan, 2001). Faigley et al. (1981) investigated writing apprehension and writing performance of 110 undergraduate students. They found that highly anxious students wrote shorter and were not as successful as their low anxiety counterparts at developing their ideas and writing syntactically complex sentences.

Liu and Ni (2015) attempted to reveal causes and results of foreign language writing anxiety in a Chinese university. Data were collected through Foreign Language Writing Anxiety Scale, a writing test and interviews. Results showed that writing anxiety in second language was a predictor of English writing performance of the learners and influenced writing performance negatively at a significant level. Interview data indicated that believing that writing in English is difficult, being exam-oriented, having a limited range of vocabulary, not having adequate writing practice, being unfamiliar with the genre, and being slow in writing in English are the main anxiety provoking elements in writing classes.

Erkan and Saban (2011) verified the hypothesis that when learners had low levels of writing apprehension, they would receive higher grades on a writing test than the learners who had high levels of writing apprehension. Writing performance of the learners who have low level writing

anxiety was significantly higher than that of the ones who had high level writing anxiety on a writing test.

Zhang (2011) compared two groups of ESL students majoring in English at a Chinese university. The researcher employed SLWAI by Cheng (2005) to determine the writing anxiety levels of students and their grades from a 30-minute composition and their writing course grades were used to measure student achievements. The results indicated that writing performance and course grades correlated negatively with ESL writing anxiety at a significant level. Learners with high anxiety levels did poorly on the composition writing and had lower course grades.

In his study, Hassan (2001) attempted to find out whether writing anxiety and self-esteem of EFL students affected writing quality and quantity of learners. The researcher implemented a writing anxiety questionnaire, a self-esteem scale and a timed writing task. Students with lower anxiety levels wrote better quality writings and produced longer texts than students with high anxiety levels.

Horwitz (2001) reviewed literature on anxiety in second language learning in an attempt to determine the relationship between second language learning and anxiety. She concluded that anxiety was a factor influencing language learning negatively.

Hussein (2014) conducted a mixed-methods study with 110 students from some universities in the United Arab Emirates, in an effort to identify potential factors and consequences of second language writing anxiety. Writing tests with unfamiliar topics, unclear instructions and time limitation were among the factors creating writing anxiety. Another important dimension was the cognitive factors which include lack of ability to organize ideas, not having a command of the basic mechanics of writing, unfamiliar genre and not knowing much about what makes a writing good. The third point was linguistic factors which include a poor command of grammar, inadequate vocabulary and problems related to spelling.

This chapter has presented the theoretical framework of the study and touched on concepts related to written teacher feedback. A short account of written feedback, WCF, writing anxiety and attitudes towards writing was reviewed in this chapter. In the light of studies on written teacher feedback and considering the discussions surrounding the issue, it has been realized that there exists a need to find empirical data concerning the focus of written teacher feedback in an EFL context in Turkey.

CHAPTER TWO

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Introduction

The present study sets out to search the impact of form-focused feedback and content-focused feedback on EFL students' writing performance and student perceptions towards the two types of written teacher feedback. The study also aims to find out the effects of receiving the two aforementioned feedback types on students' writing anxiety and attitudes towards writing. In this section of the study, an account of how the study was carried out is presented. This chapter focuses on the general design of the study, research design, sampling, participants, data collection tools and data analysis methods used in the study.

2.2. Research Design

This study, by nature, uses both quantitative and qualitative research methods, in other words mixed methods, to evaluate the effectiveness of two kinds of teacher written feedback, namely form-focused feedback and content-focused feedback, and how students feel about the type of the feedback they received. Mixed methods research which involves gathering and combining qualitative and quantitative data aims to obtain "a more complete understanding of a research problem than either approach alone" (Creswell, 2014: 48). As the definition suggests, this approach was adopted to allow a detailed insight into the topic investigated. In the present study, a writing attitude questionnaire, a writing anxiety inventory and writing tests were employed for quantitative data collection. Besides, semi-structured interviews with students were held to collect qualitative data to get a better exploration of student perceptions towards receiving feedback.

The research design is a quasi-experimental nonequivalent control group design in which both a control and an experimental group exist. The participants were not assigned randomly to the groups. The classes had been formed before the study started so it was not possible to select students randomly. The nonequivalent (pretest and posttest) control-group design includes an experimental group and a nonequivalent untreated control group. Both groups received a pretest and after the treatment was administered to the experimental group, both of the groups received a posttest. For analysis, the scores of the experimental group and the control group were compared to reveal differences between groups (Johnson and Christensen, 2014: 488).

Two preparatory level classes, B1-B and B1-D, were chosen for the study. B1-B class received form-focused written feedback while B1-D received content-focused feedback. A pretest and posttest control group design was applied to see whether there was a significant difference between the two groups in terms of writing performance, writing anxiety and attitudes towards writing in English. Two timed writing tests, one at the beginning of the period and one at the end of it, were conducted to understand possible effects of each feedback type on student writing performance. Similarly, the writing attitude questionnaire and second language writing anxiety scale were administered before and after the treatment. The study also aimed to uncover students' perceptions towards those two types of written teacher feedback. To this end, semi-structured interviews were held with students to collect qualitative data.

2.3. Research Setting

The study was conducted in two preparatory level classes at the Department of Foreign Languages, KTU. The study was carried out in a 10-week period in the first semester of 2018-2019 academic year. The Department offers a one-year English preparatory program to Turkish and international students who could not pass the proficiency examination carried out by the Department of Foreign Languages in order to be accepted to their departments. Thirty percent of the classes in their departments are taught in English. Students must be at least at B1 level of proficiency in English to attend the classes at their departments. The students who are not proficient enough to pass the proficiency examination take general English classes at the Department of Foreign Languages. At the beginning of the academic year, students take a placement test and they are placed in A1, A2 or B1 level classes based on their scores from the placement test. Students who have completed B1 level of English successfully attend the classes at their departments.

The Department offers two courses: a main course, and a reading and writing course. The main course presents reading, writing, speaking and listening in an integrated way and the department offers 18 hours of main course a week. The students at B1 level study an integrated skills student book called *English File Intermediate* (2012) by Christine Lantham-Coening, Paul Seligson and Clive Oxenden. The reading and writing course aims to help students acquire writing skills for academic writing. Students at B1 level study *Skillful 2 Student's Book* (2018) by Louis Rogers. The course combines reading and writing to help students to develop their writing skills by exposing them to different types of texts. After studying two texts, students produce paragraphs every week. The texts act as a ground on which students build their ideas. The classes meet for 90 minutes four times a week for reading and writing classes. Through the course, students learn conventions of paragraph writing such as spelling, punctuation, grammar, capitalization and sentence structure. Planning, outlining and revising paragraphs are practiced in the classes. Basics of paragraph writing such as brainstorming, drafting, writing topic sentences, and developing

supporting details, presenting facts, giving opinions and using transitions are also covered. Genres covered in the writing classes are descriptive, argumentative, cause-effect, opinion and comparison-contrast types of paragraphs. Students have weekly assignments on which teachers give feedback. However, they do not have to revise their paragraphs in line with teacher feedback. Weekly assignments do not count to the overall scores of the students. Apart from weekly assignments, students have to write two writing tasks during the term. The first draft is written in classroom in 60 minutes and students have to revise these paragraphs using teacher feedback. They have to file the first and the final drafts of two tasks and return them to the teacher. The Department requires teachers to give indirect written feedback through correction codes.

2.4. Sampling and Participants

A total of 35 students studying English as a Foreign Language at the Department of Foreign Languages of Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, in the fall semester of 2018-2019 academic year were recruited for this quasi-experimental study through convenience sampling. There were two different groups consisting of 15 and 20 students, respectively content-feedback and form-focused feedback groups. Ten of the participants were female while 25 of them were male as both classes accommodated 35 students. The experimental group which received content-focused feedback included 5 females and 10 males. The control group which received form-focused feedback consisted of 5 females and 15 males. The graduate students pursuing their M.A or Ph.D. degrees were excluded from both groups to rule out the possibility of affecting research results. Similarly, 3 students from the control group were excluded from the study since two of them dropped out of school because of exceeding the absenteeism limit and the other student was absent when the posttest was implemented.

A writing attitude questionnaire, a writing anxiety inventory and a writing test were used to ensure the homogeneity of the groups at the beginning of the study. Pretest scores of three data collection tools were used to find out any preexisting differences between the groups, which may have posed a threat to the internal validity of the study.

The pretest results of data collection instruments verified that there were no significant differences between the groups in terms of writing performance, attitudes towards writing and writing anxiety in English. An independent samples t-test run on writing pretest scores of the experimental and the control group revealed that the groups did not differ significantly in terms of writing proficiency (t=1.32, p>.05), indicating the groups were close in terms of proficiency. Similarly, to see whether the groups differed in terms of writing attitude towards writing in English, Mann Whitney U-test was conducted on pretest scores of writing attitude questionnaire and the results showed that no significant difference existed between the writing attitude scores of the groups (U=139.00, p>0.5). Finally, Mann Whitney U-test conducted on writing anxiety scores of

the experimental and the control group before the treatment indicated that there was not a significant difference between the groups (U=140.50, p> .05).

The two classes were at B1 level of English language proficiency determined by a test at the beginning of the period. The criteria for selecting B1 level classes were as follows: The Department offers reading and writing courses to A2 and B1 level classes and B1 level students are expected to be able to respond to teacher feedback better, especially to content-focused feedback, thanks to their proficiency level in English. Both classes were instructed by the same teacher-researcher. The teacher-researcher had meetings with each group to inform them about the process and answered students' questions. All the participants were informed about the study and consent forms were filled by the participants.

2.5. The teacher-researcher

Teacher research is defined by Murrhead (2002: 23) as an area in which teachers are actively taking part in research in order to improve the working conditions, reconsider the syllabus and foster their professional development. McDonough and McDonough (1997: 21) mention the value of teacher research by which teachers take control of their professional environment: "Research is not only something that is done "on" or "to" teachers, but is also an undertaking in which they can themselves be actively involved, by for example identifying interesting or problematic issues and topics, choosing suitable investigative instruments, and pursuing answers and outcomes" (McDonough and McDonough, 1997: 21). It is the teacher who can understand students' needs and interests and can design the learning environment to meet these needs and interests. Hammersley (1993: 432) summarizes advantages of teacher research:

1. A teacher researcher can understand his or her intentions, motives, opinions and feelings and interpret his/her own behaviors better than an outsider, who is researcher in that case, can ever do.

2. As a teacher researcher usually has long-term acquaintance of the setting which is being studied, the teacher researcher has first-hand information on the context which is necessary to comprehend what is going on. However, an outsider has to spend a long time to gain that knowledge of the context and most of time it is impossible to acquire.

3. The teacher researcher has already established relationships with the participants in the setting and these relationships will facilitate collecting further data while it takes an outsider a great deal of time to develop such relationships.

4. Teachers will be able to experiment the theoretical ideas much better than an observer can as teachers are thought to be the key actors of the context studied.

Although being a teacher-researcher has the potential of leading the researcher to look for proof to strengthen her/his personal stance to the issue studied, I made use of both qualitative and

quantitative data collection and analysis strategies to validate my results. Quantitative data, which consisted of pretest, posttest and questionnaire, prevented me from drawing any potentially biased judgments. Moreover, considering the possibility that the participants would answer the questions according to my inclinations, I tried to hold a detached position to both feedback strategies equally. To overcome biases in the data analysis, I paid attention to allow codes to develop on emerging information rather than imposing predetermined codes.

The teacher-researcher for the present study was myself, a teacher of English who has been teaching for 8 years at the Department where the study was conducted. I was responsible for conducting the writing classes and giving feedback to the student papers as their writing teacher and for carrying out the study as the researcher.

2.6. Procedure

The study attempts to answer a major and five minor research questions below:

1. What is the role of form-focused and content-focused written teacher feedback on improving EFL preparatory school students' writing abilities?
2. Is there a statistically significant difference between writing performance of students receiving form-focused feedback and those receiving content-focused feedback based on the type of feedback they receive?
3. Are there any attitudinal differences between form-focused feedback group and content-focused feedback group towards writing in English based on the type of feedback they receive?
4. Are there any differences between control group and experimental group in terms of writing anxiety experienced by students based on the type of feedback they receive?
5. What are the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of form-focused written teacher feedback?
6. What are the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of content focused written teacher feedback?

The following procedure was adopted in order to find answers to the research questions above. It was a 10-week quasi-experimental study. Prior to the study, the teacher-researcher explained the study to the participants and ethical clearance was obtained. At the beginning of the study, a writing attitude questionnaire was applied to both experimental and control groups to reveal their attitudes towards writing in English. Scores of the groups were used to determine whether two groups differed in terms of their attitude to writing in English. This was done to eliminate selection biases jeopardizing the internal validity of the study. By doing so the researcher ensured the groups were equal in terms of their writing attitudes at the beginning of the study. The

writing attitude questionnaire was used, though this was not an initial aim, to see whether writing attitudes changed over the term. For writing attitude questions, a Likert-scale was used.

Another threat to the internal validity of the research was the varying writing anxiety level among the students. A writing anxiety inventory was administered to both groups to determine the participants' writing anxiety levels in English at the beginning of the term and to see whether any statistically significant differences existed between the groups. The scores of the writing anxiety scale were also employed to reveal whether anxiety levels of the groups lowered at the end of the study.

Likewise, a test on writing ability was conducted to evaluate the current writing proficiency of the participants. The writing test scores were compared to ensure homogeneity of the groups. The results of the writing tests were also used to determine if the participants in the groups improved their writing proficiency over the term.

Over the ten weeks, both classes were taught by the same teacher-researcher similarly but differed in the feedback type students received throughout the experiment. The participants in both groups fulfilled the same eight tasks in practice sessions. Upon writing weekly paragraphs, the participants in the experimental group received content-focused written feedback from the teacher while the control group received form-focused written feedback from the teacher. The tasks were imposed by the reading and writing course syllabus of the Department of Foreign Languages. After the treatment, writing attitude questionnaire, writing anxiety inventory and writing test were applied again. Lastly, semi-structured interviews were held with each participant.

Table 1: Overall Design of the Study

	Experimental group (content-focused feedback group)	Control group (form-focused feedback group)
1st week 1-5 October	Writing attitude questionnaire Writing anxiety scale Writing test	Writing attitude questionnaire Writing anxiety scale Writing test
2nd week 8-12 October	Writing first draft of an opinion paragraph about politeness Getting content-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of an opinion paragraph about politeness Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
3rd week 15-19 October	Writing first draft of a paragraph describing food production in Turkey Getting content-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of a paragraph describing food production in Turkey Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
4th week 22-26 October	Writing first draft of an introduction to an essay about a successful business Getting content-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of an introduction to an essay about a successful business Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
5th week 29 October-2 November	Writing first draft of a summary of past trends (description of a graph) Getting content-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of a summary of past trends (description of a graph) Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
6th week 5-9 November	Writing first draft of a description of the changes to an area Getting content -focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of a description of the changes to an area Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
7th week 12-16 November	Writing first draft of a cause- effect paragraph about pressure on children Getting content-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of a cause- effect paragraph about pressure on children Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
8th week 19-23 November	Writing first draft of a paragraph about advantages and disadvantages of fear Getting content-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of a paragraph about advantages and disadvantages of fear Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
9th week 26-30 November	Writing first draft of a story of an invention Getting content-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph	Writing first draft of a story of an invention Getting form-focused teacher feedback Writing second draft of the paragraph
10th week 3-7 December	Writing attitude questionnaire Writing anxiety scale Writing test Interviews	Writing attitude questionnaire Writing anxiety scale Writing test Interviews

2.7. Data Collection Tools

As stated earlier, both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools were utilized: a writing attitude questionnaire, a writing anxiety inventory, writing tests, weekly writing tasks and semi-structured interviews.

2.7.1. Writing Attitude Questionnaire

The scale was originally developed by Erdem (2007) to measure attitudes of primary school students' attitudes towards writing course. The scale was adapted by Erarslan (2011) to measure attitudes of preparatory school students towards the writing course. The validity and reliability of the scale was tested by Erarslan and Cronbah Alpha was found to be .91 in his main study. It was a 28-item Likert-type questionnaire with the scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1).

The questionnaire was adapted from Erarslan (2011) for the present study by the researcher. Some of the items in that questionnaire were thought to be irrelevant to the research purpose and subjects in the present study. Some items concentrated on students' beliefs, opinions and feelings after they took the writing course. The subjects in the present study had not taken a separate writing course before. The items which probed student attitudes after they had taken writing classes were removed. Some items were double-barreled, asking about two different aspects in a single question. These items were also excluded. The modified version included 12 items about student beliefs, opinions and feelings towards writing in general (see the Appendix 2). This version was implemented to the some students the year before to see if the items were clear and if anything needed to be altered. It was a Likert-type scale from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). The items 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12 were reversed coded. The questionnaire was conducted in Turkish for practical reasons. The Cronbach's Alpha was measured to be 0.77 (n=35) for the pretest of the scale and 0.74 (n=35) for the posttest of the scale for the study suggesting that it had acceptable internal consistency.

2.7.2. Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory

To find out whether students in the present study suffered from anxiety while writing in English, the SLWAI developed by Cheng (2004) was used before and after the treatment. The main purpose was to ensure that there was not a significant difference between the two groups in terms of anxiety level at the beginning of the study.

The SLWAI, a 22-item scale, was built by Cheng (2004) to measure anxiety experienced by ESL/EFL students while writing in English. It is a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree (1). The scale has three subscales which contain items related to cognitive anxiety (1, 3, 7, 9, 14, 17, 20, 21), somatic anxiety (2, 6, 8, 11, 13, 15, 19) and avoidance behavior (4, 5, 10, 12, 16, 18, 22). There are seven reverse coded items in the scale (1, 4, 7, 17, 18, 21, 22). The scale was reported to have reliability of .91 measured by Cronbach alpha co-efficiency by Chen (2004).

The SLWAI was slightly modified for the present study. The items 2, 10, 13, 17 were excluded from the inventory as they were irrelevant to the purpose of the present study and the same points were repeated in different items. The modified version had 18 items. Scores of items 1, 3, 6, 13, 15 and 16 were reversed in data analysis. The Turkish version of the scale which was translated by Öztürk and Saydam (cited in Kaynak, 2017) was used in the present study (see the Appendix 3). The inventory was distributed to another group of students one year earlier in order to test whether the items were clear. The Cronbach's Alpha was measured to be 0.71 (n=35) for the pretest of the scale and 0.75 (n=35) for the posttest of the scale for the present study. As for the face and content validity of the scale, the questionnaire was presented to the thesis supervisor and a PhD student was consulted for her opinions.

2.7.3. Writing tests

In the first week of the study, a pretest was applied to both the control group and the experimental group. It was a 60 minute paragraph writing test. The teacher-researcher presented five writing topics to the students for the pretest. The topic of the paragraph was chosen by the students after a class discussion and vote. Topic familiarity of the students was taken into consideration and a topic students agreed to write about was chosen as not having prior knowledge would influence students' performance negatively and the performance of students could be attributed to topic familiarity or unfamiliarity.

The students were requested to write a paragraph about their summer holiday. They were notified that the scores from these tests would not have any effect on their grades to avoid Hawthorne effect. The paragraphs of both groups were graded according to the analytic scoring scale for writing developed by Tribble (1996). Following this step, to ensure reliability of scores, two independent raters rated each paper on a scale of 100 and scores were averaged. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test inter-rater reliability of the two raters who graded the writing pretest and posttest papers of the students. The scores of the pretest was used to see whether there were significant differences between the two groups in terms of writing proficiency before the study started. A posttest was used to evaluate the writing proficiency of both groups after conducting the experiment. It was applied in the 10th week of the study. The topic was again chosen after a class discussion and vote as in pretest. The topics were chosen taking students' topic familiarity into consideration. The students were asked to write a paragraph about the advantages and disadvantages of social media. The scoring process was like in the pretest. Pretest scores and posttest scores of the groups were compared using independent t-test to reveal if there were significant improvements over the term.

2.7.4. The Scoring Rubric

In the present study, an analytic scoring rubric for writing developed by Tribble (1996) was employed to evaluate paragraph writing abilities of participants. The analytic rubric by Tribble has five main dimensions (content, organization, vocabulary, language and mechanics). Each dimension is presented by explicit descriptors of levels of performance. A range of scores is given for each level and these scores, when added, constitute an overall grade of 100. The 5 subscales weigh differently. Each subscale is also divided into 5 levels from inadequate to excellent. Upon separately grading five elements of writing, that is content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics, total points of students are calculated: A maximum of 20 points for content, another maximum of 20 points for organization, another maximum of 20 points for vocabulary, a maximum of 30 points for language use and a maximum of 10 points for mechanics all constitute 100 points (see Appendix 1).

There are a few reasons for preferring an analytic scoring rubric. A scoring rubric gives a more detailed picture of the student's performance in various areas of writing such as content, language use, vocabulary and mechanics so they are widely used in assessing writing (Weigle, 2002: 114, 115). Analytic scoring rubrics enable teachers to evaluate students' writings consistently by providing standard criteria and are appropriate when assessing students' writing in detail (Turgut and Kayaoğlu, 2015: 51).

2.7.5. Weekly Writing Assignments

Over the period, students both in the control group and in the experimental group were exposed to exactly the same instruction in the classes. In the reading and writing course, students were introduced to elements of good paragraph writing. Brainstorming, planning writing and editing, writing topic sentences and supporting details, using a variety of linking words to connect ideas, using examples, facts and reasons to support main ideas were presented to the participants. Having read two texts related to the writing assignment of the week, students were expected to write an out of class paragraph about 120 words long about a topic every week. The teacher-researcher collected the assignments in the first session of the week. They were free to use sources to write the first and final drafts of their writings. These weekly tasks were not graded by the teacher-researcher and they did not count towards the average grade of the students. Having given feedback to student paragraphs, the teacher-researcher returned the assignments. The teacher-researcher held 5 minute one-to-one conference sessions with the students to clear any ambiguity related to the feedback she gave and to answer students' questions.

In addition to the weekly assignments, the students also had to write two tasks. The tasks were in-class timed writing activities. Students were not allowed to use dictionaries. They received

grades and it made up 5% of their passing grade. These two tasks were excluded from the study as students were concerned with grades.

2.7.6. Semi-Structured Interviews

The final stage of the study comprised a semi-structured interview with participants from both the experimental and the control group. The semi-structured interviews were utilized to gain more extensive information about students' perceptions towards the teacher written feedback they received during the treatment and the reasons behind their opinions. Prior to the interviews, the teacher-researcher informed the interviewees about the purpose of the study and consent from each participant was taken before the interview sessions. Each participant was interviewed for 5 to 10 minutes depending on the length of the interviewee's answer. The interviews were conducted in Turkish, in participants' mother language, as they would be more relaxed and free to express their ideas considering the participants' level of English. The students were encouraged to express their opinions in detail by creating a friendly atmosphere. The interviews were held in the researcher's office where no interruptions would intervene the recording of the interviews.

The questions were prepared to get information on the effectiveness of the type of feedback and students' feelings about the process. The interview questions were formed on the literature review by the teacher-researcher, prepared with the guidance of the advisor and were further piloted (see Appendix 4 and 5).

Interview questions were intended to elicit students' opinions on the main areas below in the experimental group:
- The feelings of the students towards writing activities done in the writing classes
- the students' beliefs of efficacy of receiving written teacher feedback
- the advantages of getting feedback
- the feelings and experiences of the students during the process
- general views about the method used in giving feedback
- the positive effects of content-focused written feedback
- the negative effects of content-focused written feedback
- the feelings of the students towards content-focused feedback
- the opinions of the students related to the efficacy of content-focused feedback
- the opinions of the students related to the advantages and disadvantages of getting content-focused feedback
- the aspects of feedback which the students found useful

Relevant follow-up questions were asked when necessary to elicit further information about the questions.

The themes below were investigated during the interview sessions with the control group:
- the feelings of the students towards writing activities
- the students' beliefs of efficacy of receiving written teacher feedback
- the advantages of getting feedback
- the feelings and experiences of the students during the process
- general views about the method used in giving feedback
- the positive effects of form-focused written feedback
- the negative effects of form-focused written feedback
- the feelings of the students towards form-focused feedback
- the opinions of the students related to efficacy of form-focused feedback
- the opinions of the students related to the advantages and disadvantages of getting form-focused feedback
- the aspects of feedback which the students found useful

Relevant follow-up questions were asked when necessary to elicit further information about the questions. The teacher-researcher thanked all the students for their time and effort at the end of the sessions. All the interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim.

2.8. The Feedback Procedure

Two types of written teacher feedback were compared in this study. The control group and the experimental group received different treatments. One type of feedback included providing feedback on sentence level grammar errors which is form-focused feedback and the other group received content-focused feedback, which is meaning-related feedback to student paragraphs. Both forms of written teacher feedback were accompanied by conferencing with students about their paragraphs to let students justify their reasons or eliminate possible misunderstandings between the writers and the reader.

The control group was exposed to traditional form-focused written teacher feedback for eight weeks. In the control group, the teacher used a set of correction codes (see Table 2) to indicate form-related problems and they were also accompanied with comments at the end of the paragraphs. The teacher-researcher provided indirect coded corrective feedback to student papers without giving the correct form. She underlined the incorrect language forms in the sentences and provided codes related to the type of feedback. For example:

I am <u>boring</u> in the dormitory.
wf

The students received a list of error correction codes with explanations and example sentences of each error. At the beginning of the study, the students in the control group had a session on error correction codes. As they were in the first term, they were not familiar with the correction codes. It was hoped that indirect corrective feedback would lead students to correct their errors themselves. Written teacher feedback was also combined with oral discussions with the students on their paragraphs.

Bates et al. (1993: 33-44) suggested the following guidelines when giving feedback to sentence level errors:

- Target the most serious errors that prevent readers from understanding the writing.
- Target the most frequent errors on a student paper.
- Take students' level of proficiency, attitudes and aims into consideration while giving feedback on sentence level errors.

As a teacher-researcher, I tried to stick to these guidelines throughout the procedure in the control group, hoping to make the maximum use of the form-focused feedback provision.

Table 2: The List of Error Correction Codes Used Giving Feedback to the Control Group

ERROR CODE	EXPLANATION	EXAMPLE SENTENCE	CORRECTED SENTENCE
Fr	Sentence Fragment	When I am happy. Fr	When I am happy, I sing.
WT	Wrong Tense	Sue goes to school last year. WT	Sue went to school last year.
WO	Word Order Error	She likes pizza eating. WO	She likes eating pizza.
WW	Wrong Word	I did a very delicious cake. WW	I made a very delicious cake.
WF	Word Form Error	I am boring in the dormitory. WF	I am bored in the dormitory.
VF	Verb Form Error	Harry do his homework. VF	Harry does his homework.
X	Extra Word	She comes to here at 9: 00. X	She comes here at 9: 00.
Λ	Missing Word	My father Λ a dentist.	My father is a dentist.
Pr	Preposition Error	Amy is talking with the teacher. Pr	Amy is talking to the teacher.
A	Article Error	My mother is Λ housewife *A*	My mother is a housewife.
P	Punctuation Error	I like reading books. P	I like reading books.
C	Capitalization Error	I go to school on monday. C	I go to school on Monday.
Sp	Spelling Error	My favuorite color is red. Sp	My favourite color is red.
?	Meaning or handwriting is not clear	Myfatherlikesswimming inthesea. ?	My father likes swimming in the sea.
/	Insert a space	I watch horror/films.	I watch horror films.
//	// Start a new sentence here	I study English // I always do my homework.	I study English. I always do my homework.
→	Indent the paragraph →	Football is very popular in Turkey.	Football is very popular in Turkey.

The experimental group was exposed to content-focused written teacher feedback for eight weeks. The teacher wrote comments related to content on both in the margins and in an end comment. The comments were given in question, request and imperative forms. To give an example, if what the student meant was incomprehensible, the teacher wrote "What do you mean?" in the margin and if the ideas or details are inadequate to support the main idea, the teacher wrote "Good point but can you develop this point?" Marginal comments helps students to locate a problematic area or a well written part. They were not only negative comments about the student writing. Comments were utilized to highlight both strengths and weaknesses of students' writing. Making general comments was avoided because it was believed that they would not help students to revise their papers to get better or to understand what the teacher really meant.

The content-focused feedback in this study was given in line with Bates et al.'s (1993) model/procedure. Bates et al. (1993: 23-27) suggests the following will be helpful when giving feedback to content:

- Writing personalized comments shows the student that you are an interested reader engaging the students in the writing process. Students will be motivated to write more and these comments will enable students to develop a sense of audience.

- Providing guidance without taking control of students' writings as inexperienced writers may have knowledge on conventions of writing in English.

- Making text-specific comments such as "I liked your example about your sister" rather than "good example" which can be given to any example on any paper.

- Balancing negative and positive comments because positive comments on content will lay the ground to take the negative feedback on content more easily on the part of students.

- Paying attention to the number of comments on a student paper as it is believed that too many comments on a piece of writing will demotivate students.

In the feedback giving process, the teacher-researcher gave content feedback to students' writings in line with the categories addressed by Bates et al. (1993) and Ashwell (2000: 235).

Table 3: Main Types of Points Addressed When Giving Content Feedback

Points	Examples
Incomprehension	What do you mean here? It not clear ……
Clarification	Can you make this point clearer? Your topic sentence needs to be clearer. How does the internet affect young people badly? It is not clear why you think so?
Repetition	You are repeating that. Can you find synonyms for that word instead of repeating it?
Irrelevant ideas	Does this relate to fear? Is this point related to…. Stay focused throughout the paragraph.
Deviation from the topic	Your paragraph drifts away from its focus. The focus of your paragraph becomes too narrow, only focusing on… instead of… Are you focused on the question? The major weakness of your paragraph is that it does not focus on the question.
Organization	It is a nice ending to your paragraph.
Cohesion	This idea does not lead to the next idea.
Appreciation	Good specific example about good customer service. Your topic sentence is very clear. Nice opening. A fun original example. You illustrated your points with good specifics. You have analyzed the causes of … effectively.

2.9. Data Collection

Prior to the study, the participants in both groups were informed about the nature of the study and the teacher-researcher informed the participants that data from the questionnaires would be kept confidential. They were informed that their course grades would not be affected by their participation in the study. The students in both the experimental group and the control group expressed their willingness to participate in the study. Upon obtaining consent from the participants, the writing attitude questionnaire was administered to both the experimental group and the control group to reveal the participants' general attitude towards writing in the first week of the study. Pretest scores of the writing attitude questionnaire showed that the groups did not differ significantly in terms of writing attitude towards writing.

In order to identify participants' foreign language writing anxiety levels and to see whether the two groups differ significantly in terms of foreign language writing anxiety, the SLWAI was conducted in both classes in the first week of the study. Scores of the SLWAI indicated that no significant differences existed between two classes.

In order to assess students' writing performance and to see whether the two groups differ significantly in terms of writing performance, a writing pretest was implemented in the first week of the study. Scores of the writing test showed that students in both groups had similar writing proficiency levels.

At the end of eight weeks of treatment of different written teacher feedback, both groups were given the writing attitude questionnaire again to see changes in students' attitudes towards writing by comparing pretest and posttest results. The students were also given a writing posttest to see their writing progress over the term. The results were also used to compare the two groups. Similarly, students completed SLWAI at the end of the treatment. The scores from the posttest were used to determine whether students' anxiety levels reduced. The posttest scores of the groups were also compared to the differential effect of two types of feedback provision.

The final stage of data collection comprised a semi-structured interview with each student who participated in the study from both the experimental group and the control group to explore the students' perceptions as to the two different forms of written teacher feedback.

2.10. Data Analysis

2.10.1. Quantitative Data Analysis

Statistical analysis of the quantitative data was performed using SPSS, version 18. Parametric methods were used in the analyses of the data from writing pretests and posttests as data distribute normally. Non-parametric methods were utilized in the statistical analyses of the data from writing attitude questionnaire and SLWAI as the sample size was smaller than 30 in each group and the data did not distribute normally according to scores of Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

Mann Whitney U test was employed to detect whether there were preexisting differences in writing attitudes of the groups. Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was conducted on the data from the questionnaire to see whether there was a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental and control groups in terms of writing attitude, in other words, to find out whether the feedback type groups received influenced their attitudes towards writing. Posttest scores of the groups were also compared to see whether they differed significantly after the treatment.

The writing pretests and posttests were assessed using analytic scoring scale for writing by Tribble (1996). To establish inter-rater reliability, the student papers were scored by the teacher-researcher and another teacher from the same department. Independent t-test was run on the pretest scores of the experimental and control group to see whether the groups differ significantly in terms of their writing ability at the onset of the study. Paired samples t-test was carried out to reveal whether the participants in the experimental and control groups improved significantly on paragraph writing. The posttest scores of the groups were also compared by means of independent t test to see whether the scores differed significantly after the treatment.

Mann-Whitney U test was conducted on the data from the pretest scores of the writing anxiety inventory to see whether the groups differ in terms of writing anxiety at the beginning of the study. Later, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was utilized to see whether the anxiety levels of the groups changed from the beginning to the end of the study. Next, Mann Whitney U test was used to compare the posttest scores of the experimental and the control groups to reveal any significant differences between anxiety levels of the groups.

2.10.2. Qualitative Data Analysis

In order to answer research question 5 and 6, semi-structured interviews were held with the participants. It was aimed to find out the students' opinions about the feedback process. Ten open-ended questions were asked during the interviews. The interviews were held in Turkish as students

would be able to express their opinions better in their native language. The interviews with the participants in both groups were recorded and transcribed.

The qualitative data was analyzed using descriptive analysis and subsequently content analysis to reach shared and common themes across the cases. Descriptive analysis aims to picture, describe and explain the topic. In descriptive analysis, data are analyzed based on questions, topics or themes derived from observations, interviews and documents. The emerging themes are used as headings and quotations are provided to support the headings (Ekiz, 2017: 76). The qualitative data analysis started with preparing the data by transforming audial data into written text by transcribing all the interviews with the students. A complete transcript including all of the interview questions was obtained. Upon transcribing the data, the teacher-researcher read through the transcriptions to get familiar with the data. Later, the researcher identified the key concepts and initial coding categories. The coding categories were revised to check the coding consistency and similar categories were combined. Having read and coded the entire corpus, the coded data were reduced. After reading the data over and over again, the data revealed general themes. Findings related to each theme with representative quotations from the student interviews were presented. The representative comments were examples reflecting each theme.

CHAPTER 3

3. FINDINGS

This chapter presents the analysis of and the findings from the data obtained from quantitative and qualitative data collection instruments. The quantitative data were obtained from a writing test, a writing attitude questionnaire and a second language writing anxiety inventory which were implemented before and after the treatment. The qualitative data came from semi-structured interviews held with 35 EFL students.

3.1. Analysis of the Quantitative Data

The results of the quantitative data analysis performed in line with the procedures described in the previous chapters are presented here. The reliability of the data collection tools was estimated before carrying out the analyses to answer the research questions.

3.1.1. The Reliability of the Data Collection Tools

Cronbach's alpha test of reliability was used to measure the internal consistency of the writing attitude questionnaire and SLWAI.

Table 4: Reliability Estimation of the Data Collection Tools

Data collection tool		Cronbah's alpha
Writing Attitude questionnaire	pretest	.77
	posttest	.74
Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory	pretest	.71
	posttest	.75

The results of the Cronbach's alpha reliability estimation are presented in Table 4. Cronbach's alpha was calculated .77 for the pretest and .74 for the posttest of the of the writing attitude questionnaire. The writing attitude questionnaire was found to be reliable. Similarly, Cronbach's alpha was estimated .71 for pretest and .75 for posttest of the SLWAI. The values were within accepted levels of reliability.

3.1.2. Inter-Rater Reliability of the Raters

Writing tests of students in the experimental and the control groups were graded by two independent raters. In order to assure inter-rater reliability between the two independent raters who scored the writing pretests and posttests of the experimental and control groups, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient test on SPSS 18 was conducted on the pretest and the posttest scores of the writing test separately.

Table 5: Pearson Correlation Test Results for the Writing Pretest Scores of the Raters

	Rater 1	Rater 2
Rater 1	1	
Rater 2	.472**	1

As shown in Table 5, a significant positive correlation was found between the writing pretest scores of the two raters (r=.472, p<.01), suggesting the two raters were coherent with each other while assessing the writing pretests.

Table 6: Pearson Correlation Test Results for the Writing Posttest Scores of the Raters

	Rater 1	Rater 2
Rater 1	1	
Rater 2	.743**	1

It can be seen from the data in table above, a significant positive correlation existed between the writing posttest scores of the two raters (r=.743, p<.01), suggesting the two raters were consistent with each other while assessing the writing posttest.

3.1.3. Testing the Homogeneity of the Groups before the Treatment

In order to ensure homogeneity between the control and experimental groups in terms of writing proficiency, writing anxiety and attitudes towards writing, the teacher-researcher first tested whether any initial differences existed in the scores of the experimental and the control groups in the writing test, the writing attitude questionnaire and the writing anxiety scale. First, mean and standard deviations of the groups from the writing test, writing attitude questionnaire and second language writing anxiety inventory are presented. Next, the pretest scores of the groups from these instruments are compared.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of the Writing Test, the Writing Attitude Questionnaire and the Writing Anxiety Inventory before the Treatment

Data Collection Tools	Group	n	Mean	Standard Deviation
Writing Test	experimental	15	43.33	3.29
	control	20	41.30	4.63
Writing Attitude Questionnaire	experimental	15	48.00	5.60
	control	20	47.30	5.76
Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory	experimental	15	52.80	8.62
	control	20	52.09	8.76

The results in Table 7 indicate that the students in both the experimental group and the control groups had similar writing proficiency, similar attitudes towards writing and similar writing anxiety levels before the treatment. The mean score in writing test was 43.33 out of 100 for the experimental group and 41.3 for the control group out of 100. The mean score in writing attitude questionnaire was 48.00 out of 60 for the experimental group and 47.30 out of 60 for the control group. The mean score in SLWAI was 52.80 out of 90 was for the experimental group and 52.09 out of 90 for the control group.

3.1.3.1. Comparison of the Writing Test Scores of the Groups before the Treatment

Independent t-test was conducted on the data from the pretest writing to find out whether the results in Table 7 were significant.

Table 8: Independent Samples T-Test Results for the Pretest Writing Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups

Groups	n	x	S.d	t	p
Experimental	15	43.33	3.29	1.44	.15
Control	20	41.30	4.63		

Independent samples t-test was run on the writing pretest scores of the experimental and control groups to see whether the students in the groups differed in terms of writing proficiency at the beginning of the study. The results obtained from the independent samples t-test revealed that the groups did not differ significantly in terms of writing proficiency (t=1.44, p>.05).

3.1.3.2. Comparison of the Writing Attitude Questionnaire Scores of the Groups before the Treatment

Mann Whitney U test was conducted on the data to reveal whether the groups differed in terms of writing attitude towards in English before the treatment. The results of the Mann Whitney

U test is shown in Table 9. No significant difference between the two groups before the treatment was evident (U=139, 00, p> 0.5).

Table 9: Mann-Whitney U Test Results Comparing the Writing Attitude Questionnaire Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	U	p
Experimental	15	18.73	281.00	139.00	.71
Control	20	17.45	349.00		

3.1.3.3. Comparing the Writing Anxiety Scores of the Groups before the Treatment

The writing anxiety levels of the students in the experimental and the control groups were determined by the writing anxiety scale before the treatment. The difference related to writing anxiety between the groups was analyzed with Mann Whitney U test. As can be seen in Table 10, the experimental and control groups did not differ significantly in terms of writing anxiety before the treatment (U=140.50, p> 0.5).

Table 10: Mann-Whitney U Test Results Comparing the Writing Anxiety Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups before the Treatment

Group	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	U	p
Experimental	15	18.63	279.50	140.50	.75
Control	20	17.52	350.50		

3.1.4. Analysis of the Writing Test Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups

Data gathered by means of the writing tests were initially checked for normality through Shapiro-Wilks test. Skewness and Kurtosis values were also taken into consideration to decide whether the data followed a normal distribution. Normality was also assessed visually by histogram and P-P plot test. In the end, parametric tests were preferred for the analysis of the writing test.

Table 11: Skewness, Kurtosis and Normality Tests for the Writing Pretest and the Posttest Scores of the Students

	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilks
Writing pretest	.43	.36	.22
Writing posttest	.22	-.49	.41

As can be seen from Table 11, the writing pretest scores were normally distributed with skewness of .43 and kurtosis of .36. Skewess and Kurtosis values were .22 and -.49 for the writing

posttest scores respectively. Shapiro-Wilks normality test results for both the writing pretest and the posttest yielded that the data had a normal distribution ($p > .05$).

The mean scores of the experimental and control groups were compared. In order to see whether there was any increase in the writing performance of the students over the two tests in the experimental and the control groups, paired samples t-test was run on the pretest and posttest scores of the experimental and control groups separately.

3.1.4.1. The Results of the Impact of Content-Focused Feedback on Students' Overall Writing Ability

In order to reveal what impact content-focused feedback practices have on the participants' overall writing performance, the writing proficiency levels of the participants in the experimental group before and after the feedback practices were calculated and compared.

Table 12: Paired Samples T-Test Results Comparing the Writing Pretest and the Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group

Writing tests of the Experiential group	n	x	S.D	Degree of freedom	t	p
Pretest	15	43.53	3.29	14	-5.98	.00
Posttest	15	52.93	7.31	19		

It can be seen from the data in Table 12 that the difference between the writing pretest and the posttest scores of the experimental group was significant (t=-5.98, p<.01). The mean of the pretest scores is 43.53 and the mean of the posttest scores is 52.93. Therefore, it can be said that the content-focused feedback that the experimental group received may have had a positive effect on the overall writing performance of the students. An assessment scale which was developed by Tribble (1996) was used by the raters to evaluate and assess the writing pretest and the posttests of the participants on 5 different aspects of writing (content, organization, vocabulary, language use and mechanics). The possible scores for each aspect and dimension were provided to help the raters to judge the papers objectively.

3.1.4.2. The Results of the Impact of Form-Focused Feedback on the Students' Overall Writing Ability

In order to reveal whether or to what extent, if any, impact form-focused feedback practices have on the participants' overall writing performance, the writing proficiency levels of participants in the control group before and after the feedback practices were calculated and compared.

Table 13: Paired Samples T-Test Comparing the Writing Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Control Group

Writing tests of the Control group	n	x	Standard deviation	Degree of freedom	t	p
Pretest	20	41.30	4.63	19	-6.25	.00
Posttest	20	52.50	10.25			

From Table 13 above, it can be seen that there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest scores of the control group which received form-focused feedback (t=-6.25, p<.01). The mean of the pretest scores of the control group (41.30) is lower than the mean of the posttest scores (52.50). It can be inferred from the analysis that form-focused written feedback may have helped students in the control group to improve their writing performance.

3.1.4.3. Comparison of the Posttest Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups in terms of Writing Ability

To determine which group improved more after the feedback procedures, the posttest scores of the groups were compared through independent samples t-test.

Table 14: The Results of Independent Samples T-Test Comparing the Writing Posttest Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	n	x	Std. deviation	Degree of freedom	t	p
Experimental	15	52.93	7.32	33	.13	.89
Control	20	52.50	10.25			

To compare the writing posttest scores of the experimental and the control groups, independent samples t-test was applied. Table 14 shows that there is no significant difference between the experimental and control groups in terms of the writing scores of the posttest (t=.13, p>.05). It means that the overall writing performance scores of the experimental and the control groups were not significantly different after the feedback practices. The increase in the writing performance of the experimental and control groups was close. The results show no group outperformed the other.

3.1.5. Analysis of the Writing Attitude Questionnaire Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups

As attitudes towards writing are strong predictors of writing achievement, having positive attitudes towards writing may help students to write well and show maximum performance while having negative attitudes may lead them to failure as they do not have the strategies to deal with problems they face in writing classes. Writing attitudes towards writing were investigated to see

whether any prior difference regarding the writing attitudes existed between the groups. It was also aimed to find out whether there were any attitudinal differences between the two groups after getting different types of feedback. Initially, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks tests were conducted to see whether students' attitudes towards writing in English changed after the treatment in each group. Later, the posttest scores of the two groups were compared to reveal which type of feedback had more influence on the students' writing attitudes towards writing.

3.1.5.1. The Results of the Impact of Content-Focused Feedback on the Students' Attitudes towards Writing

Table 15: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Results Comparing the Pretest and the Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group from the Writing Attitude Questionnaire

Posttest-pretest	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	z	p
Negative ranks	7	7.43	52.00		
Positive ranks	6	6.50	39.00	-.45	.64
Ties	2				

Based on negative ranks

To examine whether the experimental group's writing attitude changed after the treatment, the group's pretest and posttest writing attitude questionnaire scores were compared using Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test. As can be seen in Table 15, there was no statistically significant difference (z=-, 45, p>.05). It can be inferred that receiving content-focused feedback was not effective in improving the students' attitudes towards writing.

3.1.5.2. The Results of the Impact of Form-Focused Feedback on the Students' Attitudes towards Writing

To find out whether the control group's writing attitudes changed after the treatment, the control group's pretest and posttest writing attitude scores were compared using Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test. From the table below it can be seen that there was no statically significant difference between the pretest and the posttest scores of the students in the control group (z=-.35, p> .05).

Table 16: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Results Comparing the Pretest and the Posttest Scores of the Control Group from the Writing Attitude Questionnaire

Posttest-pretest	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	z	p
Negative ranks	10	8.40	84.00		
Positive ranks	7	9.86	69.00	-.35	.72
Ties	3				

Based on negative ranks

3.1.5.3. Comparison of the Posttest Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups in terms of Writing Attitude

Mann Whitney U test was utilized to find out whether a significant difference existed between the writing attitude posttest scores of the groups. The results showed that no significant differences were found between the writing attitude scores of the experimental and the control groups after the treatment at significance level of 0.05 (U=138.50, p>.05). It can be said that receiving different types of teacher feedback did not have a positive effect on their general attitudes towards writing.

Table 17: Mann Whitney U Test Results Comparing the Experimental and the Control Groups in terms of the Posttest Scores of Writing Attitude Questionnaire

	Groups	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	U	p
Writing attitude	Experimental	15	18.77	281.50	138.50	.70
	Control	20	17.43	348.50		

3.1.6. Analysis of Second Language Writing Anxiety Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups

Writing anxiety is thought to be an important factor influencing the writing performance of learners. Second language writing anxiety inventory was initially employed to ensure any external variables posing threats to the experiment at the onset of the study. It was also aimed to reveal whether any differences in terms of writing anxiety existed between the two groups after getting different types of feedback. First, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test was utilized to examine the difference between the pretest and the posttest scores of each group from SLWAI. Next, Mann Whitney U test was conducted to compare the posttest scores of the experimental and the control groups to get a better idea of which feedback procedure was more effective in lowering the writing anxiety levels of the students.

3.1.6.1. The Results of the Impact of Content-Focused Feedback on the Students' Second Language Writing Anxiety

Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was utilized to find out whether the pretest and post test scores of the students in the experimental group differed significantly. It can be seen from Table 18 that no significant differences were found between the pretest and the posttest scores of the students in the experimental group (z=-1.08, p> .05). It can be argued that the treatment was not effective in lowering the second language anxiety levels of the students.

Table 18: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Results Comparing the Pretest and the Posttest Scores of Second Language Writing Anxiety Inventory of the Experimental Group

	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	z	p
Negative ranks	9	8.78	79.00	-1.08	.28
Positive ranks	6	6.83	41.00		
Ties	0				

Based on positive ranks

3.1.6.2. The Results of the Impact of Form-Focused Feedback on the Students' Second Language Writing Anxiety

Wilcoxon Signed Rank test was utilized to find out whether the pretest and the posttest writing anxiety inventory scores of the students in the control group differed significantly. It can be seen in the Table 19 that no significant differences were found between the pretest and the posttest scores of the students in the control group ($z=-1.62$, $p> .05$). It can be said that the treatment was not effective in lowering the second language anxiety levels of the students in the control group.

Table 19: Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test Results Comparing the Pretest and the Posttest Scores of Second Language Writing Inventory of the Control Group

	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	z	p
Negative ranks	13	11.42	148.50	-1.62	.104
Positive ranks	7	8.79	61.50		
Ties	0				

Based on positive ranks

3.1.6.3. Comparison of the Posttest Scores of the Experimental and the Control Groups in terms of Writing Anxiety

To examine whether there was a significant difference between the two groups in terms of writing anxiety after the treatment, posttest writing anxiety inventory scores of the experimental and control groups were compared using Mann Whitney U test. The control group's posttest writing anxiety inventory scores demonstrated a mean rank of 17.55. The experimental group's posttest writing inventory scores showed a mean rank of 18.60. As can be seen in Table 20, the results of the test does not provide any statistically significant difference ($U=141.00$, $p> 0.05$).

60

Table 20: Mann-Whitney U Test Results Comparing Writing Anxiety Scores of the Experimental and Control Groups after the Treatment

Group	n	Mean ranks	Sum of ranks	U	p
Experimental	15	18.60	279.00	141.00	.76
Control	20	17.55	351.00		

3.2. Analysis of the Qualitative Data

3.2.1. Analysis of the Interview with the Group which Received Content-Focused Feedback

The semi-structured interviews focused on the students' perceptions of the written teacher feedback they received over the period. The themes which are representative of the participants' opinions about the writing process and the provision of written teacher feedback are presented upon an analysis of the interview data. Content analysis of the data from the student interviews yielded four main categories:

1. Students' perceptions towards writing activities in general
2. Students' perceptions of whether receiving content-focused feedback improved their writing skills
3. Perceived advantages of receiving content-focused feedback
4. Perceived disadvantages of receiving content-focused feedback

3.2.1.1. Students' Perceptions towards Writing Activities in General

The students were invited to tell whether they liked the writing activities and the reasons for their answers were probed. One of the questions aimed to elicit their general perceptions towards writing and the activities they participated in during the course. The rest of the questions inquired students' perceptions of and opinions about the type of written feedback they received. The students provided opinions about process writing they were exposed to during the experiment. Further, they mentioned the effectiveness of writing classes and training on their process of language learning. The students also provided their opinions about the topics of assignments and the book used. The majority of students (8) seemed satisfied with the writing activities and they stated they learned a lot and improved their writing skills over the period.

> I think it is improving our writing. Personally, I couldn't write very well at the beginning. But, at the moment, I believe that I have developed myself. I can write a very good topic sentence and a concluding sentence (Student 4).

> Writing about a topic every week has improved our writing. The ones who are good at writing become better. Everybody increased their level in their own way. That is good (Student 2).

I liked the first and final draft practice. My first drafts lacked something. When you gave feedback on that, I could develop that part of my writing (Student 2).

I was not good at writing when I came here. But it was nice for us to write every week. I feel I have developed my writing skill (Student 6).

It worked for me, miss. I have realized what I can do and what I cannot do. Writing a first draft and a final one is really useful. I have the chance to correct my mistakes in the final draft (Student 7).

I liked the writing activities. I hadn't written in English up until three months ago. [..] But I realized that I could write when I participated in the writing activities in class. It was nice for me. [..] I think I have improved writing. I started out from scratch. Now I am not there, I have improved (Student 10).

It can be inferred from the statements that the writing class enabled students to develop their writing skill over the period. The students believed they benefited from the writing class because their writing ability at the end of the period was far better than it was at the beginning. From the comments it is understood that the students found writing two drafts useful since it facilitated their learning English and lead to student writing improvement.

However, a small number of students (4) expressed negative opinions of the writing classes:

When I felt that I had to write because it was homework, it did not help me to write better (Student 2).

I didn't want to write a second draft. Writing the same thing again was boring for me (Student 5).

I did not like this practice. My first drafts are usually good. Well, I have errors in the first drafts, but there are also errors in my final drafts. I don't need to do a little better in the final draft (Student 1).

I did not like vocabulary practices. There should be more grammar activities because we are writing (Student 12).

The students expressed their dissatisfaction related to the assignments, the revising process and the book. One of the students stated assigning writing homework caused negative feelings and s/he did not want to write. Having to write as it was their homework may have caused the students to have a negative attitude towards writing. Two of them pointed out they felt restricted when the topic was imposed on them and expressed their preference for more freedom in topic choice. Two of the students criticized the book for being inadequate and wanted to have more grammar exercises in it. This situation may stem from their deep-seated perceptions of writing: Writing is perceived as a compulsory course in which the audience is always the teacher rather than a means of communication of information. Two of the students argued that the course did not help them as they did not think the revising process was necessary. They further stated that they focused on the final product and grammar-free paragraphs were their priority. One of the students stated that

writing two drafts was extra work and s/he did not need that as s/he believed her/his first drafts were quite good.

3.2.1.2. The Students' Perceptions of Whether Receiving Content-Focused Feedback Improved Their Writing Skills

The students were asked to provide their ideas on the effectiveness of the teacher feedback they received on their writing. The students' perceptions towards the effectiveness of written teacher feedback on content were generally positive. Students reflected:

> I think teacher feedback was useful. Seeing the semantic mistakes I made and the problems of my paragraph was helpful for me (Student 10).

> It is helpful to see my weaknesses. You point that I have written a lot of things irrelevant to the subject. Sometimes I write everything that comes to my mind to meet the word count criterion. But when I look at it later, I understand that it is really irrelevant and I take it out. It helped me to have unity in my paragraphs. I learned how to connect my sentences meaningfully (Student 8).

> The feedback I received in the writing course was useful to me. I am not good at writing even in Turkish. The feedback you gave me, such as "Can you give details?" led me to think more comprehensively and write in a more detailed way so I think it was very useful (Student 7).

As can be inferred from the comments, the students who received content feedback believed that feedback provision contributed to them in terms of attaining clarity of meaning, supporting their ideas adequately and having a logical sequence of ideas in their writings. A frequently stated reason for the effectiveness of teacher feedback was that teacher feedback indicated the weak points of student writing so the students could notice the problematic parts and work on them. Many students commented that they realized meaning-related problems and found ways to fix these problems through teacher feedback.

A majority of the students further mentioned that teacher feedback contributed to them in terms of having paragraph unity, appropriate development of ideas, supporting the ideas with examples, facts, etc., and using correct transitional signals:

> I used to write in a chaotic way. I used to write about something and then jumped to another idea. I remembered I had forgotten to give examples for the previous idea and provided one. So my paragraphs turned out to be disorganized (Student 10).

> It helped me to present a variety of things in my writing. It led me to write more meaningful paragraphs (Student 7).

> It was beneficial in terms of ensuring coherence on the subject. I had unrelated sentences. I learned how to link these sentences with words like *so* and *however* (Student 8).

> Sometimes I do not explain something fully and that causes confusion. For example, we say that something is an advantage, but I do not say why it is an advantage or a disadvantage. It is a problem (Student 10).

One unanticipated effect of the content-focused feedback on student writings was that even though they received meaning-related feedback, some students expressed that they corrected their grammar mistakes with the help of feedback. One reason they gave was that when they realized a sentence was not clear, they thought it was because of grammar and they tried to get the message across by fixing the grammar mistake. Another reason was that when they revised the papers, they noticed their own mistakes which were not caused by their lack of proper grammar knowledge but by situational factors. Some students stated that teacher feedback indicated where they expressed their ideas ineffectively/poorly. The students admitted direct translations from L1 into L2 caused problems in their writings. With the teacher feedback they realized that the sentences did not convey the intended message. Therefore, even though the teacher did not give grammar feedback, they felt the need to revise the grammar as they believed the main reason of ambiguity was grammar.

> I have a number of mistakes in my first drafts. However, although you focus mainly on content, I see my grammatical mistakes when I revise it and I also pay attention to these grammar mistakes (Student 7).

> It also improved the grammar in my writings. I paid more attention to my grammar if my points were unclear (Student 9).

> I believe I write more grammatically correct sentences in the final draft (Student 4).

Two of the students expressed that the feedback they received was partly effective. Although they held positive ideas towards the feedback, they did not utilize teacher feedback to its full potential. They explicitly stated that they were concerned with grades and were not interested in developing their writing. However, they emphasized that it was a great opportunity for the students who wanted to develop their writing skills:

> I don't think that I care so much about my writing, so I think feedback didn't help me a lot. You commented on my paper, maybe it really would be very useful to someone who wants to improve herself/himself but I focus more on grades. I just write something (Student 3).

Few of the students stated that the feedback was not effective. One reason was that they were not happy with the idea of revising the paper. One thought:

> I don't think it was useful. I need to see my grammar mistakes (Student 5).

> I don't act on feedback because I focus on grades and I don't receive grades from class writings (Student 1).

It can be inferred from the students' comments that a variety of factors influence the effectiveness of content-focused feedback. Because they are highly motivated by grades, the students may not have felt that it was necessary to exploit teacher feedback to improve their writings. The self-efficacy attitudes of the students were also decisive in to what extent students

used teacher feedback. The students who thought they were already good at writing took little notice of teacher feedback. Perhaps they associated writing much more with the ability of writing grammatically correct sentences. They did not see any grammar mistakes indicated by the teacher and this gave them the impression that they were good at writing.

3.2.1.3. The Positive Effects and the Advantages of Receiving Content-Focused Feedback

The students in the experimental group were asked to report on the positive effects and the advantages of receiving content-focused written teacher feedback. The overall response to this question was positive. The majority of the students indicated that seeing the problems in their writings through teacher content feedback was important and they perceived it as positive experience because it provided them with an opportunity to get better.

We noticed the mistakes and realized they needed to be fixed (Student 10).

Realizing I do not know helps me to close the gap (Student 9).

Another issue was emotional response to feedback. The students reported positive effects of teacher-feedback on motivation and confidence. Some students stated that the tone of the teacher was important. Having received appraisal, the students had a can-do feeling and they felt encouraged to write more.

When playing games, we communicate in the universal language, English. When you gave me good, positive feedback, I became willing to chat more with other players. I felt self-confident. I thought if the teacher says so, I am good at English (Student 10).

Positive feedback boosts my ego (Student 1).

The students also expressed that knowing somebody, who was the teacher in that case, would read their writing was important. Having a sense of audience even though it was not a real audience may have a positive effect on the students and may motivate them to write.

I elaborated on my writings because I knew somebody would read and evaluate them (Student 10).

3.2.1.4. Negative Feelings and Disadvantages related to Receiving Content-Focused Feedback

The students were asked to report what disadvantages of getting content-focused feedback there were, if any, and the negative feelings or experiences they had during the feedback process. There were several comments in favor of content-focused feedback and the majority of the students said that receiving feedback on content was useful. However, the students also mentioned some

undesirable effects of that kind of feedback. The students in the experimental group argued that receiving feedback on grammar was more important than receiving feedback on content. Nearly half of students (5) emphasized the need for grammar correction. Students reflected:

> I think grammar should be checked in the final draft because when you don't check the grammar, the students think it is right. They learn wrong forms and make mistakes in exams. You ask me to give an example. The example I provide may be incorrect in terms of grammar. That practice is a little bit wrong (Student 5).

> I want to see my grammar mistakes (Student 12).

> Writing a second draft is unnecessary. Instead of that, grammar can be emphasized (Student 19).

> Not indicating grammar mistakes is a bit problematic. I need to correct grammar mistakes because they become permanent mistakes (Student 10).

> I need to work on my grammar. I think you should also consider my papers in terms of grammar (Student 6).

> It would be better if our writings were supported in terms of grammar (Student 12).

It can be understood from the comments above that the students are still under grammar-dominated teaching and learning methods and prefer corrective feedback focusing on grammar mistakes. They regard writing as a practice area for grammar and they need to test their grammar knowledge in the writing classes. They perceive themselves to be incapable of correcting their own mistakes and they have worries about the fossilization of errors if they are not corrected by the teacher in the feedback process. The students further expressed concerns related to exams. If they do not correct their mistakes in the writing class, they will have problems in the grammar sections of the exams. Another argument for grammar correction was that writing, when compared to speaking, was permanent and it was normal to make mistakes when speaking but writing is more formal and the readers will focus on the writer's mistakes when reading it. The content-focused feedback was not highly appreciated because of the students' attitudes towards writing which were shaped by their previous learning experiences and teacher practices. Language teaching stressing the priority of grammar accuracy obviously influenced the students' perceptions towards writing. Teacher practices which mainly focus on students writing mistakes lead students to think that to write well, they should write grammatically correct sentences.

Although highlighting the weak parts of the students' writings was valued by the majority of the students and was accepted by students, some students had opposing ideas. They stated that receiving negative comments and seeing problems in their writing affected them negatively. The amount of teacher feedback was another issue which caused students to lose interest in writing. This may be rooted in the characteristics of high context cultures in which losing face is an important issue and criticism may not be welcomed.

If there was a lot to be corrected in the first draft, I did not want to do it. I don't want to have so many mistakes. I lose my interest (Student 5).

Something affected me negatively. I had a lot of mistakes in a paragraph because I wrote it in the last five minutes. I didn't want to write the second draft as there were too many mistakes. That was a bit demotivating (Student 2).

3.2.2. Analysis of the Interview with the Group which Received Form-Focused Feedback

Students in the control group were asked questions about their experiences in the writing classes to elicit their opinions related to form-focused written teacher feedback. The data from the interviews were analyzed and presented under the following categories:

1. The students' perceptions towards writing activities in general
2. The students' perception towards whether receiving form-focused feedback improved their writing skills
3. The perceived advantages of receiving form-focused feedback
4. The perceived disadvantages of receiving form-focused feedback

3.2.2.1. The Students' Perceptions towards Writing Activities in General

The students were asked whether they liked the writing activities in general and provided reasons for their answers. The students in the control group broadly agreed on the idea that they liked the writing activities in the class. All the students were of the opinion that getting feedback was important to raise awareness about their mistakes and to stimulate students to revise their papers.

I liked it, especially focusing on writing correctly (Student 2).

I think there is something that makes a difference. Learning different types of paragraphs was effective. How to write an opinion paragraph or how to order our ideas, how to write an advantage and disadvantage paragraph. I think the most important thing was to learn these. The structure of a paragraph and how to write supporting details (Student 1).

I liked the activities. What had to be done was done. There was nothing I did not like (Student 9).

I liked them because we could develop ourselves. We saw our mistakes better in our writings (Student 11).

I generally liked the writing activities (Student 3).

I liked them. Not liking was out of question. I came here to learn English. I'm going to need it for my job in the future, such as writing a report. And I think it's useful. Here we saw the mistakes and we had the opportunity to fix them (Student 6).

I liked it because I saw my mistakes and had a chance to correct them (Student 12).

I liked it because they contributed to me a lot. I can see that when I look at my first writings (Student 8).

I liked it because I can see my improvement (Student 7).

The comments above reflect the students' favorable opinions of the writing process in general. It was clear that students hold positive perceptions towards the writing class as it enabled them to improve their writing skills. The most frequently stated reason was that writing practices improved their writing performance and the improvement was clearly perceived by the students. The second reason was that the students, by means of process writing, became aware of their mistakes and had the opportunity to correct these mistakes. The third reason was that the students had the chance to produce the language, in other words, they tested their knowledge of language in writing.

3.2.2.2. The Students' Perceptions of whether Receiving Form-Focused Feedback Improved their Writing Skills

The students were asked whether receiving feedback improved their writing in English. All of the students expressed that getting feedback helped them to write better in English. The students broadly (12) agreed that getting feedback improved the accuracy of their writings through practice. They stated they mainly dealt with serious problems such as word order, sentence structure, and verb tense mistakes and minor problems such as article and preposition mistakes. Most students stated that teacher's indicating the grammar errors helped them realize the problem and they made an effort to avoid these errors in their succeeding writings.

I can see the difference when I look at my first writings (Student 4).

I believe getting feedback improved my writing in English because what I wrote at the beginning of the term and what I can write now are not the same (Student 11).

I think it is useful because I see that I make fewer and fewer mistakes so it was positive, very useful (Student 12).

I think it was effective because I can see what was wrong or I try something new, something I have recently learned, in my writing that week. I can test whether I can use it correctly that week in the article. If I can't, I ask you the reason (Student 8)

I think the feedback worked well for me. For example, I used to get confused about passive structures mostly. I used to forget to put the right words in the right places. I solved that (Student 5).

From the comments above, it can be inferred that the students tend to consider mastery of grammar rules and sentence structure as the main indicator of a good performance in EFL writing. Their answers to the question whether their writing improved through teacher feedback indicated that their writings became better as they had fewer grammar mistakes in their subsequent writings.

The students also mentioned the benefits of feedback on their vocabulary development. They stated they usually had meaning-related problems because they used inappropriate or wrong words in their writing and teacher feedback made it clear that the intended meaning was not achieved. Some students also commented on problems caused by using Turkish syntax to write sentences in English. Two of the students admitted writing paragraphs in Turkish first and then translating it into English. They came to realize adopting such a method in English writing classes caused them to have ill-structured sentences.

I am sometimes confused by words, I mean the meanings. I searched for the words that I used incorrectly. It worked for me (Student 5).

Some student comments (5) indicated that they have developed organization and paragraph structure.

I used to jump from one idea to another at first. My paragraph was very complicated. But as I wrote, I managed to order the ideas in my paragraphs (Student 5).

For example, in the English Proficiency Test, the question was: Do you prefer to travel with a travel agency or on your own? At that time, I had jumped from topic to topic as I had poor vocabulary. I wrote something nonsense. But now my writings are more organized (Student 2).

Some student comments (5) indicated that they have developed content besides organization:

At the beginning, my writings were problematic. I had difficulty ordering my sentences. I used to use Turkish syntax to write in English. Now I write something and I explain it. It was helpful in terms of paragraph structure and content (Student 3).

But I also paid attention to content. My paragraphs have developed in terms of content as well (Student 8).

After receiving feedback, I check whether I have any sentences which are not supported. If there are any, I support them with either new words or sentences (Student 7).

As can be inferred from the comments above, providing feedback on form contributed to the students in terms of language use, vocabulary, content and organization. Interestingly, the students reported that they have improved on aspects of writing on which they received no feedback. When asked for the rationale for this, some students said that when they were revising, they also paid attention to content and organization if they noticed problems related to these areas. Another possible explanation for students' perceived improvement on content and organization can be the writing instruction they had throughout the term.

The students' beliefs about the lack of importance of writing in English in their future studies was also influential on the effort that they made to improve their writing skill. One of the students admitted that receiving feedback did not improve her/his writing skills as much as it was expected because s/he did not attend to teacher feedback. One possible reason why some students did not revise their paper attentively is reflected in the following quote:

It improved but it could have improved more. I did not study. I mean I did not make use of it. It has to do with me. In the first weeks of the period, I thought I needed English. Later, I noticed I don't need it for Medicine department. I stopped studying (Student 9).

3.2.2.3. Perceived Advantages of Receiving Form-Focused Feedback

When the students were questioned about the advantages of having form-focused feedback in their writings, all the students (12) expressed positive views towards receiving form-focused feedback. They had the mindset that it would facilitate improvement in their writing. It was proposed by many students that they could write better at the end of period:

Before, I could not think of anything to write and I felt my head was empty. I did not know what to write. Now I can say I will start like that and will write about that if I need to write (Student 2).

As I said, we can see the mistakes and ask you questions. It's a good way to learn the correct version. It is nice (Student 8).

I improved gradually, I can see that (Student 11).

The students all stated that one of the main advantages of receiving form-focused feedback was improved command of grammar. Through teacher feedback, students attended to frequent mistakes on their papers and corrected them in their following writings. Feedback was effective in correcting both minor and major mistakes. Students reported:

For example, I made mistakes when writing sentences in the passive voice. Later I started to pay more attention (Student 9).
It was useful especially in terms of grammar (Student 11).

I did not know much about grammar when I came here. Now, I know how to write sentences in the simple past tense and where to use Verb 2 and Verb 3. It was good for me (Student 2).

One of the frequent mistakes I made was forgetting to use *was* and *were* in the passive voice. I corrected it (Student 6).

It helps to correct serious mistakes (Student 5).

It helped me to pay attention to some points (Student 4).

I realized that I had more mistakes in my first writings on auxiliary verbs, verb tenses, etc. The number of my mistakes decreased compared to the past (Student 7).

The students further mentioned that bearing in mind that they made mistakes in their writings prevented them from making the same mistakes in the upcoming/following writings. Student responses included comments like the following:

I don't make the mistakes I made at first (Student 8).

I saw my mistakes and corrected them. The mistakes I repeated gradually decreased. I don't make these mistakes now (Student 12).

I don't repeat the mistakes when I have seen them many times (Student 11).

Some students suggested that seeing their errors gave them a chance to correct them and created space for improvement. For example one student said:

Here we had the chance to see our mistakes and correct them (Student 6).

It was also clear that students have favorable perceptions towards error correction. They believed having no mistakes means no improvement on their part. One student reflected:

I liked seeing my mistakes. Because I think I can develop. Not having any mistakes means making no progress. When we make mistakes, we have more chance to learn more. It is fun in that sense (Student 4).

The same view was echoed by another student:

Making no mistakes shows that I don't try anything new and no progress takes place. It means getting nowhere. Having no mistakes means we don't practice what we have learned (Student 19).

It was also reported by students that tracking their progress made them happy:

It makes me happy to see what I wrote is accurate. As a matter of fact, it feels good to be able to write something (Student 8).
In fact, when I saw that my writing improved, I felt happy (Student 11).
I saw that my mistakes decreased day by day. This motivated me (Student 7).

It can be concluded that the students in the control group seemed satisfied with the traditional type of feedback which focused primarily on form.

3.2.2.4. Perceived Disadvantages of Receiving Form-Focused Feedback

The students were finally asked to share whether there were any disadvantages of receiving form-focused feedback and which aspects of teacher feedback they found unhelpful. Students were also asked to provide any negative experiences related to the feedback they received in the writing process.

5 of the students were critical of teacher feedback as it was restricted to providing error feedback focusing on accurate use of language. They expected the teacher to provide comments on the content of ideas besides grammar feedback because they think content is also an important aspect of writing and grammatical accuracy does not determine the success of the writing on its own:

There have been times I elaborated on the writing tasks. But, as I received no feedback on the content of these writings, I had no idea whether they were good or not. It would be great if I received feedback on content (Student 3).

If a writing does not have any grammar mistakes, it should not be considered to be a perfect piece of writing. For example, when I don't have any grammar mistakes, I think of what to write in the second draft and how to make it better. I see no mistakes and content seems perfect to me because I wrote it. If I received feedback on content, I would try to correct the content (Student 5).

The content of our writings was not emphasized. I think I have content-related problems (Student 12).

One of the students highlighted that focusing on grammatical accuracy limited her/his creativity by having her/him write simple sentences which did not really convey what she meant:

I can write my ideas in a simple way but I don't want to write in a simple way. After your feedback, I simplify my sentences. In that case, I also simplify my ideas but now it is not what I want to say (Student 4).

Another concern which was brought up by 2 of students was the amount of feedback. Even though the majority of the students did not mind seeing their mistakes and held positive feelings towards highlighted mistakes, a small number of students expressed their discouragement because of the amount of the teacher feedback they received. They stated that having lots of mistakes in their writing caused them to lose their interest in revising and they felt discouraged:

When I have few mistakes, I want to write more; but when I have a lot of mistakes, I think that I can't write and lose my interest (Student 10).

It can have such a disadvantage. It happened to me a few times. When I see a lot of mistakes in my writing, it may affect my motivation negatively (Student 8).

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter summarizes the study and the research findings briefly. Later, some pedagogical implications on teacher feedback provision for EFL writing classes and some suggestions for further research are offered. The chapter also discusses the limitations of the study shortly.

As was stated previously, the main goal of this study was to explore the effectiveness of receiving two types of written teacher feedback on EFL students' overall writing performance. It aimed to compare the effects of content-focused written feedback and traditional form-focused written feedback on the writing performance of students. Additionally, the students' perceptions of the two feedback provision in writing classes were explored. The study also investigated whether the type of feedback was effective in changing the students' second language writing anxiety level and their attitudes towards writing since second language writing anxiety and attitudes towards writing are also some strong predictors of academic success/performance.

The data for the study were collected through a questionnaire, an inventory, two writing tests and semi-structured interviews in order to answer the research questions. In order to ensure there were no significant differences between the two groups of students, several procedures were implemented prior to the treatment. After the groups were chosen, all the participants were asked to complete a writing test, writing anxiety inventory and a writing attitude questionnaire to ascertain that the writing performance of the groups did not differ and that the groups had similar levels of second language writing anxiety and writing attitudes towards writing at the beginning of the study. The pretests showed no significant differences between the two groups with regard to writing performance, writing anxiety and writing attitudes at the onset of the study. It was important to ensure that any significant difference developed during the experiment can be attributed to the type of feedback the teacher-researcher provided rather than the instruction or course content.

Both groups were taught by the same teacher-researcher. The students were asked to write two drafts for each week's assignment. They were instructed to act upon teacher feedback and revise the first draft which was returned with teacher feedback.

In order to analyze the data obtained from the quantitative data collection tools, SPSS 18 was used. Parametric and non-parametric tests were implemented to analyze the quantitative data from writing test, second language writing anxiety inventory and writing attitudes questionnaire. The qualitative data from the student interviews were analyzed through content analysis.

Comparing the pretest and posttest scores of both groups from the writing tests employing Wilcoxon Signed Rank test showed that there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest scores. Teacher feedback, irrespective of the type, proved to contribute positively to the writing performance of the writers in both the control and the experimental groups.

As for writing attitudes and writing anxiety, the results did not show any statically significant differences before and after the treatment in either group. The group which received form-focused feedback and the one which received content-focused feedback did not seem to be affected by the type of feedback they received in terms of anxiety and attitude.

Analysis of semi-structured interviews suggested that the students relied on teacher feedback and considered teacher feedback a useful tool to notice their mistakes. In terms of corrective feedback, the students seemed to think that they needed corrective feedback on grammar mistakes on their papers, as they have doubts about their self-efficacy in writing. They need a more knowledgeable source to provide them with guidance since they are learning and in that sense they are not proficient yet. The students seem to have fixed perceptions on the role of writing. They still tend to perceive writing at the service of grammar rather than a means of expressing themselves. This inclination may be a result of their prior writing experiences which traditionally focused on error correction and instruction which put great emphasis on linguistic accuracy of their writings. While accepting the reality that error correction is both perceived valuable by students and teachers in an EFL setting and will help learners to notice their errors, as highlighted by Fiona Hyland, (2003: 22) an over-emphasis on the correct use of structures in English may have the potential to limit students in producing only the structures they believed they could write correctly and inhibit them from practicing and producing more complex language patterns.

The major findings of the study upon quantitative and qualitative analyses are presented below along with the research questions.

The main research question aimed to unearth the role of form-focused and content-focused written teacher feedback on improving EFL preparatory school students' writing abilities.

Paired samples t-test was conducted on the quantitative data from the writing pretests and posttests of both groups. It was found that students in both groups improved significantly their writing performance in new writings which were assessed by an analytic scoring rubric. This finding is in line with that of Fathman and Whalley (1990) who concluded that both form-focused feedback and content-focused feedback affected students' writings positively. However, the finding is contrary to that of Chandler (2003) who found that students receiving WCF did not achieve progress in terms of overall writing quality. In addition, the qualitative data from semi-structured interviews with the students in the control group revealed that students believed that written teacher

feedback helped them to realize their mistakes. They revised their writings with indirect feedback that the teacher provided and they felt that it enabled them to improve since they were actively engaged in correcting their mistake. This finding was also reported by Buckingham and Ekinci (2017) who found students valued indirect written feedback and were positive towards WCF. The students in the experimental group also believed that they improved their writing. Most of the students stated that they could see their development by simply comparing their first writings and the last ones in their portfolios.

The second research question aimed to discover if there was a statistically significant difference between the writing performance of the students receiving form-focused feedback and those receiving content-focused feedback based on the type of feedback they received.

Paired samples t-test analysis revealed that there was a significant increase between the writing pretest and posttest scores of the experimental group which received content-focused feedback ($t=-5, 98, p<.01$). It seems that content-focused feedback was effective in improving the writing performances of the students. Similarly, paired t-test analysis showed that there was also a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest scores of the control group which received form-focused feedback ($t=-6, 25, p<.01$). This finding can be explained with the fact that both groups received the same writing instruction and went through similar processes while composing their texts. This finding is significant because it shows that content-focused group, even though they did not received feedback on grammar, improved their writing as much as the form-focused group did. This finding may be helpful to change the perceptions of students and teachers who highly value the role of error correction and overuse this strategy hoping to help students to write well.

However, independent samples t-test comparing the writing posttest scores of the experimental and control groups yielded that the overall writing performance scores of the experimental and the control groups were not significantly different at the end of study, which indicates that both of the groups improved on a similar level.

In summary, it does not seem possible to say that content-focused feedback is more effective than form-focused feedback in facilitating the writing performance of learners in timed writing activities. Both forms of teacher feedback seem to have been successful in improving the writing performance of the students as the pretest and the posttest scores of writing test were significantly different.

The third research question sought to find if there were any attitudinal differences between the students in the form-focused feedback group and those in the content-focused feedback group towards writing in English based on the type of feedback they received.

In terms of writing attitudes towards writing, Wilcoxon Signed Ranks test results comparing the pretest and the posttest scores of the experimental group from the writing attitude questionnaire showed that there was no statistically significant improvement (z=-.45, p>.05), suggesting that receiving content-focused feedback was not effective in improving the students' attitudes towards writing. Similarly, there was no statically significant improvement in the control group (z=-.35, p> .05) with regard to writing attitudes. It can be inferred from the results that there was no evidence that form-focused feedback provision has a positive influence on the writing attitudes of the students.

The result of the Mann Whitney U test comparing the experimental and the control groups in terms of the posttest scores of writing attitude did not show any significant differences between the two groups (U=138.50, p>.05). The general writing attitudes of the group which received content-focused feedback and the group which was exposed to form-focused feedback did not differ significantly.

The fourth research question attempted to find out if there were any differences between the control group and the experimental group in terms of writing anxiety experienced by the students based on the type of feedback they received.

Wilcoxon Signed Rank test on the pretest and the posttest scores of the experimental group showed that content-focused feedback did not decrease the second language writing anxiety of the students significantly (z=-1.08, p> .05). Likewise, no significant differences were found between the pretest and the posttest scores of the students in the control group with regards to second language writing anxiety (z=-1.62, p> .05), indicating that form-focused feedback was not effective in lowering the second language anxiety levels of the students.

Mann Whitney U test results comparing the writing anxiety scores of the experimental and the control groups after the feedback treatment showed that there was not a significant difference between the two groups in terms of second language writing anxiety at the end of study (U=141. 00, p> 0.05).

The fifth research question was aimed at finding what the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of form-focused written teacher feedback were.

Semi-structured interviews demonstrated that students favored the writing activities in general and the feedback provision since it assisted them to be aware of their mistakes and triggered revision. The students held positive opinions of teacher feedback and expected it as they broadly agreed that getting feedback would result in improved accuracy of their writings by dealing with both major and minor problems in their writings. This finding supports evidence from a

previous study which showed no students had any objections to receiving error correction and the most frequently preferred technique by the students was marking errors and labelling them with an error correction code (Ferris and Roberts, 2001). Form-focused feedback in the form of indirect feedback was welcomed by students since they believed this kind of error treatment created an awareness on the problematic parts of their writing and help them to refrain from these errors in their subsequent writings. This results are in line with those of Chaudron (1988) who also found that students feel that their mistakes, when pointed out by the teacher, will be reduced in their subsequent writings if they are treated. In the present study, the main advantage of receiving form-focused feedback expressed by the students was obtaining a better command of grammar. Receiving form-focused treatment on their papers enabled them to pay attention to mistakes, both minor and major ones, and offered improvement in linguistic accuracy of their writings. This finding is consistent with that of Leki (1991) who found that students showed their preference for error correction and having error free texts was their major concern.

In spite of the verbalized advantages of form-focused teacher treatment, it was found that not receiving feedback on content, which is also regarded an important element of good writing, sacrificing the intended meaning in order to achieve grammatical accuracy and losing confidence and enthusiasm in writing because of having lots of mistakes indicated on the papers were among the drawbacks of form-focused feedback provision. One possible interpretation of that finding may be that learners pay excessive attention to linguistic features.

The sixth research question attempted to uncover what the Turkish EFL students' perceptions of content-focused written teacher feedback were.

The findings from semi-structured interviews with the experimental group indicated that student were satisfied with the writing activities, as in the control group. Similarly, it was voiced by the majority of the students that their writing ability developed to a considerable degree over the period. A concrete proof of the improved writing ability perceived by the students was stated to be their writings at the end of the period which were relatively better than the ones at the beginning of the period. Yet, a number of students seemed to believe grammar-free paragraphs were important and they inclined to focus on the final product rather than the process. This finding is consistent with that of Leki (1991) who found that grammar-free writing was a concern for students. The students in the content-focused group maintained positive stance to feedback provision in general and they believed that feedback assisted them to fix meaning-related problems and to express their ideas well in their writings. Teacher feedback by calling attention to problematic issues in their writings guided them through the task of writing and encouraged them to seek ways to fix meaning-related problems.

One of the interesting findings to emerge from the analysis of the interviews is that even though they did not receive error correction treatment on their writings, some students believed teacher feedback helped them with their grammar mistakes. They paid more attention to structures and grammar of their papers in the revision process when they realized that the intended message was not conveyed. They also realized their own mistakes without explicit teacher feedback. Another positive aspect the students mentioned was that having received feedback on strong parts of their writings, the students felt motivated and confident to write more. Receiving feedback on weak parts of their writings was not perceived negatively as they believed it had a constructive role and offered them opportunities to better their writings.

Apart from those positive perceptions, the students also voiced their dissatisfaction with the type of treatment. Content-focused group argued that they placed importance on grammar accuracy and nearly half of the students emphasized their need for grammar correction. The students' obvious preference for error correction should be interpreted with their language learning background. Their inclination to written corrective feedback can be a result of the product-oriented writing instruction they were exposed to before. One of the participants openly blamed the teacher-researcher for giving them incorrect feedback as she only focused on communicative aspects of their writing without indicating the grammar mistakes. To change the students' perceptions towards writing seems difficult as they think they need to practice and improve their grammar in writing classes. Since they believe they cannot correct their mistakes on their own, they rely on their teachers to do the correction. Teacher practices which put great emphasis on grammar-dominated teaching for years may have been effective in shaping the students' attitudes towards writing. The students tend to ignore the communicative role of writing and try to excel at grammar accuracy.

The study showed that EFL learners may benefit from any form of written teacher feedback, both corrective feedback and comments on content. Then, it can be argued, EFL instructors must be attentive to students' needs for feedback in writing classes and both forms of feedback need to be employed in EFL contexts. By doing so, EFL learners can have the chance to improve their writing performance in EFL programs.

One limitation of the study is that the sample size was restricted to 35 EFL students from a preparatory level class in a university in Turkey. In order to generalize the finding to a greater population, it is necessary to replicate the study in other preparatory level classes in Turkey. The data would generate more reliable results. Another possible limitation is that some students may have had friends in the other group and they might have talked about and compared the feedback procedures they received. This, in turn, may have given rise to prejudices about the treatment they received. The teacher-researcher realized that when one of the students in the control group criticized the feedback provision for being faulty because it did not deal with the meaning and the content of his writing. He had friends from the experimental group. That indicated that the students

shared information about their classes. Another limitation of the study is that the study was conducted at the beginning of the academic year. Thus, the students cannot have been exposed to segregated writing classes before and they could not compare their previous feedback practices with the newly experienced practices.

The present study attempted to make some contributions to the related literature. However, it is obvious that the debate and discussions surrounding the teacher feedback issue will not stop. Further research is needed to validate the findings of the study. The study is limited to EFL students at two preparatory level classes at a state university and replicating the study in similar context will generate more reliable results. The proficiency level of the students was B1 in English according to Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. The study can be conducted at different levels of proficiency to examine the effect of different forms of teacher feedback on the performance of EFL learners studying at different proficiency levels. Further, the study lasted for 10 weeks and more longitudinal studies can be conducted to see the effects of teacher feedback on language anxiety and writing anxiety as writing attitudes and writing anxiety take a longer time to change.

To sum up, teacher feedback tends to be an integral part of any writing class and activity. By realizing how to make the best use of it will make it possible to guarantee success and generate the necessary motivation in learners in any learning environment. However, what to focus on in student writings may be one dilemma teachers may encounter while teaching. The findings of the present study indicate that implementing multi-draft writing rather than one and feedback provision appear to improve learner writing irrespective of the focus of feedback. The feedback offered by writing teachers seems to be considered valuable by learners. It is important to point out that this study does not discard error correction in writing classes but aims to create awareness about the real purpose of writing which is communication. It is important to realize both forms of feedback, form-focused and content-focused, are not real dichotomies but rather two arms on the same body.

REFERENCES

Al-Jarrah, Rasheed S. (2016), "A Suggested Model of Corrective Feedback Provision", **Ampersand**, 3, 98-107.

Ashwell, Tim (2000), "Patterns of Teacher Response to Student Writing in A Multiple-Draft Composition Classroom: Is Content Feedback Followed by Form Feedback The Best Method?", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 9(3), 227-257.

Atay, Derin and Kurt, Gökce (2006), "Prospective Teachers and L2 Writing Anxiety", **Asian EFL Journal**, 8(4), 100-118.

Badger, Richard & White, Goodith (2000), "A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing", **ELT Journal**, 54(2), 153-160.

Baghzou, Sabrina (2011), "The Effects of Content Feedback on Students' Writing", **Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi** 51(2), 169-180.

Bates, Linda et al. (1993), **Writing Clearly: Responding to ESL Compositions,** Heinle and Heinle Publishers, Florence.

Biber, Douglas et al. (2011). "The Effectiveness of Feedback for L1-English and L2-writing Development: A Meta-analysis", ETS Research Report Series, 2011(1), i-99.

Birkner, Victor A. (2016), "Revisiting Input and Output Hypotheses in Second Language Learning", **Asian Education Studies,** 1(1), 19-22.

Bitchener, Jean (2008), "Evidence in Support of Written Corrective Feedback", **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 17 (2), 69–124.

Bitchener, Jean et al. (2005), "The Effect of Different Types of Corrective Feedback on ESL Student Writing" **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 14 (3), 191–205.

Bitchener, John and Ferris, Dana R. (2012a) "Theory and History of Error Treatment in SLA and Composition Studies", **Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing**, in 1st edition (1-27), Routledge. New York.

_____ (2012b), "From Theory to Practice: Written CF for L2 Student Writers", **Written Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition and Writing**, in (138-171) Routledge, New York

Bitchener, John. (2018), "Teacher Written Feedback", John I. Liontas (ed), **the TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching**, in (1-7), John Wiley & Sons, Inc,

Brookhart, Susan M. (2017), **How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students**, ASCD.

Brown, H. Douglas (2001), **Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy**, 2nd ed, Longman.

Buckingham, Lousia and Aktuğ-Ekinci, Derya (2017), "Interpreting Coded Feedback on Writing: Turkish EFL Students Approaches To Revision", **Journal of English for Academic Purposes,** 26, 1-16.

Chandler, Jean (2003), "The Efficacy of Various Kinds of Error Feedback for Improvement in the Accuracy and Fluency of L2 Student Writing", **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 12, 267–296. doi: 10.1016/S1060-3743(03)00038-9

Chaudron, Craig(1998), **Second Language Classrooms: Research On Teaching And Learning**. Cambridge University Press.

Cheng, Yuh-Show (2002), "Factors Associated with Foreign Language Writing Anxiety", **Foreign Language Annals**, 35(6), 647-656.

_____ (2004), "A Measure of Second Language Writing Anxiety: Scale Development and Preliminary Validation", **Journal of second language writing**, 13(4), 313-335.

Cheng, Yuh-Show et al.(1999), "Language Anxiety: Differentiating Writing And Speaking Components", **Language Learning**, 49 (3), 417-446.

Cohen, Andrew, and Cavalcanti, Marilda (1990), "Feedback on Compositions: Teacher and Student Verbal Reports", Barbara Kroll (Ed.), **Second Language Writing: Research Insights for the Classroom**, in (155–177).

Creswell, Johnson, (2014), **Research Design**, 4th Ed., Sage Publications, The United States Of America.

Cumming, Alister H. (2006), "Introduction, Purpose, and Conceptual Foundations", Alister H. Cumming (ed.), **Goals for Academic Writing: ESL Students and Their Instructors**, in (1-10), John Benjamins Publishing.

Daly, John A. and Miller, Michael D.(1975), "The Empirical Development Of An Instrument To Measure Writing Apprehension", **Research in the Teaching of English**, 9(3), 242-249.

doi: 10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0506

Donesch-Jezo, Ewa (2011), "The Role of Output and Feedback in Second Language Acquisition: A Classroom-Based Study of Grammar Acquisition by Adult English Language Learners". **The Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics (ESUKA–JEFUL)**, 2(2), 9-28.

Ekiz, Durmuş (2017), **Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemleri: Yaklaşım, Yöntem Ve Teknikleri**, Anı Yayıncılık.

Ellis, Rod (2008), "A Typology of Written Corrective Feedback Types", **ELT Journal**, 63(2), 97-107.

Ellis, Rod, et al. (2008), "The Effects of Focused and Unfocused Written Corrective Feedback in an English as a Foreign Language Context", **System**, 36, (353–37).

Enginarlar, Hüsnü (1993), "Student Response to Teacher Feedback in EFL Writing", **System**, 21(2), 193-204.

Erarslan, Ali, (2011), **Perceptions And Attitudes Of The Preparatory Class Students Towards The Writing Course And Attitude-Success Relationship in Writing In The School Of Foreign Languages At Pamukkale University**, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Pamukkale University, The Institute Of Social Sciences.

Erdem, Devrim (2007), "A Study of Developing an Attitude Scale Toward an English Course", **Eurasian Journal of Educational Research,** 28, 45-54

Erkan, Dilek Yavuz and Saban, Ayten İflazoğlu (2011), "Writing Performance Relative To Writing Apprehension, Self-Efficacy In Writing, And Attitudes Towards Writing: A Correlational Study In Turkish Tertiary-Level EFL", **The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly,** (13)1.

Faigley, Lester et al. (1981),"The Role of Writing Apprehension in Writing Performance and Competence", **The Journal Of Educational Research**, 75(1), 16-21.

Fathman, Ann, & Whalley, Elizabeth (1990), Teacher Response To Student Writing: Focus On Form Versus Content. Barbara Kroll (Ed.), **Second Language Writing (Cambridge Applied Linguistics): Research Insights for the Classroom** (Cambridge Applied Linguistics, in (178-190), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Ferris, Dana R. (1995), "Can Advanced ESL Students Be Taught To Correct Their Most Serious And Frequent Errors?", **CATESOL Journal**, 8, 41–62

_____ (1997), "The Influence of Teacher Commentary on Student Revision", **TESOL Quarterly**, 31, 315–339.

Ferris, Dana (1999), "The Case for Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes: A Response to Truscott", **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 8(1), 1-11.

_____ (2002), **Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing,** Ann Arbor: University Of Michigan Press.

_____ (2003), **Response to Student Writing: Implications for Second Language Students**, Routledge.

_____ (2006), Does Error Feedback Help Student Writers? New Evidence on the Short- And Long-Term Effects of Written Error Correction, Key Hyland & Fiona Hyland (Eds.) **Feedback In L2 Writing: Contexts And Issues**, in (81-104), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

_____ (2011), **Treatment of Error in Second Language Student Writing**, University Of Michigan Press.

_____ (2014), "Responding to Student Writing: Teachers' Philosophies And Practices", **Assessing Writing**, 19, 6-23.

Ferris, Dana and Roberts, Barrie (2001), "Error Feedback in L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need To Be?", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 10(3), 161-184.

Ferris, Dana et al. (1997), "Teacher Commentary On Student Writing: Descriptions & Implications", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 6(2), 155-182.

Ferris, Dana R., and Helt, Marie (2000), "Was Truscott Right? New Evidence on the Effects of Error Correction in L2 Writing Classes", In Proceedings of the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference, Vancouver, BC (11-14).

Ferris, Dana, & Roberts, Barrie (2001), "Error Feedback In L2 Writing Classes: How Explicit Does It Need To Be?", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 10, 161–184.

Ghandi, Maryam, & Maghsoudi, Mojtaba (2014), "The Effect of Direct and Indirect Corrective Feedback on Iranian EFL Learners´ Spelling Errors", **English Language Teaching**, 7(8), 53-61.

Grami, Mohammed (2005), "The Effect of Teachers' Written Feedback on ESL Students' Perception: A Study in A Saudi ESL University-Level Context", **Annual Review Of Education, Communication and Language Sciences,** 2(1), 10-13.

Hammersley, Martyn (1993) "On the Teacher as Researcher", **Educational Action Research**, 1(3), 425-445.

Harmer, Jeremy (2004), **How to Teach English,** 2th ed., Pearson Education Limited, Malesia.

Hasan, Kamrul and Moniruzzaman Akhand (2010), "Approaches to Writing In EFL/ESL Context: Balancing Product And Process In Writing Class At Tertiary Level", **Journal of NELTA**, 15(1-2), 77-88.

Hassan, Badran A. (2001), **The Relationship of Writing Apprehension And Self-Esteem to The Writing Quality And Quantity of EFL University Students**, Unpublished Ph. D thesis, Mansoura University, College of education.

Hattie, John, & Timperley, Helen. (2007), "The Power of Feedback", **Review of Educational Research,** 77(1), 81-112.

He, Deyuan (2018), **Foreign Language Learning Anxiety in China: Theories and Applications in English Language Teaching**, Springer.

Hedgcock, John and Lefkowitz, Natalie (1994), "Feedback on Feedback: Assessing Learner Receptivity to Teacher Response in L2 Composing", **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 3(2), 141-163.

Hillocks, George (2005), "At Last: The Focus on Form vs. Content in Teaching Writing", **Research in The Teaching Of English**, 40(2), 238-248.

Horning, Alice (1987), **Teaching Writing as a Second Language**, SIU Press, United States of America.

Horwitz, Elaine (2001), "Language Anxiety and Achievement", **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**, 21,112-126.

Horwitz, Elaine K. et al. (1986), "Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety", **The Modern Language Journal**, 70(2), 125-132.

Hyland, Fiona & Hyland, Key (2001), "Sugaring the Pill; Praise and Criticism in Written Feedback", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 10 (3), 185-212.

Hyland, Fiona (2003), "Focusing On Form: Student Engagement with Teacher Feedback", **System**, 31(2), 217-230.

_____ (2010), "Future Directions in Feedback on Second Language Writing: Overview and Research Agenda", **International Journal of English Studies**, 10(2), 171-182.

Hyland, Ken (2003), Writing and Teaching Writing, Richards, Jack C.(eds), **Second Language Writing,** Cambridge University Press, 1st ed ,(1-28) the United States of America.

_____ (2008), "Writing Theories and Writing Pedagogies", **Indonesian JELT**, 4(2), 1-20.

_____ (2009), "Concepts and Issues", N. Cristopher Candlin and David R. Hall (eds), **Teaching And Researching Writing,** in 2nd ed.(7-74), Pearson, Great Britain.

Hyland, Ken and Hyland, Fiona (2006a), Interpersonal Aspects of Response: Constructing and Interpreting Teacher Written Feedback, **Feedback in Second Language Writing: Contexts and Issues**, 206-224.

_____ (2006b), "Feedback on Second Language Students' Writing", Language Teaching, 39(2), 83-101.

JI, Xiaoling, (2015), "Error Correction in College EFL Writing Instruction: Students' Expectations and Correction Effects", **The Journal Of Asiatefl**, 12(1) 117-140.

Johnson, R Burke And Christensen, Larry (2004), **Educational Research Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods**, 5th Ed, Sage Publications, The United States Of America.

Junqueira, Luciana and Payant, Caroline (2015), "I Just Want To Do It Right, But It's So Hard: A Novice Teacher's Written Feedback Beliefs And Practices", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 27, 19-36.

Kahraman, Ayhan and Yalvac, Fatma (2015), "EFL Turkish University Students' Preferences about Teacher Feedback and Its Importance", **Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences**, 199, 73-80.

Kayaoğlu, Mustafa Naci (2009), "Process Writing With the Internet", **Modern English Teacher**, 18(2), 48-50.

Kaynak, Mihri, (2017), **Impact of Peer Feedback on EFL Learners' Foreign Language Writing Anxiety and Their Ideas about Peer Feedback,** Unpublished Master's Thesis, Eskisehir Anadolu University, The Institute of Educational Sciences.

Keh, Claudia L. (1990), "Feedback In The Writing Process: A Model and Methods for Implementation.", **ELT Journal**, 44 (4) 294-304

Kepner, Christine Goring (1991), "An Experiment in the Relationship of Types of Written Feedback to the Development of Second-Language Writing Skills", **The modern language journal**, *75*(3), 305-313.

Kim, Ji Hyun (2004), "Issues of Corrective Feedback in Second Language Acquisition", **Tesol**, 4 (2), 1-24

Kregar, Sandra(2011), **Relative Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback Types in Computer-Assisted Language Learning**, Unpublished Ph. D thesis, Department of Modern Languages & Linguistics, Florida State University

Kurt, Gokce and Atay, Derin (2007), "The Effects of Peer Feedback on the Writing Anxiety Of Prospective Turkish Teachers Of EFL", **Online Submission**, 3(1), 12-23.

Lalande, John F. (1982), "Reducing Composition Errors: An Experiment", **Modern Language Journal**, 66, 140–149.

Lee, I. (2008), "Understanding Teachers' Written Feedback Practices in Hong Kong Secondary Classrooms", **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 17(2), 69-85.

Lee, Icy (2004), "Error Correction in L2 Secondary Writing Classrooms: The Case of Hong Kong", **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 13(4), 285-312.

_____ (2017), "Teacher Feedback in L2 Writing**, Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts**, in (65-79), Springer Singapore.

_____ (2017), "Perspectives on Feedback in L2 Writing", **Classroom Writing Assessment and Feedback in L2 School Contexts**, in (53-61), Springer Singapore.

Leki, Ilona (1991), "The Preferences of ESL Students for Error Correction in College-Level Writing Classes", **Foreign Language Annals**, 24(3), 203-218.

Liu, Meihua and Ni, Huiliuqian (2015), "Chinese University EFL Learners' Foreign Language Writing Anxiety: Pattern, Effect And Causes", **English Language Teaching**, 8(39), 46-58.

Liu, Qiandi and Brown, Dan (2015), "Methodological Synthesis of Research on the Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback In L2 Writing", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 30, 66-81.

Long, Michael H. (1996), "The Role of Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition", William Ritchie and Tej. K. Bhatia (Eds.), **Handbook of Second Language Acquisition**, in (413-468), Academic Press, San Diego.

Lundstrom, Kristi and Baker, Wendy (2009), "To Give Is Better Than to Receive: The Benefits Of Peer Review to the Reviewer's Own Writing", **Journal of Second Language Writing,** 18(1), 18(1), 30-43.

M. Lillis, Theresa and Swann, Joan (2005), "Giving Feedback on Student Writing", **Teaching Academic Writing: A Toolkit for Higher Education,** in (01-129), Routledge.

Mackey, Alison et al. (2000), "How Do Learners Perceive Interactional Feedback?", **Studies in Second Language Acquisition,** 22(4), 471-497.

Mcdonough, Jo, Mcdonough, Steven. (1997). "The Teacher Researcher in Focus", **Research Methods for English Language Teachers,** 1st edition (21-35), Routledge, New York.

Montgomery, Julie L. and Baker, Wendy (2007), "Teacher-Written Feedback: Student Perceptions, Teacher Self-Assessment, and Actual Teacher Performance", **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 16 (2), 82-99.

Muirhead, Brent. (2002). "Teacher-as-Researcher", **USDLA Journal**, 16 (9).

Murray, Donald (1972), "Teach Writing as a Process not Product", **The Leaflet**, 1972, 71(3), 11-14.

Nation, Ian Sp. (2008), **Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing,** Routledge.

Ortega, Lourdes (2009), "Studying Writing Across EFL Contexts: Looking Back And Moving Forward", Rosa Manchon(ed.),**Writing in Foreign Language Contexts: Learning, Teaching, And Research,** 232-255, Multilingual Matters.

Ozturk, Gökhan & Saydam, Deniz (2014), "Anxiety and Self-Efficacy in Foreign Language Writing: The Case in Turkey Yabancı Dilde Yazmada Özyeterlik ve Kaygı: Türkiye'de Bir Durum Çalışması", **Journal of Educatıon**, 1(2), 10-21.

Park, Eunjung (2006), "Review Article on the Effectiveness of Teacher's Written Feedback on L2 Writing", Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242531333

Qashoa, Sulaiman Hasan Hussein (2014), "English Writing Anxiety: Alleviating Strategies", **Procedia-Social And Behavioral Sciences**, 136, 59-65.

Qin, Jinging, And Karabacak, Erkan (2013), "Turkish EFL University Instructors' Practices In Providing Written Feedback", **Procedia-Social And Behavioral Sciences**, 70, 95-100.

Rahimi, Mohammad. & Asadi, Ebrahim (2014), "Effect of Different Types of Written Corrective Feedback On Accuracy And Overall Quality Of L2 Learners' Writing", **European Journal Of Academic Essays,** 1(6), 1-7.

Robb, Thomas et al. (1986), "Salience Of Feedback on Error And Its Effect On EFL Writing Quality", **TESOL Quarterly**, 20, 83–93.

Rodríguez, Yarimax *et al* (2009), "Foreign Language Writing Anxiety among Pre-service EFL Teachers", **Lenguas Modernas**, 33, 21-31.

Schmidt, Richard (2012), "Attention, Awareness, and Individual Differences in Language Learning", Wai Megn Chan et al. (Eds), **Perspectives on Individual Characteristics and Foreign Language Education**, in (27-50), De Geuyter Mouten, Germany.

Semke, Harriet D.(1984), " Effects Of The Red Pen", **Foreign Language Annals**, 17(3), 195-202.

Sheppard, Ken (1992), "Two Feedback Types: Do They Make A Difference?", **Relc Journal**, 23(1), 103-110.

Sommers, Nancy (1982), "Responding To Student Writing", **College Composition And Communication**, 33(2), 148-156.

Spielberger, Charles D. (2010), "State-Trait Anxiety Inventory", **The Corsini Encyclopedia of Psychology**, 1-1.

Susser, Bernard. (1994), "Process Approaches in ESL/EFL Writing Instruction", **Journal of Second Language Writing**, 3(1), 31-47.

Swain, Merrill (2005), "The Output Hypothesis: Theory and Research", Eli Hinkel (ed.), in **Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning**, 1st edition (495-508), Routledge.

Swain, Merrill and Lapkin, Sharon (1995), "Problems in Output and the Cognitive Processes They Generate: A Step towards Second Language Learning", **Applied linguistics** 16(3), 371-391.

Swain, Merrill, (1985) "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in its Development", Susan Gass and Carolyn Madden (Eds.), **Input in Second Language Acquisition,** in (235-256) Newbury House, New York.

The Case in Turkey", **Başkent University Journal of Education**, 1(2), 10-21.

Tribble, Christopher (1996), **Writing**, Oxford University press.

Truscott, John (1996), "The Case against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes", **Language Learning**, 46(2), 327-369.

Truscott, John (2007), "The Effect Of Error Correction on Learners' Ability to Write Accurately", **Journal Of Second Language Writing**, 16(4), 255-272.

Truscott, John and Hsu, Angela Yi-Ping (2008), "Error Correction, Revision, and Learning", **Journal Of Second Language Writing,** 17(4), 292-305**.**

Turgut, Fehmi and Kayaoğlu, Mustafa Naci (2015), "Using Rubrics as an Instructional Tool In EFL Writing Courses", **Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies**, 11(1), 47-58.

Ünaldi, İhsan (2017), "A Qualitative Analysis of EFL Written Corrective Feedback", **The Online Journal of Science And Technology,** 7(1), 12.

Weigle, Sarah Cushing (2002), **Assessing Writing**, Ernst Klett Sprachen.

Zamel, Vivian (1985), "Responding to Student Writing", **Tesol Quarterly**, *19*(1), 79-101.

_____ (1987), "Recent Research on Writing Pedagogy", **Tesol Quarterly,** 21(4), 697-715.

Zhang, Hongxia (2011), **A Study on ESL Writing Anxiety among Chinese English Majors: Causes, Effects and Coping Strategies for ESL Writing Anxiety**, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Kristianstad University, School of Teacher Education.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: ANALTIC SCORING RUBRIC FOR WRITING

Area	Score	Descriptor
Content	20-17	**Excellent to very good:** Excellent to very good treatment of the subject; considerable variety of ideas or argument; independent and thorough interpretation of the topic; content relevant to the topic; accurate detail
	16-12	**Good to average:** Adequate treatment of topic; some variety of ideas or argument; some independence of interpretation of the topic; most content relevant to the topic; reasonably accurate detail
	11-8	**Fair to poor:** Treatment of the topic is hardly adequate; little variety of ideas or argument; some irrelevant content; lacking detail
	7-5	**Very poor:** Inadequate treatment of the topic; no variety of ideas or argument; content irrelevant, or very restricted; almost no useful detail
	4-0	**Inadequate:** Fails to address the task with any effectiveness
Organization	20-17	**Excellent to very good:** Fluent expression, ideas clearly stated and supported; appropriately organized paragraphs or sections; logically sequenced (coherence); connectives appropriately used (cohesion)
	16-12	**Good to average:** Uneven expression, but main ideas stand out; paragraphing or section organization evident; logically sequenced (coherence); some connectives used (cohesion)
	11-8	**Fair to poor:** Very uneven expression, ideas difficult to follow; paragraphing/organization does not help the reader; logical sequence difficult to follow (coherence); connectives largely absent (cohesion)
	7-5	**Very poor:** Lacks fluent expression, ideas very difficult to follow, little sense of paragraphing/organization; no sense of logical sequence (coherence); connectives not used (cohesion)
	4-0	**Inadequate:** Fails to address this aspect of the task with any effectiveness
Vocabulary	20-17	**Excellent to very good:** Wide range of vocabulary; accurate word/idiom choice and usage; appropriate selection to match register
	16-12	**Good to average:** Adequate range of vocabulary; occasional mistakes in word/idiom choice and usage; register not always appropriate
	11-8	**Fair to poor:** Limited range of vocabulary; a noticeable number of mistakes in word/idiom choice and usage; register not always appropriate
	7-5	**Very poor:** no range of vocabulary; uncomfortably frequent mistakes in word/idiom choice and usage; no apparent sense of register
	4-0	**Inadequate:** Fails to address this aspect of the task with any effectiveness
Language	30-24	**Excellent to very good:** Confident handling of appropriate structures, hardly any errors of agreement. tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions; meaning never obscured
	23-18	**Good to average:** Acceptable grammar - but problems with more complex structures; mostly appropriate structures; some errors of agreement. tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions; meaning sometimes obscured
	17-10	**Fair to poor:** Insufficient range of structures with control only shown in simple constructions; frequent errors of agreement. tense, number, word order, articles, pronouns, prepositions; meaning sometimes obscured
	9-6	**Very poor:** Major problems with structures - even simple ones; frequent errors of negation, agreement. tense, number word order/function, articles, pronouns, prepositions; meaning often obscured
	5-0	**Inadequate:** Fails to address this aspect of the task with any effectiveness
Mechanics	10-8	**Excellent to very good:** Demonstrates full command of spelling, punctuation, capitalization, layout
	7-5	**Good to average:** Occasional errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, layout
	4-2	**Fair to poor:** Frequent errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, layout
	1-0	**Very poor:** Fails to address this aspect of the task with any effectiveness

APPENDIX 2: WRITING ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

İNGİLİZCE YAZMAYA YÖNELİK TUTUM ANKETİ

Sevgili öğrenci,

Aşağıdaki anket, İngilizce yazmaya yönelik tutumlarınızı ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla oluşturulmuştur. Anket sonuçları gizli tutulacak ve tamamıyla araştırma amaçlı kullanılacaktır. Aşağıdaki cümleleri dikkatlice okuyunuz ve cümle sonunda verilen "Tamamen katılıyorum / Katılıyorum / Kararsızım / Katılmıyorum / Hiç katılmıyorum" seçeneklerinden size uygun olanı işaretleyiniz. Katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU

KTÜ Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Uygulamalı Dilbilimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Cinsiyet   :Kadın ( )   Erkek ( )

Öğrenci Numarası   : …………...

Sınıf   : …………...

		Hiç katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum
1.	İngilizce'de yazma becerimi mümkün olduğunca geliştirmek isterim.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	İngilizce yazma dersi, önem verilmesi gereken dil becerilerinden biridir.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	İngilizce'de yazma becerimi geliştirmek ilgimi çekmez.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	İngilizce yazmayı öğrenmek bana eğlenceli gelir.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	İngilizce yazma dersinde kendimi mutsuz hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Bir konu hakkında İngilizce yazı yazmak zorunda olduğumda kendimi sıkıntılı hissederim.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Bir konu hakkında İngilizce yazılı iletişim kurmanın anlamsız olduğunu düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	İngilizce yazmayı öğrenmek insanın bakış açısını genişletir.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	İngilizce öğrenmenin günlük hayatta bir yararı olmayacağını düşünürüm.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	İngilizce yazma dersi gereksiz bir derstir.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	İngilizce yazma dersi sevdiğim dersler arasındadır.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	İngilizce yazmayı öğrenmek zorunda olmak istemezdim.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 3: SECOND LANGUAGE WRITING ANXIETY INVENTORY

YABANCI DİLDE YAZMA KAYGISI ANKETİ

Sevgili öğrenci,

Aşağıda yabancı dilde yazma kaygısıyla ilgili bazı ifadeler kullanılmaktadır. İfadeleri dikkatlice okuyunuz ve cümle sonunda verilen"Tamamen katılıyorum / Katılıyorum / Kararsızım / Katılmıyorum / Hiç katılmıyorum seçeneklerinden size uygun olanı işaretleyiniz. Katkılarınızdan dolayı teşekkür ederim.

Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU

KTÜ Batı Dilleri ve Edebiyatı Anabilim Dalı

Uygulamalı Dilbilimi Yüksek Lisans Programı

Cinsiyet : Kadın ( ) Erkek ( )

Öğrenci Numarası : …………..

Sınıf : …………..

		Hiç katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Katılıyorum	Tamamen katılıyorum
1.	İngilizce yazı yazarken hiç heyecanlanmam.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	İngilizce yazı yazarken bu yazıların değerlendirileceğini bilmek beni endişelendirir.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Yazı yazarken düşündüklerimi genellikle, doğrudan İngilizce yazarım.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	İngilizce yazmaktan elimden geldiğince uzak dururum.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	İngilizce yazmaya başladığımda kafam bomboşmuş hissine kapılırım.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	İngilizce yazılarımın diğerlerininkinden kötü olması beni üzmez.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Zaman baskısı altında İngilizce yazarken çok heyecanlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Yazdığım paragraf değerlendirilecek ise düşük not almaktan korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Kısıtlı bir zamanda yazım yaparken düşüncelerim birbirine girer.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Mecbur kalmadıkça İngilizce yazılar yazmam.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Diğer öğrencilerin İngilizce yazdıklarımı okuduklarında dalga geçmelerinden çekinirim.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Aniden İngilizce yazmam istendiğinde donup kalırım.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Sınıf dışında İngilizce yazı yazabileceğim her şansı değerlendiririm.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Yazılarımın sınıf ortamında tartışılmasından korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Yazılarımın düşük puan almasından korkmam.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Mümkün olduğu her zaman İngilizce yazı yazarım	1	2	3	4	5
17.	İngilizce yazmam istendiğinde çeşitli bahaneler uydururum.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	İngilizce yazım yaparken gerilirim.	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (CONTROL GROUP)

1. Reading and writing dersi kapsamında yazma faaliyetlerinde bulundunuz. Bu faaliyetleri beğenip beğenmediğinizi belirtin ve sebepleri ile birlikte açıklayınız.

2. Öğretmen tarafından verilen biçime yönelik geri bildirimin ingilizce yazma becerinizi geliştirdiğini düşünüyor musunuz? Lütfen açıklayın.

3. Aldığınız geri bildirim faydalı oldu mu? Lütfen açıklayın.

4. Biçime yönelik geri bildirimin hangi bakımdan yararlı ve yararsız olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz? Lütfen açıklayın.

5. Biçime yönelik geri bildirim almanın sağladığı yararlar/ avantajlar nelerdir?

6. Biçime yönelik geri bildirim almanın sağladığı zararlar/ dejavantajları nelerdir?

7. Aldığınız biçime yönelik geri bildirimi, yazma becerinizi hangi alanda veya alanlarda (kelime bilgisi, içerik, paragraf düzeni, noktalama vb.) geliştirdi?

8. Aldığınız geri bildirim sizde olumlu olumsuz duygular oluşturarak yazma dersindeki hevesinizi/ isteğinizi etkiledimi? Nasıl?

9. Bunların dışında eklemek istediğiniz bir şey var mı?

APPENDIX 5: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (EXPERIMENTAL GROUP)

1. Reading and writing dersi kapsamında yazma faaliyetlerinde bulundunuz. Bu faaliyetleri beğendinip beğenmediğinizi belirtiniz ve sebepleri ile birlikte açıklayınız.

2. Öğretmen tarafından verilen içeriğe yönelik geri bildirimin ingilizce yazma becerinizi geliştirdiğini düşünüyor musunuz? Lütfen açıklayın.

3. Aldığınız geri bildirim faydalı oldu mu? Lütfen açıklayın.

4. İçeriğe yönelik geri bildirimin hangi bakımdan yararlı/ yararsız olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz? Lütfen açıklayın.

5. İçeriğe yönelik geri bildirim almanın sağladığı yararlar/avantajlar nelerdir

6. İçeriğe yönelik geri bildirim almanın sağladığı zararlar/dejavantajları nelerdir?

7. Aldığınız içeriğe yönelik geri bildirimi, yazma becerinizi hangi alanda veya alanlarda(kelime bilgisi, içerik, paragraf düzeni, noktalama vb.) geliştirdi?

8. Aldığınız geri bildirim sizde olumlu olumsuz duygular oluşturarak yazma dersindeki hevesinizi/ isteğinizi etkiledimi? Nasıl?

9. Bunların dışında eklemek istediğiniz bir şey var mı?

B1-D
Task 1
Traft 1

I went to Samsun two years ago. Because I visited my friend and traveled. Firstly I bought a bus ticket and went to the terminal. Then holiday started. When I was the bus, I called her. I said : I am coming. She suprised. When I went to Samsun, we went to Amisos. Amisos is a history place in Samsun. It seen unclear magnificent. We had a breakfast there. And we went to Piazza Shopping Centre. Piazza Shopping Centre is the most huge shopping centre in the Blacksea. Then we went to her home and I met her mother. She made coffee and we talk about school. And a little time after I was sleeping because I am verry tired. After day I got up early. Because this day end day. We had a breakfast with her mother, her father and her sister. And her cousin came. We went to Atakum. Atakum was crowded. Because Atakum is centre in Samsun. We went to a pub in nearly coast. And we conversed her friend and her cousin. And the time was end. I had to go to the Trabzon. We went to the bus terminal. And she void come repetition.

30.10.18

95

WHAT MAKES A COMPANY SUCCESSFUL?

Customer service is most important part of a successful business. Because the better customer service, the more satisfied the customers. If customers are satisfied, sales will be higher. If the sales are more, the company wins more and succeeds. Everything starts with customer satisfaction. The duty of customer service ∧ to satisfy the customer. The way to success passes through customer service. So for these reasons I agree ∧ this idea. If I am not satisfied with the service when I speak with a customer service about a product, I don't shop from that brand. This also makes the customer lose customers.

M.A

01.11.18

Thank you!

B1-D

- Draft 1 -

what do you mean?

Generally speaking things that are important for a company good customer service. Because consumer service of a company —the better the high earn money. For example IPhone's customer service is very polite. When we call them, they ask you "How are you today?" Before solving your problems, they make you feel how valuable you are to them. Another importent for a company is quality product. In my opinion this example absolutely importent. A company the higher quality products puts on the market, the greater the demand. ⟹ Can you develop this point?

good point

good focus on the question

Another subject, What things that add value to a company. If your ask me important polite or good relationship for this things. Because anybody don't wont talking with rude person. I think another important things, good staff. If staffs are successful and experienced, the company become so well known.

In my opinion, everything needs to be maintained in a good way for a good company.

In this paper, you have done a good job of addressing the question.

I liked your example about Iphone. It is true. Casturner service is good and that makes the company succcessfull? Can you develop your point about quality. how high quality leads to great demand.

Thank you

M.A   1.11.18

97

Fears.

Fear is a important emotion in our lifes. It has positive and negative effect. One positive effect is that fear can help people succeed. For instance, Last year I had university exam, I was afraid of this exam so I studied a lot of and finally I passed this exam with good point. Another positive effect is fear make people live healthy. People always scare to die. Health sector always develops because of fear of death. We want to more live. So we eat healthy food, we exercise, we go to doctor. An addition, fear makes us stronger and can keep us safe. For instance, We want to do bad thing and we scare this. So we give up to do bad thing because of fear. Of course, fear has negative effects. One negative effect is Sometimes we miss opportunites because of fear. For example, we wont apply for a Job. Another negative effect is, fear causes unnecessary stress. For example we set up a new Job. If we scare, fear causes stress so we don't success on this Job. In briefly We should scare if it is necessary.

nice personal response

wow a different point of view

Good point Can you develop that on example, please

What happens next? How do we miss opportunities by applying for a job.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Mevlüde ABDİOĞLU was born in Trabzon in 1987. She completed her high school education in Yomra High School. She started her university education in 2005 at Istanbul University and graduated from English Language Teaching Department in 2009. She started her MA degree in Applied Linguistics in 2016. She has been teaching English since 2010 at School of Foreign Languages, Karadeniz Technical University.

She is single and she can speak English fluently.