

**STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTIONS ON FEEDBACK
TO STUDENT WRITING**

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

BY

GÖKÇE VANLI

**IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

FEBRUARY 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Gölge Seferoğlu
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Prof. Gölge Seferoğlu
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members:

Prof. Hüsni Enginarlar	(METU, FLE)	_____
Prof. Gölge Seferoğlu	(METU, FLE)	_____
Assist. Prof. Bilal Kırkıcı	(METU, FLE)	_____
Asisst. Prof. İskender Hakkı Sarıgöz	(GU, FLE)	_____
Asisst. Prof. Dilara Demirbulak	(YU, FLE)	_____

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

Gökçe Vanlı

ABSTRACT

STUDENT AND INSTRUCTOR PERCEPTIONS ON FEEDBACK TO STUDENT WRITING

Vanlı, Gökçe

Ph. D., Department of Foreign Language Education

Supervisor: Prof. Gölge Seferoğlu

February, 2013, 161 pages

Giving written feedback to students' essays has gained importance by the emergence of the process approach to teaching writing. In the literature, many studies have been conducted to when and how to provide teacher feedback to students' writing. In contrast, there have been very few studies on the teacher and students' perceptions of teacher feedback. The aim of the present study is to investigate the EFL students' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback and to investigate the instructors' perception of written feedback and their expectations of the students. To this end, the researcher designed this study and carried it out in ENG 102 course at Middle East Technical University.

The data for the study were collected through both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools. These tools were the questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale administered to the students and the interviews held with some of the students and instructors teaching at the Department of Modern Languages. The data were collected in the spring semester of the 2009-2010 academic year.

Analyses of the collected data revealed that both the teachers and the students think that teachers play a key role in improving a student's writing ability. However,

there seems to be a kind of mismatch between what the students expect and what the teachers provide. The study also displays that the students' expectations of, preferences for and their handling of teacher feedback changes according to some factors such as the students' gender or faculty. The teachers should be aware of such differences and reflect this knowledge in their teaching practices. Finally, the study reveals that there is a positive correlation between the students' writing self-efficacy beliefs and their perceptions regarding the value they attach to teacher feedback in general.

Key words: Feedback, attitude, perception, self-efficacy

ÖZ

ÖĞRENCİ VE ÖĞRETMENLERİN ÖĞRENCİLERİN YAZILARINA VERİLEN GERİBİLDİRİMLE İLGİLİ GÖRÜŞLERİ

Vanlı, Gökçe

Doktora, Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Gölge Seferoğlu

Şubat 2013, 161 sayfa

Yazma öğretiminde süreç temelli yaklaşımın ortaya çıkmasıyla beraber öğrencilerin yazılarına öğretmenlerin verdiği yazılı bildirimler önem kazandı. Literatürde öğrencilerin yazılarına ne zaman ve nasıl bir öğretmen geribildirim sağlanması konusunda birçok çalışma yapılmıştır. Buna karşılık, öğretmen ve öğrencilerin öğretmen geribildirimleri hakkındaki algılarına yönelik çok az çalışma bulunmaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin öğretmen geribildirimleri hakkındaki beklentilerini, tercihlerini ve bu bildirimleri kullanma şekillerini ve öğretmenlerin yazılı geribildirim hakkındaki algılarını ve öğrencilerden beklentilerini araştırmaktır. Bu amaçla, araştırmacı bu çalışmayı planlamıştır ve Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nde İngilizce 102 dersi kapsamında uygulamıştır.

Çalışmanın verileri nicel ve nitel veri toplama araçları aracılığıyla elde edilmiştir. Bu araçlar öğrencilere uygulanan bir anket ve Yazma Öz Yeterlik Ölçeği ile bazı öğrenciler ve Modern Diller Bölümü'nde görev yapan bazı öğretmenler ile

yapılan mülakatlardır. Veriler 2009-2010 akademik yılı bahar döneminde toplanmıştır.

Toplanan verilerin nicel ve nitel analiz sonuçları hem öğrencilerin hem de öğretmenlerin bir öğrencinin yazma becerisini geliştirmede öğretmenlerin anahtar bir rol oynadığını düşündüğünü göstermiştir. Fakat öğretmenlerin sunduğu geribildirim ve öğrencilerin beklentileri arasında bir uyumsuzluk olduğu görülmektedir. Çalışma ayrıca öğrencilerin öğretmen geribildirimleri hakkındaki beklentilerinin, tercihlerinin ve bu bildirimleri kullanma şekillerinin öğrencilerin cinsiyeti ve okudukları fakülte gibi faktörlere göre değiştiğini de göstermektedir. Öğretmenlerin bu farklılıklar konusunda bilgili olmaları ve bu farkındalığı öğretim şekillerine yansıtmaları gerekmektedir. Son olarak, çalışma öğrencilerin yazma öz yeterlik inançları ve genel olarak öğretmen geribildirimleri hakkındaki algıları arasında pozitif bir ilişki olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Key words: Geribildirim, tutum, algı, öz yeterlik

To my children

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my dissertation advisor, Prof. Gölge Seferođlu for the insight, guidance and encouragement she has provided throughout the entire process of writing up this dissertation. I would like to thank her for sharing her expertise and positive outlook. Without her invaluable support, this study would not have been realized.

I also would like to thank Prof. Hüsnu Enginarlar, Assist. Prof. Dilara Demirbulak, Assist. Prof. Bilal Kırkıcı and Assist. Prof. İskender Hakkı Sarıgöz for their advice and suggestions on various aspects of this study.

I wish to express my thanks to the administration of the Department of Modern Languages (DML) for giving me the opportunity to conduct my study and supporting me throughout the whole process. In addition, I would like to extend my gratitude for my colleagues in the DML, who kindly accepted devoting some of their class time and administered the student questionnaires and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale in their classes. My special thanks also go to the students of the DML who participated in this study. Without their contributions, this thesis would not have been completed.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my family. They are the ones who were always there to support me and help me to realize my full potential whenever I felt the need.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
ÖZ.....	vi
DEDICATION	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	x
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF SYMBOLS/ABBREVIATIONS	xv
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 The Department of Modern Languages	6
1.3 Aim of the Study	7
1.4 Need for the Study.....	8
1.5 Significance of the Study	9
1.6 Limitations of the Study	10
1.7 Definition of Terms	11
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	13
2.1 The Writing Process	13
2.2 Feedback in L1 and L2	18
2.3 Types and Effectiveness of Teacher Feedback	19
2.4 Source of Feedback: Peer versus Teacher	25
2.5 Students' Reactions to Teacher Feedback	26
2.6 Attitudes and Perceptions	30
2.7 Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs	35
3. METHOD.....	41
3.1 Research Design	41

3.2 Participants of the Study	42
3.2.1 The Instructors Teaching at the DML	42
3.2.2 ENG 102 Students	44
3.3 Data Collection Instruments and Procedures	45
3.3.1 The Questionnaire	45
3.3.2 The Writing Self-Efficacy Scale	46
3.3.3 Interviews	48
3.3.4 Ethics Committee Approval	51
3.4 Data Analysis Procedures	52
4. RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS	53
4.1 Results of the Quantitative Data	53
4.1.1 Analysis of the Questionnaire	53
4.1.2 Analysis of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale	86
4.2 Analysis of the Qualitative Data	87
4.2.1 Results of the Student Interviews	88
4.2.2 Results of the Teacher Interviews	100
5. CONCLUSIONS	106
5.1 The Summary and Discussion of the Findings	106
5.1.1 Research Question 1	106
5.1.2 Research Question 2	111
5.1.3 Research Question 3	111
5.1.4 Research Question 4	114
5.1.5 Conclusion and Discussion	115
5.2 Implications of the Study	117
5.3 Recommendations for Further Research	123
REFERENCES	124
APPENDICES	
A. THE QUESTIONNAIRE	135
B. THE WRITING SELF-EFFICACY SCALE	137
C. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR THE TEACHERS AND STUDENTS	138
D. INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE	

AND THE SCALE.....	139
E. INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR THE INTERVIEWS	140
F. EXPLANATIONS TO THE TRANSCRIPTION CONVENTIONS USED IN THE STUDY	141
G. CURRICULUM VITAE	142
H. TURKISH SUMMARY	145
İ. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	161

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 4.1 Table 4.1 Mean Scores Displaying the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Skills	54
Table 4.2 Mean Scores Displaying the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Points in Written Teacher Feedback	55
Table 4.3 The Percentages Displaying the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Points in Written Teacher Feedback	56
Table 4.4 The Percentages Displaying the Students' Preferences for Written Teacher Feedback.....	57
Table 4.5 The Percentages Displaying the Teacher's Written Feedback Practices ...	59
Table 4.6 The Percentages Displaying the Students' Reactions to Written Teacher Feedback	60
Table 4.7 The Percentages Displaying the Sources Preferred by the Students for Help.....	62
Table 4.8 Results of the Independent Samples t-tests for the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Skills	63
Table 4.9 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Students' Preferences for Written Teacher Feedback.....	64
Table 4.10 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Teacher's Written Feedback Practices	66
Table 4.11 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Students' Reactions to Written Teacher Feedback	67
Table 4.12 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Sources Preferred by the Students for Help.....	68
Table 4.13 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Best Method to Learn From Errors.....	69
Table 4.14 Results of the ANOVA for the Perceived Importance Attached to	

Specific Skills.....	70
Table 4.15 Results of the ANOVA for the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Points in Written Teacher Feedback	72
Table 4.16 Results of the ANOVA for the Students' Preferences According to Faculties for Written Teacher Feedback	74
Table 4.17 Results of the ANOVA for the Teacher's Written Feedback Practices According to Faculties	77
Table 4.18 Results of the ANOVA for the Students' Reactions to Written Teacher Feedback.....	80
Table 4.19 Results of the ANOVA for the Sources Preferred by the Students for Help.....	84
Table 4.20 Correlations Between the Students' scale Scores and the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Skills	86

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DBE	Department of Basic English
DML	Department of Modern Languages
EAP	English for Academic Purposes
EFL	English as a Foreign Language
EPE	English Proficiency Exam
METU	Middle East Technical University

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter consists of six sections. The first two sections provide a background to the study and some information about the Department of Modern Languages where the study was conducted. The third section presents the aim of the study and the research questions. The fourth and fifth sections explain the need for and the significance of the study respectively. The sixth discusses the limitations of the study. Finally, the last section introduces the definitions of some commonly used terms in the study.

1.1 Background to the Study

Language learning is one of the goals of each individual in today's global world. People from all ages and from different backgrounds engage in language learning activities at some point in their lives. Among the languages preferred commonly is English, which has become the lingua franca of the 20th century. Because of its status in the world today, English has been given importance by governments all around the world and it has even been accepted as the medium of instruction in many countries. In institutions whose medium of instruction is English, it is especially important to improve one's writing skills in order to be able to survive in the academic arena where ideas are communicated through papers, reports and projects. Thus, it is inevitable for students to develop appropriate writing skills to gain academic success.

Writing in a second or foreign language presents a great challenge for all non-native students due to the nature of writing itself. The students do not only try to

learn the conventions of writing in a second language but they also have to cope with language problems such as grammar and vocabulary.

Over the years, there has been a change in the teaching of writing. In the past, writing instruction used to follow a product approach considering writing as a controlled mechanical activity. However, in the last decades, writing has started to be regarded as a recursive and complex activity requiring care and effort both on the part of the student and the teacher. Therefore, teachers have begun to follow a process approach through which they have the chance to interfere with students' writing and guide them with their feedback to make them better writers. It has become so obvious over the years that feedback given by teachers to students is an integral part of learning. In this vein, Gagné (1985) and Gagné et al. (1992) perceive the importance of feedback for one's learning and define feedback as an "external learning condition" to improve the effectiveness of learning.

Although feedback is vital for students, teachers most of the time do not feel comfortable while giving feedback. Goldstein (2004) expresses the worries of all writing teachers very well by saying "Teachers of second language writers often mention their concerns regarding the most effective means for providing feedback on text-level issues (content and rhetoric) to help students improve their texts in both the immediate sense and the long term" (p. 185). Even when teachers assume that they have provided the best feedback they could to help students, this feedback may not mean much for students. To get most out of feedback, it is important to take both teachers and students into consideration. Feedback means a lot to a student but for students to make the best use of it, it should be given just-in-time matching "specific descriptions and suggestions with a particular student's work" (Brookhart, 2008, p. 1).

Feedback can be very powerful if done well. For feedback to be effective, it should address two important factors: the cognitive and the motivational. As Brookhart (2008) explains good feedback informs students about where they are in their learning and what to do next- the cognitive factor. When students have the idea that they understand what to do and the reason for this, they feel that they can control their own learning- the motivational factor. However, despite teachers' best

intentions, some feedback may have negative effects on students and it can be very destructive for their beliefs about themselves and their achievement.

Feedback is related to a student's self-efficacy. Self-efficacy is defined as "an individual's judgments of his or her capabilities to perform given actions" by Schunk (1991, p. 207). Ormrod (2003) points out its goal-oriented nature and says it is "the belief that one can execute certain behaviors or reach certain goals" (p. 152).

Students' self-efficacy beliefs play a pivotal role in their academic life. Zimmerman, Bonner and Kovach (1996) urged teachers to be aware of students' self-efficacy beliefs and warn that this awareness should guide their counseling practices and instructional strategies. Assessing students' self-efficacy beliefs can provide some insights about students' academic success and motivation. Pajares (2007) points out the responsibility of schools in increasing students' competence and confidence. "When academic difficulties erode students' self-efficacy in their writing capability, it will be difficult to improve this capability without altering the self-efficacy beliefs that are instrumental in creating and nurturing it" (p. 246). Bandura (as cited in Pajares, 2007) asserts that "Belief and behavior influence each other reciprocally, self-efficacy beliefs and writing competence work in tandem, and improving one requires improving the other" (p. 246). He concludes by saying that if students develop a strong sense of self-efficacy, they are "well-equipped to educate themselves when they have to rely on their own initiative" (p. 246).

This conclusion leads to the understanding that teachers have a very important role in improving students' writing abilities. While teachers may act as guides in this process, they can also end up being the ones responsible for making the students hate writing. In order to avoid being the latter, teachers should aim at improving students' self-efficacy beliefs so that they will rely less on the teacher and more on themselves. In other words, the ultimate goal of every writing teacher should be creating autonomous learners who can take the responsibility of their own learning. In writing, this can only happen through constructive and timely teacher feedback. However, this issue raises some other types of questions for teachers such as how and when to give feedback or what the benefits of giving feedback for students are.

Over the years, these questions have been the starting points of many studies in the field of English language teaching. While there are studies that point to the usefulness of error feedback (Fathman&Whalley, 1990; Ferris, 1995, 1997; Lalende, 1982), there are also others which cast doubt on its benefits (Cohen, 1987; Truscott, 1996, 1999). Quite radically, in his 1996 and 1999 studies, Truscott argues that error correction is harmful and should be abandoned totally in language classrooms. Although teachers may like this idea at first sight, it is easier said than done because especially in L2 writing classrooms, students value teacher feedback and attach a great importance to writing accuracy (Cohen, 1987; Ferris and Roberts, 2001; Lee, 1997; Leki, 1991).

A number of studies have also been carried out about how to give feedback. One of the first questions that arise out of this issue is whether to mark all student errors. Providing comprehensive error feedback, i.e., marking all student errors has proved to be detrimental for students in many studies. Zamel (1982, 1985) pointed out that when teachers give excessive attention to student errors, they turn into grammar teachers, which deflects them from more important concerns in writing instruction such as content or organization. Teachers who prefer comprehensive feedback perceives writing as an error-free activity. Since “it is unrealistic to expect that L2 writers’ production will be error-free” (Ferris, 2002, p. 5), comprehensive error feedback is exhausting for teachers (Enginarlar, 1993; Ferris, 2002) and frustrating for students (Reid, 1998). In this sense, teachers should resort to selective error feedback, which looks like a more viable option.

Equally important are the questions of whether to correct or not correct errors, to identify or not to identify error types and to locate errors directly or indirectly. There is research evidence indicating that providing students with indirect feedback, i.e., indicating errors without correcting them, has more benefits for students in the long run compared to direct feedback (Ferris, 2002; Lalende, 1982).

The second issue of whether to identify error types for students or not has also been studied by some researchers. One common error correction technique is for students to underline or circle errors and use error codes to identify error types (Ferris, 2002), which is generally referred to as indirect feedback. Ferris and Roberts (2001) questioned the usefulness of marking codes in their study and found out that

there is no significant difference between student performance in error correction based on errors located by teachers and when students are provided with codes/symbols. Error identification, however, can also be “cumbersome for the teacher and confusing for the student” (Ferris, 2002, p. 67). While teachers may spend time and effort identifying student errors using codes, they may be overestimating their students’ capacity to interpret marking codes. As Lee (1997) says, teachers may be “using a wider range of metalinguistic terms than students could understand”, which may confuse students more in the short term and impede their learning in the long run. (p. 471).

Teachers are so overwhelmed with the idea of giving feedback that they usually forget about the most important factor in learning: *the learner*. It is no use for teachers to consider the most effective ways of giving feedback unless they take learners and their attitudes or perceptions towards feedback into account. According to Gagné et al. (1992), instruction is “a deliberately arranged set of external events designed to support internal learning processes” (p. 11). Therefore, teachers should consider both external and internal factors while designing their instruction. The internal learning conditions are “states of mind that the learner brings to the learning task” such as the attitudes of the learner; on the other hand, external conditions are “the stimuli that are external to the learner” (Gagné et al., 1992, p. 9). In this sense, providing feedback is considered as an external learning condition designed to support learning. At this point, Gagné et al. (1992) draw teachers’ attention to the idea that during instructional planning, external learning conditions should be designed by taking into consideration the internal learning conditions. It is important to understand how internal and external factors affect each other because instruction and mostly feedback will prove to be effective if teachers are aware of the individual characteristics and attitudes of their learners.

Feedback to written work creates challenges for teachers. Especially when teachers realize that their students’ development is not satisfactory although they receive detailed instruction and feedback on their writing, they regret spending so much of their time and effort on students’ writing. The process approach is considered to be one of the best ways of teaching writing; however, as can be understood from above, it is not only a demanding but also a time consuming

activity. Considering the heavy workload and time constraints of teachers, it is easy to assume that teachers might sometimes sacrifice the process approach and divert from it in order to keep up with their schedules.

1.2 The Department of Modern Languages

The Middle East Technical University (METU) is an English medium university and the School of Foreign Languages (SFL) is in charge of English Language teaching in the university. SFL has two basic divisions within itself, the Department of Basic English (DBE) and the Department of Modern Languages (DML). While DBE is responsible for teaching English at the preparatory level, DML aims at teaching English for academic purposes.

When students are accepted to the university, they are to take the METU English Proficiency Exam (EPE) to determine whether their proficiency level in the language is enough for them to deal with their courses in their departments. If students fail in this exam, they study in the DBE for a year and receive instruction addressing all four skills, namely reading, writing, listening and speaking. The ones who pass the proficiency exam, on the other hand, go directly to their departments and take compulsory language courses from the DML. The DML is in charge of planning and teaching the English for academic purposes (EAP) courses in order to provide students with language skills that will help them pursue their academic education. Throughout their academic life at METU, students have to take three compulsory EAP courses. Students are to take ENG 101 and ENG 102 in their freshman year in their departments. These courses are designed as complementary courses and ENG 101 is a prerequisite for ENG 102. Both courses are thematically organized and adopt an integrated-skills approach.

As stated in The *METU School of Foreign Languages Curriculum Policy Document*, both of these courses are learner-centered, integrated skills-based courses that are intended to develop students' skills in reading, writing, speaking and understanding English in an academic context. In ENG 101, within a thematic approach, reading, writing, speaking and listening skills are developed in order to build on the foundation established at the DBE. The language component of the

course, which includes grammar and vocabulary, are taught implicitly. ENG 102, on the other hand, is a continuation of ENG 101. ENG 102 aims at developing student autonomy, research skills and synthesizing ability. Having practised writing paragraphs and essays in ENG 101, students are introduced to proper documentation, which they practise in a few academic essays throughout the course in ENG 102.

This study was carried out in the second semester of the year when students were taking the ENG 102 course. The reason for this is that by the end of this course, they have not only practised writing short paragraphs but also a few academic essays and consequently have received different types of feedback. It would be more reliable to have their views concerning written error correction and feedback when they have had more practice in it.

1.3 Aim of the study

The aim of this study is to investigate EFL students' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback and to investigate teachers' perceptions of written feedback and their expectations of students.

With these concerns in mind, this study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What kinds of teacher feedback (direct vs. indirect, content vs. structural) do the EFL students at the Department of Modern Languages (DML) expect and desire and to what extent are these expectations and preferences being met by teacher feedback?
 - a. How important do the EFL students at the DML perceive different areas of teacher feedback?
 - b. What types of feedback are provided by teachers?
 - as perceived by the EFL students at the DML
 - as perceived by teachers
 - c. What areas of teacher's feedback do the EFL students at the DML attend to more?

- d. What kinds of discrepancies, if any, exist between the students' and teachers' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback?
2. What source do the EFL students at the DML turn to for getting help in correcting their errors in English?
3. What factors seem to influence the students' expectations and preferences for and handling of teacher feedback?
4. What is the relationship between the students' writing self-efficacy beliefs and their expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback?

1.4 Need for the Study

There are several reasons for investigating the role of feedback in the DML. To begin with, it is strictly stated in the curriculum document of the department that a process approach to writing is applied in the courses offered. However, the syllabus is loaded and the instructors are compelled to race against time to cover the materials and tasks in the syllabus. In addition to this, considering the high number of students in classes, it can be said that most of the time giving effective feedback to all of them can be overwhelming for teachers since among the writing teacher's responsibilities, providing feedback is the most time consuming and cognitively challenging one. Therefore, every teacher adopts different ways of giving feedback, which may create some problems and misunderstandings for the students.

Secondly, in house meetings, one of the highly debated issues is how and when to give feedback to students' writings. Since teachers in the DML are from various educational backgrounds, they all have a different attitude and understanding of what constitutes "good" feedback. It can be said that there is not a standard among the teachers considering giving feedback. Similarly, in standardization sessions for the writing component of the courses, teachers' grades may sometimes vary drastically, which shows their different perceptions and expectations regarding what constitutes "good" writing. There are times when teachers hold long discussions until they can reach a consensus about establishing a standard. In addition, the students of the DML usually have different teachers teaching each semester. Therefore, they

come across various types of feedback on their writings. In such a situation, it is questionable how well they understand or interpret the feedback on their papers.

Thirdly, the teachers are also concerned about the educative value of the feedback they provide for their students. With the feedback they provide, teachers are worried that they might be spoon feeding the students. This concern is in quite opposition with another objective of the department which is to create autonomous, independent learners. In other words, teachers are concerned about the extent to which the EAP courses they offer help students become independent learners. However, teachers are not alone in their concerns about the feedback they provide. Students also complain about what they see on their papers when they get them back. When they visit their instructors' offices or when they talk to each other, it is so frequent that one may hear sentences like "I don't understand what s/he says" or "Teacher, you have written more than I did". It can be concluded that students also have their own reservations considering the feedback on their papers. In this respect, the comments of both teachers and students reveal that there is a need for clarifying the purpose of feedback in learning.

The instructors at the DML think that students' development in writing skills is not at the desired level and the students have their own misconceptions regarding the issue of receiving feedback. Therefore, to provide the most useful feedback for students, it is believed that an analysis of how teachers' and students' perception of feedback differ or resemble may be useful for both teachers and students to understand each other better, which may lead to more fruitful writing sessions for both parties involved.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Due to the increasing popularity of English in many fields of life, a lot of institutions, mainly tertiary level institutions, choose English as the medium of instruction in order to prepare their graduates better for their lives in the future. The students who are accepted to these universities study English for academic purposes to improve their language skills in order to be able to cope with the lectures, long

articles, assignments and so on in their academic life. Thus, it is inevitable for a university student to develop appropriate writing skills to gain academic success.

Because of this reason, as one of the productive skills, writing has gained a higher status in second language teaching and has become an important component of language programs today. Teachers and institutions are forced to find ways to equip students with appropriate writing abilities. One of the ways of helping students improve their skills in writing is through teacher feedback. However, as mentioned earlier, there might sometimes be a mismatch between what teachers provide and what students expect.

This study attempts to bridge this gap by getting views of both the students and teachers so that it would be able to reach some awareness about what constitutes “good” feedback. Once instructors are clear about what their students expect from them in terms of written feedback, they may adjust their instruction and can have more effective commenting practices, which may lead to more effective learning on part of the learners.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

One of the main limitations of this study is that the data collection procedure took place in the last two weeks of the semester when both teachers and students were busy before the term ended. Although at the beginning of the study, it was aimed at reaching all students, it proved to be impossible due to the heavy workload and tight schedule of teachers. Some instructors even chose not to administer the questionnaires in their classes. However, through a detailed sampling procedure, a great number of students representing different faculties were reached.

Another limitation of this study is the number of interviews held with the students. The interviews with the students were held after the questionnaires and the scale was administered to the students. This meant the end of the semester and it was not possible to reach many students who would be willing to spare some time to have an interview with the researcher. This problem was tried to be overcome by the sampling procedure for the interviews. At least two students representing each faculty were randomly chosen to be interviewed.

The last limitation of the study was that since the students were asked to fill in a questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale at the same time, it was necessary for the researcher to ask students to fill in their names on both papers so that it would be possible to make correlation studies between the two. The questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale were prepared as optic forms and it was logistically impossible to have both on one page. Considering that the students might be unwilling to reveal their identity on the forms or it might not be possible to get sincere answers, the students were asked to fill in their student identity number, which does not reveal the identity of the person as much as his/her name. Despite this precaution, few students preferred not to fill in their numbers. Unfortunately, the forms of these students had to be excluded from the study due to the reasons mentioned.

1.7 Definition of Terms

The definitions of some of the commonly used terms in the study are as follows:

Feedback: Gagné et al. (1992) described feedback as one of the nine events of instruction: “[feedback] provides the learner with information about performances and sets in motion the process of reinforcement” (p. 189). Feedback may take many forms. Within this research study, the focus would be particularly on written feedback for academic writing, which can be described as one or a group(s) of comments, edits, marks, and so forth, written by someone who reviewed an academic paper. The reviewer is most of the time a teacher, who provides an external kind of feedback to learners to improve the effectiveness of learning.

Attitude and Perception: Oppenheim (1966) defined and described *attitude* as follows: ...[A]n attitude is a state of readiness, a tendency to act or react in a certain manner when confronted with certain stimuli.... Attitudes are reinforced by beliefs (the cognitive component) and often attract strong feelings (the emotional component) that will lead to particular forms of behavior (the action tendency component). (pp. 105-106)

Perception, on the other hand, is defined as “a) a result of perceiving: observation, b) a mental image: concept” (Merriam-Webster, 2003, p. 918).

Self-efficacy: Self-efficacy is defined as “an individual’s judgments of his or her capabilities to perform given actions” by Schunk (1991, p. 207).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter where the literature regarding written feedback is visited, the first part is about the writing process itself. Secondly, feedback in L1 and L2 is analyzed. The next part introduces studies conducted on different types of teacher written feedback and their effectiveness. In the following part, the source of feedback is analyzed. The fifth part is about the students' reactions to teacher feedback. In the last two parts, students' and teachers' attitudes and perceptions regarding feedback and students' self-efficacy beliefs are investigated respectively.

2.1 The Writing Process

Writing has always been one of the most important assets of learning a foreign language. There are quite valid reasons behind it. One of the most important factors leading to this trend is that writing is a habit of people's daily lives. For different purposes, people are engaged in writing of some sort in their lives. Consequently, for a person who wants to learn a foreign language, it turns out to be important to learn how to express himself/herself in written form in that language. As cited in Leki and Carson (1994), in a study of children learning English, Saville-Troike concludes that "the language skill which is most likely to develop . . . [academic] competence is *writing*" (p. 83). Ability to write well is necessary to achieve, demonstrate and maintain academic success. Due to these reasons, writing has been in the program of almost all language courses. However, despite its popularity in language courses and the abundant amount of time students spend on writing, many students raise their concerns about not being able to do it well.

Traditionally, writing was considered as a passive activity in which the writer was on his own trying to produce an end product. However, this view has changed

over the years in line with the changes in people's beliefs about teaching and learning. Therefore, there has been a shift from the product approach to writing to the process approach. In this new approach, the teacher sees writing as a social activity and accepts writers as independent and active participants of the writing process.

The perception of writing as a social activity requires some kind of an interaction between the teacher and the student, which must pave the way for a better end product. Due to this aspect of the process approach, Zinsler (1988) resembles a piece of writing to "a constantly evolving organism" (p. 16).

The process approach to writing has its basis in Vygotsky's social learning theory. In Vygotsky's (1978) view, learning is a sociocultural process in which the learner acquires new knowledge and skills by interacting with a more expert person. Consequently, this enables him to perform a task which could not be achieved alone. According to Vygotsky, "knowledge is not transmitted from an expert to a novice or constructed by individuals on their own. Rather, it is socially constructed among individuals facilitated by the learner's reciprocal contributions to the process" (Lee & Schallert, 2008, p. 168). In other words, in order for learning to occur, scaffolding through oral or written language plays a critical role but the importance of the learner in the process should not be disregarded (Bruner, 1986). As Ko, Schallert, and Walters (2003) stated, "scaffolding is technically always guided by the learner" (p. 305). In a writing classroom, students learn to write and improve their writing through teacher's feedback, which guides them during the writing process.

The importance of feedback in writing classes has been recognized by researchers and practitioners alike. Many of these people have stated the crucial role that feedback plays in a student's learning and development within and beyond formal educational settings. Hounsell (2003), for example, thinks that "[students] learn faster, much more effectively, when they have a clear sense of how well they are doing and what they might need to do in order to improve" (p. 67).

On the other side of the coin, there are the teachers who try to help students to improve their writing quality and increase their motivation for writing. One way of achieving this is through providing feedback. Ramsden (2003) argues that effective comments on students' work represent one of the key characteristics of quality teaching. For a writing teacher, commenting on student essays is arguably one of the

most important, time-consuming, yet thankless tasks. Regardless of the time and effort spent in giving feedback, many teachers complain that students still make the same mistakes so their writing does not improve. This leads one to question whether students benefit from teachers' feedback or not. Some students also raise their concerns by saying that they have responded to their teachers' feedback accordingly; however, they cannot still satisfy their teachers with their writing. In this sense, "there seems to be a mismatch between the students' and the teacher's perception in the use of feedback" (Zacharias, 2007, p. 39). For this reason, a teacher should be very careful and knowledgeable while giving feedback to students' writing. In fact, Coffin *et al.* (2003) maintain that "the provision of feedback on students' writing is a central pedagogic practice" (p. 102). The importance of teacher response is also highlighted by Straub (1996), "It is how we receive and respond to student writing that speaks loudest in our teaching" (p. 246). Teachers sometimes talk to their students through their feedback and this kind of interaction is as equally important as face to face interaction. Taras (2003) declares that researchers on feedback have reached a consensus that written feedback "is not a freestanding piece of information, but that it forms part of learning context where all the protagonists need to be engaged in the process" (p. 550). It is clear that the process approach to writing requires both the teacher and the students to be active participants throughout the writing process.

Teachers have quite valid reasons for providing written feedback to student writing. Despite claims to the contrary (Krashen, 1984), it is generally accepted that students do not become more proficient writers just by reading and writing. According to Goldstein (2004), they "need some form of feedback that helps them see how others are reading their writing and what revisions might strengthen their writing" (p. 64). This will raise students' awareness of audience and will help them understand the interactive nature of reading and writing (Ferris & Hedgcock, 1998; Leki, 1990; Reid, 1993). If students get feedback from readers, they can see "whether what they have intended has been achieved and where their texts may have fallen short of their intentions and goals" (Goldstein, 2004, p. 64).

Writing is a skill with many facets. One may write for many different reasons to many different audiences. Unlike much of the writing, however, academic writing

has a different standing, which creates some difficulties for both students and instructors. First of all, different from personal or free writing tasks, academic writing topics are usually assigned and the end product is evaluated by an expert. This expert is usually the one who assigns the task such as an instructor. Due to this nature of academic writing, the instructor may have to “play several roles, among them coach, judge, facilitator, and gatekeeper as they offer more response and more intervention than an ordinary reader” (Reid, 1994, p. 283.)

Among the roles a writing teacher plays, one of the most important ones is the coach. As a coach or a guide, the instructor tries to lead the students to correct ways of producing a good piece of writing. In this case, the instructor’s feedback becomes one of the key components of successful learning. And the most effective feedback is the one which is immediate and also provides explicit information on how performance can be improved (Bangert-Drowns, Kulik, Kulik, & Morgan, 1991; Bruning, Schraw, & Ronning, 1995; Schwartz & White, 2000). This second aspect is important because good feedback is constructive; in other words, it guides students into how their work can be improved. When students feel that they can control their learning, this will decrease their feelings of anxiety and helplessness and increase their motivation and they will start to take responsibility of their own learning, which also has positive impacts on their self-esteem (Bandura, 1993).

Through written feedback, an instructor can address the individual strengths and weaknesses of a student directly. Owing to this, written feedback becomes an important tool in the process of teaching writing. However, since many teachers consider written feedback as tiresome and unrewarding, it does not get the attention it deserves. Vengadasamy (2002) has found that “many teachers treat the teacher response stage as a copy editing stage where they embark on an error hunt” (p. 2). He also adds that instructors are not aware of the fact that their written response could be used to provide not only instruction on grammar, but also to provide valuable advice on the basic principles of writing, which is usually the objective of most writing programs. Sharing the same view, Gilbert (1990) contends that, response to writing must begin at content, no matter how deficient a draft may be in form. Despite the value of correct expression, learner writers often need to learn the basic principles of writing before they can fine-tune the language. Earlier, Sommers (1982) and Zamel

(1985) found that teachers of writing are generally preoccupied with error correction. Both Sommers and Zamel report in their studies that comments on content were not only few, but also take the form of short and vague descriptions that students find difficult to interpret. Lamberg (1980) and Knoblauch and Brannon (1981) voice similar concerns and agree that even detailed feedback on form is not really worth the teacher's time and effort since it turns the revision process in a proofreading venture for the student.

As can be seen as a result of these studies, teachers have differing perceptions of the process approach to writing; therefore, the approach cannot get the attention it deserves both from teachers and students.

The main purposes of academic writing in higher education include assessing students' content knowledge and writing skills, improving content knowledge and thinking skills, and participating in the communication of the academic communities (Coffin et al., 2003). For these purposes, students are expected to produce different genres in writing such as essays, articles, reports, journals, and so forth.

In order to prepare students for academic writing, almost all freshman students in tertiary level institutions are to take the freshman composition course, which is one of few required courses for all students. The aim of these courses is to introduce novice writers to the genre of essay writing and, thus, prepare them for any course they will take during their education in which academic writing is expected. However, these composition courses are almost always the ones hated by both teachers and students. While the faculty members feel exhausted evaluating substandard texts, students find writing academic essays as unfulfilling.

Some even state negative reactions to writing teachers as in McLeod's (1987) study. In the study, it was found out that students perceive writing teachers as capricious individuals with high expectations which can never be met fully. Therefore, they think that "success in the writing class will have little to do with ability or effort" (p. 430).

2.2 Feedback in L1 and L2

Since its introduction to the field of English Language Teaching (ELT), process approach to writing has gained popularity among ELT practitioners. As time went by, people also started to carry out research both in L1 and L2 contexts to evaluate the effectiveness of the practice.

One of these studies has been carried out by Beason (1993). In his L1 study, Beason (1993) concluded that “feedback and revision are valuable pedagogical tools. ... the research typically indicates that high school and college students improve their drafts upon receiving feedback” (p. 396). As far as revision is concerned, Beason found that “students usually revised based on feedback, but they did so selectively” (p. 417).

In another study, on the other hand, Knoblauch and Brannon (1981) contrasted various types of teacher response in L1 writing (e.g., oral vs. written, explicit vs. implicit, praise vs. criticism). Their study results showed that none of these different response modes had much impact on subsequent student writing. Similar results have been gained in Hillocks’ study (1986), where L1 teacher response was worked on. The results showed that “teacher comment has little impact on student writing” (p. 165).

In some L2 research of teacher response, researchers have arrived at similar conclusions. Zamel (1985,) summarizes the results of some of these studies and criticizes teachers for their responding behaviors. The basis for the criticisms is that “ESL writing teachers misread student texts, are inconsistent in their reactions, make arbitrary corrections, write contradictory comments, provide vague prescriptions, impose abstract rules and standards, respond to texts as fixed and final products, and rarely make content-specific comments or offer specific strategies for revising the text” (p. 86).

Among the research carried out both in L1 and L2, few dealt with the students’ point of view regarding feedback to writing. In a case study in L1 writing conducted in Brazil, Cavalcanti and Cohen (1993) investigated the relationship between the feedback provided by the teacher on compositions, and the students’ thoughts about the comments, and what they did with this feedback. What they

concluded at the end of their study was that most students showed preference for feedback on mechanics rather than on organization.

Another study in L1 context was carried out by McGee (1999), who explored English 102 students' affective response to teacher-written comments, how students negotiated those comments, and how they used them during revision. The results showed that students revised their texts with the teacher's response in mind. The reason for this was to please the teacher to obtain a better grade.

One other focus area in the research in L1 and L2 student writing has concerned the issue of when to give feedback. The results of some studies suggested that teacher response to student compositions is most effective when it is given on preliminary rather than final drafts of student essays (Freedman, 1987; Krashen, 1984). The researchers commented that when feedback is given in earlier stages of the writing process, students have better opportunities to make revisions in their further drafts.

In short, research on L1 and L2 writing contexts includes evidence that some students experience strong emotional responses to error correction and that they value feedback on their writing.

2.3 Types and Effectiveness of Teacher Written Feedback

Written accuracy is important to students in many contexts and students themselves want and expect feedback on their written errors from their teachers (Ferris, 1995; Ferris et al., 2000; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Leki, 1991; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Rennie, 2000; Truscott, 1996). Nonetheless, issues surrounding how, and even whether, to give L2 students feedback on their written errors continue to be a source of interest and debate among researchers, instructors, and students (Ferris, 1999; Truscott, 1996, 1999)

One of the main points in the research on writing concerns the effects of instructor feedback on writing. The earlier studies are mainly limited to comparing the effects of different types of treatment techniques of sentence-level errors.

In one of these studies, Zamel (1985) found that most of the instructors' comments dealt with sentence-level errors. The results of the study also showed that

the feedback given by instructors were mostly abstract or prescriptive comments concerning grammar and they rarely deal with the content or organization of the writing. However, emphasizing the importance of organization and content in a piece of writing, Zamel (1985) urged teachers to “hold in abeyance” their “reflexlike reactions to surface level concerns and give priority to meaning” (p. 96).

A couple of years later, Cohen (1987) found out in his study that “the activity of teacher feedback as currently constituted and realized may have more limited impact on the learners than the teachers would desire” (p. 66). The results of his survey show that sometimes teachers’ feedback may “be too abbreviated in nature, too general, and possibly not focused enough in the areas where learners want feedback for it to have much impact on the learners”. (p. 66). This finding is consistent with Zamel’s (1985) finding that teacher feedback tends to concern itself more with accuracy in form than with meaning.

Campbell (1998) also found that when teachers focus on local issues in early drafts, students feel inhibited and unable to develop the global aspects of their compositions. Therefore, his advice is to provide local feedback only after most content and organizational issues are addressed in earlier drafts. Years later, Ferris (2006) also found out the same result in her study and concluded that teachers focus more on local issues such as grammar and mechanics than on global issues such as content and organization.

Chapin and Terdal (1990) share the same idea by focusing on a different aspect. According to the results of their study, 64% of teachers’ comments were on local issues. However, they showed that when teachers focused on local issues, students also focused on local issues in their revisions. Hamp-Lyons (2006) draws attention to another crucial point and contends that when teachers focus on form throughout the writing process, it gives the students the impression that the product, not the process, is most important to the teacher. Unfortunately, such an attitude towards writing undermines the basic principles behind the process approach to writing.

As can be seen, giving feedback on local issues is not a practice approved by all ELT experts. Some even question the value of it and criticize the practice harshly. For example, according to Kepner (1991), Sheppard (1992) and Truscott (1996),

providing feedback on local issues does not help learners make fewer local errors than does providing no feedback on such issues. Some studies have even suggested that correcting students' local errors in their writing leads them to make more errors on subsequent drafts (Truscott, 1996). Truscott even suggests that grammar correction should be abandoned altogether because not only is there little evidence to show that it is helpful, but also some evidence suggests that it may in fact be harmful. The reason for this actually concerns both students and teachers. While teachers lack the skills to analyze and explain students' errors or problems, students lack the skills to understand and act according to teachers' feedback.

Lalonde (1982) and Robb et al. (1986) have obtained similar results in their studies questioning the value of instructor correction of all or some of the mechanical and linguistic errors in a piece of writing. Such a practice turns the idea of giving feedback into a simple mechanical activity and diverts the role of teachers from coaches to error hunters. Consequently, students upon receiving a heavily marked paper become demotivated towards writing.

This result has been approved by the studies of Hendrickson and Semke (as cited in Enginarlar, 1993) where they contend that "overt correction of student writing by the teacher tends to have negative side effects on the quality of subsequent essays and student attitudes to writing" (p. 194).

However, some researchers still have come across the positive aspects of providing feedback on students' local mistakes in their studies. Chandler (2000) and Fathman & Whalley (1990) assert that providing feedback on local issues in student compositions improves learners' ability to recognize and fix their own local errors; even on future compositions (Ashwell, 2000).

There are also some other studies which yield positive results (Ferris, 1995, 1997; Ferris et al., 2000; Lalonde, 1982; Sheppard, 1992). In these studies, writers who received feedback on their errors showed improvement, which in some cases was statistically significant.

Teachers' practice of providing feedback on local issues is actually a demand asked by students. In some studies, students were asked their opinions regarding this issue and they commented that they prefer lots of comments (Leki, 2006), especially on local issues (Cohen, 1987). Teachers also think that providing feedback on local

issues is a necessity especially in earlier drafts as they mostly complain about not being able to understand global aspects of the students' writing until they addressed local issues.

Although there is still a controversy among theorists about how much feedback to give on local issues, researchers have at least reached a consensus on not to provide large amounts of feedback on local issues in an L2 writing composition course, where the focus is on teaching the rules and mechanics of writing compositions. Recent research by Ferris, Pezone, Tade, and Tinti (1997), however, suggests that the form/meaning division may be unhelpful, since experienced teachers will vary their feedback according to contextual features, including the target genre, the ability, and the personality of each individual student.

Apart from the studies which examine the focus of teacher feedback, there have also been lots of studies on the effectiveness of different types of corrective feedback. Among these are the studies which deal with the extent to which direct or indirect feedback facilitates improved accuracy.

One distinction that has been made in the literature is between direct and indirect teacher feedback. Ferris (2003) defines direct corrective feedback as the provision of the correct linguistic form or structure above or near the linguistic error. It may include the crossing out of an unnecessary word/phrase/morpheme, the insertion of a missing word/phrase/morpheme, or the provision of the correct form or structure. As the teacher provides the correct form for the student writer, the only thing the student does while revising the text is to transcribe the correction into the final version. On the other hand, indirect corrective feedback indicates that an error has been made in some way. This can be done in one of four ways: underlining or circling the error; recording in the margin the number of errors in a given line; or using a code to show where the error has occurred and what type of error it is (Ferris & Roberts, 2001). Rather than the teacher providing the correct form, students try to resolve and correct the problem that has been drawn to their attention.

As it is the case in the studies concerning the focus of teacher feedback, second language acquisition theorists and ESL writing specialists cannot reach an agreement about the effectiveness of direct or indirect feedback. In some earlier studies, indirect feedback instead of direct feedback was advocated by researchers

claiming that the former requires learners to think and be problem solvers, which in the end leads to long-term acquisition. (Lalande, 1982; James, 2000).

While still appreciating the value of indirect feedback, those more in favor of a direct approach have found out that teachers and students prefer direct feedback (Ferris et al., 2000; Ferris & Roberts, 2001) based on some reasons. First, they suggest that students feel confused when they fail to understand the error codes used by teachers. Leki (1991) and Roberts (1999) explain the difficulty especially students with lower proficiency experience. These students may feel at a loss when they cannot resolve some complex errors, which may lead to demotivation or further errors. In addition, Chandler (2003) explains that the greater cognitive effort expended when students are asked to use indirect feedback is not worth the effort as they may not know whether their correction is correct or not.

When it comes to student preferences for feedback, it can be said that they want all their errors to be shown to them. One notable study in this vein was conducted by Leki (1991).

In her research, Leki conducted a survey of learner preferences about feedback, asking the students the importance of different areas, and how they preferred to be corrected. Out of 100 students, 70 wanted all errors indicated. 5 students, especially, thought it very important to minimize errors. Accurate grammar and vocabulary were rated most highly. About their preference for their most popular means of correction, they chose underlining and giving a clue. As for revision concerning teacher feedback, 82% said that they rewrote either the whole text or the sentences containing the errors. In the lights of all these results, Leki concluded that teachers must either accept learner preferences, or discuss openly with the students the research about the effectiveness of correction.

In her research with college intermediate Spanish students in a foreign language writing course, Kepner (1991) sought to compare two types of written feedback with regard to their effects on students' writing improvement. She divided her subjects into two groups and provided one group with surface-level error corrections only and the other with message-related comments and no error-correction. Both groups progressed at the same rate with regard to accuracy. However, when the complexity of thoughts was concerned, the students who

received message-related comments outperformed the grammar correction group regardless of overall language learning ability. She concluded that “error-correction” and “rule reminders” were “ineffective for promoting the development of writing proficiency in the L2” (p. 310).

Additionally, while studies by Radecki and Swales (1988) and Lee (2008) show that students wanted overt correction of errors (i.e., direct error feedback) from teachers, most of the other studies (e.g., Arndt, 1992; Hyland & Hyland, 2001) suggest that students preferred indirect to direct error feedback, where they were given clues and also a more active role to play in the feedback process.

Apart from the effectiveness of different types of feedback, another important aspect while giving feedback is adopting a positive attitude to student writing. While marking mechanically, teachers may not realize that they are showing the student only his mistakes – negative points. If the student receives only negative feedback, he may easily be discouraged from trying to form complex structures and using new vocabulary. However, feedback sessions can be a beneficial experience for the student if the teacher shows the strong points as well.

Some research results highlight the importance of adopting a positive attitude. In Ferris’s study (1995), students indicated how valuable they found positive comments, remembering many specific examples. They also expressed some bitterness when they felt they had not received any praise. Ferris (as cited in Hyland & Hyland, 2001) argues that “studies of L2 students’ reactions to teacher feedback show that learners remember and value encouraging remarks but expect to receive constructive criticism rather than simple platitudes” (p. 187). This suggests that teachers should use comments of encouragement together with constructive criticism to motivate students and help them in the long term.

Justifying students’ desire for positive feedback, Dessner (1991) points at the importance of praise for its acknowledgment of the writer and the writer’s strengths as well as the strengths of the writer’s text. Similarly, Lipp (1995), Ferris & Hedgcock (1998) believe in the strong motivating force of praise; however, Hyland & Hyland (as cited in Goldstein, 2004) warn teachers that when praising students, one should keep in mind that “it should be genuinely deserved” (p. 74).

Apart from its motivating force, praise also serves another function. When students receive positive comments from their teachers, this enables them to see what is working in their essays, which builds their confidence and encourages them to make similar attempts in their future work.

2.4 Source of Feedback: Peer versus Teacher

When feedback is concerned, one other factor which might affect a student's performance might be the source of feedback; in other words, where the feedback comes from. The feedback the student gets might come from a peer, a teacher or an outsider such as a native speaker of the language. Among these, the first two are the most common sources. According to literature, there are different views concerning the source of feedback and students have different preferences for and expectations from these sources.

In some of the studies, students' preferences for peer or teacher feedback were compared (Amores, 1997; Hyland, 2000; Long, 1992; Paulus, 1999). The results of many of them show that in general students value the teacher's feedback more than feedback from their peers.

In his research, Zacharias (2007) also investigated students' opinions about their preference for teacher or peer feedback. In the study, some students indicated a strong opinion of the crucial role of teacher feedback in improving their writing. They thought teacher feedback is most useful because of the assumption that teachers have a better grasp of grammar and word choice. In addition to this, according to the results of this study, another reason which influences students' preference for teacher feedback is students' awareness of the control teachers have over their students' grades.

Long (1992) carried out a study investigating peer response and instructor commentary in and out of class, both on written and oral feedback in Spanish as a second language. The researcher also obtained the same result that students preferred teacher feedback as the one that benefitted their writing the most. According to Long, the reason for this preference was that students see the teacher as the authority of the class and that his/her comments are consistent. However, students also "pointed out

that peer feedback was very useful in revising their assignments--as long as their peers made sincere efforts to supply useful feedback” (p. 16).

2.5 Students’ Reactions to Teacher Feedback

As can be seen in the literature, teachers’ written feedback on students’ essays is quite beneficial for their improvement in writing. Students themselves also report that they value their teacher’s feedback but they have different views concerning different aspects of the issue. While some students appreciate the effort their teachers put on this work, some others have complaints or doubts about their teachers’ written commentary on their work though still having positive attitudes towards receiving feedback.

Although students play a very important role in the feedback process, much of the feedback research has put teachers at the center of the stage. Students have mostly been viewed as mere recipients—when in fact they should be active agents in the feedback process (Hyland & Hyland, 2006). Without understanding how students feel about and respond to teacher feedback, teachers may run the risk of continually using strategies that are counter-productive. Realizing this, researchers have started to conduct studies on the student perspective on feedback in the 1990s.

Until then, a number of studies have been conducted in the field of ELT about the assessment of student reactions to the feedback they receive from their teachers. (Cohen & Cavalcanti, 1990; Enginarlar, 1993; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994; Leki, 1991).

One of the earlier studies was carried out by Radecki and Swales (1988). The researchers surveyed the attitudes of 59 students in four ESL-oriented classes. According to the results of the study, it was concluded that some students may have certain misconceptions and negative attitudes when they start a writing course; however, teachers are the ones to intervene and change these attitudes through their instruction. The survey also revealed that most of the students had positive or at least neutral reactions upon receiving a heavily marked paper regardless of the nature of the markings. 8 of these 59 students were also interviewed. The respondents reported that they would read their teacher’s comments and even expressed satisfaction that

their teacher had marked their paper. According to survey results, “Majority of the students appreciate substantive comments that allow them to rethink a piece of writing”(p. 364). However, the same students also expected their teachers to correct all their surface level errors so that they could make these corrections in their later drafts. Such a narrow attitude towards rewriting can only hinder their development as L2 writers. This view of students totally contradicts with their teachers’ view of revision since teachers see revision as a generative process whereby meaning is reassessed and text is reshaped.

In Cavalcanti and Cohen’s study (1993), the researchers mentioned a misfit between written feedback teachers provide on compositions and what the students would prefer to get. They attributed this misfit to the nature of the teacher’s feedback stating that “it may frequently be unclear, inaccurate or unbalanced--both by focusing only on certain elements in written output (e.g., grammar and mechanics) and by overemphasizing negative points” (p. 84). This shows that the students and the teacher do not necessarily share common information, skills, and values when they interact.

Different from previous studies of L2 student reactions to teacher feedback, Hedgcock & Lefkowitz’s study (1994) was carried out in contexts where students were consistently required to revise and produce multiple drafts. Since students had to rethink and revise their earlier drafts, they had to pay attention to their teachers’ feedback on their written work. Therefore, at the end of the study, it was found out that students did care about their teacher’s feedback and gave attention to it while producing their further drafts. A similar result was reported in the study of Ferris (1995). This study also showed that ESL writing students in general take their teachers' feedback quite seriously and pay a lot of attention to it. Students reported receiving and paying the most attention to feedback on grammar, content, and organization respectively. In their qualitative responses, they also said that they felt that their teachers' comments helped them avoid future mistakes, improve their grammar, and clarify their ideas. Especially the result about clarity of their ideas is consistent with the findings of Hedgcock and Lefkowitz (1994) where students reported paying attention to their teachers’ suggestions about their ideas and organization.

In some of the studies investigating students' reactions to teacher feedback, it was concluded that students see the need for revision as an indication of their deficiency to produce a good piece of writing the first time and that it needs to be corrected. As Lehr (1995) states, "students often see revision not as an opportunity to develop and improve a piece of writing but as an indication that they have failed to do it right the first time. To them, revision means correction" (p. 3). Therefore, Lehr draws teachers' attention to providing feedback not only on issues considering grammar but also on the content of the papers and advises teachers to involve students in the process of revision.

In a very recent survey of student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms, Lee (2008) found out that students demand more written comments from their teachers irrespective of their proficiency level. The results also suggest that "the teachers' feedback, which was mostly teacher-centered, made students passive and dependent on teachers" (p. 144).

This shows clearly that there is a kind of mismatch between the students' and teachers' perceptions of feedback. It can be concluded from research results that what students want or expect from teacher feedback and what teachers' actual feedback practices are may sometimes be distant from each other. This finding has been justified in some other recent studies as well (Hyland, 1998, 2000).

As some study results show, teachers mark for mechanics and grammar more because these areas are the easiest to respond to, or the ones that are most in need in order to be able to understand the student's essay (Zamel, 1985; Chapin and Terdal, 1990; Campbell, 1998; Ferris, 2006). Considering students' level of language proficiency, teachers usually assume that comments relating to the other areas of writing such as content and organization may demand a higher degree of judgment and most likely take more time.

Ferris (1995) also carried out a study with 155 students in two levels of a university ESL composition program. The results of the survey indicated that students pay more attention to teacher feedback when it is given on preliminary drafts of their essays; that they utilize a variety of strategies to respond to their teachers' comments; that they appreciate receiving comments of encouragement; and that, overall, they find their teachers' feedback useful in helping them to improve

their writing. Students also asserted that they had a variety of problems in understanding their teachers' comments. They suggested that teachers should be more open and explanatory in their feedback practices so that some confusion and misunderstandings could be avoided.

In order to overcome this confusion, some students requested oral feedback from their instructors where they can discuss some points to consider regarding their paper more in detail. The importance of giving oral feedback has been emphasized in some recent studies as well. With advances in technology, the teachers started to use different ways of giving feedback such as giving audio feedback in online environments. Very recently, two studies were conducted to determine the effectiveness of audio feedback. Realizing that the written feedback may be sometimes difficult to understand for the students, the teachers preferred to use giving feedback in online environments. Atieya (2012) carried out a study in which she compared the potential benefits of audio feedback as opposed to written feedback from both students' and teachers' perspectives. The results of her study showed that because of its different nature, the practice was found to be appealing especially for the students who prefer new technological trends. The teachers were positive about audio feedback but they also stated some technological obstacles of using audio feedback such as recording and uploading heavy audiofiles, time-consuming procedures and initial confusion as to how to organize the feedback. However, they also stated it got easier with practice and they would continue using audio feedback due to its benefits. Similarly, in Alexeeva's (2012) study, in which she compared text-based feedback and audio feedback, the students expressed satisfaction with audio feedback. One of the students involved in her study even said, "It feels me more involved because it seems like I have a real conversation with my instructor" (p. 211). As the results of these recent studies indicate, students appreciate teacher feedback more when it is oral.

In general, students report a preference for longer comments, especially those that explain specific problems and make specific suggestions (Cohen, 1987; Ferris, 1995; Jenkins, 1987; Keh, 1990; Straub, 1997). Furthermore, they tend to report finding short, general comments (Ferris, 1995; Jenkins, 1987) and comments questioning content (Straub, 1997) more difficult to use. This finding was also

supported by the responses of the subjects used in Zacharias's (2007) study who expressed their desire for specific teacher feedback since this kind of feedback would facilitate them in the revision process. They also added that it would be better if teachers could justify their feedback through oral feedback.

In some studies, however, students reported that they do not use or value teacher feedback listing a number of reasons for this. For some students, only the numerical grade is of interest showing achievement and progression in simple, unambiguous and meaningful terms (Ecclestone, as cited in Duncan, 2007). Similarly, in Radecki and Swales's study (1988), most of the students reported that they first look at the grade on their returned paper rather than the comments. Likewise, according to the research findings of Wojtas (as cited in Weaver, 2006), some students were concerned only with their mark and not the feedback.

Apart from this, Duncan (2007) declares that some students will only read the qualitative comments if the quantitative mark is outside their expectations. His assertion is that students may do it to complain about the grade if it is surprisingly low. Taras' (2003) solution to this kind of an attitude is to withhold the grade until students have read and digested the qualitative feedback.

In short, students may choose to revise or not to revise according to teacher feedback. There are many reasons for unsuccessful revision or no revision that have been reported in the literature. In addition to a lack of understanding of teacher comments and how to revise in response to them, some students are resistant to revision (Enginarlar, 1993; Radecki & Swales, 1988), some simply do not have the motivation to revise (Pratt, 1999), some state lacking the time or the content knowledge to do the revision (Conrad & Goldstein, 1999).

2.6 Attitudes and Perceptions

As it is clear from the results of studies mentioned in the literature, teacher feedback on students' written work plays a very important role in a student's writing development. Leki (1990) specifically notes that "Writing teachers and students alike do intuit that written responses can have a great effect on student writing and attitude toward writing" (p. 58).

As Higgins et al. (2001) stated “The student makes an emotional investment in an assignment and expects some ‘return’ on that investment” (p. 272). This return could be in the form of a grade or feedback. Tutors assume a perceived position of authority within a power relationship based on their experience and the institutional context. The feedback comments convey a message based on an implicit understanding of particular academic terms, which in turn reflect a much more complex academic discourse, which in turn may be only partially understood by students. This suggests that the actors in the educational drama are likely to conceptualize feedback in qualitatively different ways—simply tidying up the language will have little impact.

As survey results indicate, in order to avoid some misunderstandings and confusion, students may need advice on understanding and using teacher feedback before they can engage with it. When such a crucial issue is concerned, it is vital to fully comprehend the views and responses of students to teacher feedback so that education can be truly student-centered. As Weaver (2006) puts it,

The implication is that the value of feedback depends upon the student’s particular conception; students who do not yet share a similar understanding of academic discourse as the tutor would subsequently have difficulty in understanding and using the feedback. (p. 380)

As this study revealed, students must be informed about the logic behind feedback and its potential learning benefits for them. The research study reported by Wojtas (as cited in Weaver, 2006), also claimed that many students improved their work only after they understood the purpose of feedback and assessment criteria. In another study, Maclellan (2001) questioned students’ conception of feedback and suggested that improvement in learning occurs when students perceive feedback as enabling learning, and not just as a judgment on their level of achievement.

In their study, Hartley and Chesworth (as cited in Weaver, 2006) administered a questionnaire so as to understand student perceptions of feedback. They found that students frequently have difficulty interpreting the requirements of different subjects and of different tutors. This supports the argument that some students’ level of understanding is insufficient to make sense of implicit as well as

explicit messages. In these cases, feedback may not be enough to improve students' learning (Hounsell, as cited in Weaver, 2006).

If the aim of a teacher is to help students improve their writing skills, it is important to consider what messages to convey through teacher feedback. The way in which comments are worded affects the way in which a student receives written feedback. For instance, judgmental statements which allow no room for maneuver, (e.g. 'good report', 'fails to answer the question', 'poor effort') are seen as unhelpful. They may also be taken as critical or dismissive, which can cause anger or resentment, resulting in students becoming unreceptive to tutor comments (Boud, 1995; Hounsell, 1995).

More important than the comments students get from their teachers are their grades. For students, the assessment process is a deeply *emotional* one (Boud, 1995). They invest themselves and their time in assessment tasks, and the teacher's response engages them on an emotional level. The impact of grades can have a negative impact on student engagement with feedback (Butler, 1988). If the grade is low or lower than the student expected, this would lead the student to form a negative attitude towards writing and the teacher's feedback. This is because students perceive such a situation as their deficiency in achieving something. Therefore, their ego is damaged. This emotional turmoil may either cause the student to distract from the learning potential of feedback or may even cause a threat for their self-perception (James, 2000).

As stated in some studies, students perceive teachers as the authority and expect to be guided through their feedback to get better grades. Belcher and Liu (2004) suggest that as students relinquish power to their teachers, they want to be told what to do rather than take initiative to direct their own learning. Therefore, it can be said that teachers' feedback practices have a direct influence on student reactions and expectations. However, it should also be acknowledged that when feedback is too much teacher-dominated, it breeds passive and dependent learners.

The classroom context can also have a direct impact on the way students perceive teacher feedback. The studies conducted in this vein show that students' reactions to teacher feedback change dramatically in single-draft versus multiple-draft classrooms. In multiple-draft classrooms, there is evidence to show that

students generally attend to teacher comments and think that they help them improve their writing (Diab, 2005; Ferris, 2003; Hedgcock & Lefkowitz, 1994). However, when comments are given to single or terminal drafts, students may react differently as they do not have to utilize the comments as much as in multiple-draft classrooms (Ferris, 2003). In single-draft classrooms, students bother less about vague comments than similar comments given to intermediate drafts in process-oriented classrooms (Cohen, 1987). Thus, student reactions to teacher feedback are influenced by the instructional context in which feedback is delivered.

A related factor is student motivation, which is affected by teachers' beliefs in students and their achievement. When students are taught by a teacher who believes they can never improve their writing skills no matter how hard they work, students will have an overall reaction to teacher feedback. MacDonald (1991) states that when weaker students' papers receive poor grades, their reaction is usually one of frustration and disappointment, and to reduce such tension, students are likely to discredit teacher feedback. This in the long run leads to a lack of motivation and with low motivation, students are less likely to take teacher feedback seriously and find it useful (Guenette, 2007). Guenette, also adds that "any type of feedback that does not take the crucial variable of motivation into consideration is perhaps doomed to fail" (p. 52).

Student motivation is directly related to one of the key concepts surrounding the studies conducted in the field of ELT concerning written feedback: *attitude*, namely the students' attitude towards teacher's feedback. When students lose their motivation in writing, it is impossible for them to have a negative attitude towards learning and teaching. Oppenheim (1966) defined *attitude* as "a state of readiness, a tendency to act or react in a certain manner when confronted with certain stimuli" (pp. 105-106). According to him, attitudes are reinforced by beliefs and often attract strong feelings that will lead to particular forms of behavior.

One of the studies carried out to investigate the attitudes, beliefs and perceptions of students regarding written feedback was done by Weaver (2006). Two studies were conducted, using qualitative and quantitative data collection instruments and analysis. The studies revealed that students wholeheartedly recognize the value of feedback in improving their learning, but their comments imply that feedback is

not as effective as it could be. Students indicated that they were motivated to improve when they received constructive criticism, although such guidance appeared to be rare, especially for the higher achieving students. A large majority of students also considered positive feedback to be very important and agreed that it increased their confidence; however, the evidence showed a lack of such comments.

Some studies have also been conducted in recent years on students' attitudes and perceptions towards teachers' feedback practices in higher education institutions. One of these studies was carried out by Can (2009) among doctoral students. Through her research, Can tried to understand these students' internal learning conditions; specifically, their perceptions and attitudes toward the feedback and other external conditions related to the feedback process. She hypothesized that such an understanding can help doctoral students improve their writing performance according to the academic writing standards and criteria. According to the results of her study, she grouped the factors that affect doctoral students' academic writing practices after receiving feedback under three categories: (1) emotions regarding the evaluation of their written products; (2) perceived understanding of the feedback, its purpose, and the criteria of evaluation; and (3) attitudes and perceptions toward the feedback provider. Different from the findings of some studies conducted in secondary level institutions, most of the participants in her study stated that they want to be given feedback especially on content and organization of their writing and felt they need written feedback mostly for arguments and justifications, inclusion and exclusion of information, and clarity and understandability of the statements. They preferred written feedback that provides suggestions and clear instructions for revisions, strengthens the direction of their paper, and directs them to other related resources. The balanced positive and negative comments in the feedback were also preferred. The results of her study also revealed that as students progress in their educational life, they start to have differing preferences. Her study results showed that while students in lower levels care about surface level errors or namely local errors, students in higher level institutions do care about content and organization of a paper more.

Another study that investigated students' reactions to teacher commentary was carried out by Clayton (2007). The results of this study indicate that "students do

experience emotive reactions to teacher commentary and that their reactions affect their perception of writing, the way they see themselves as writers and their revision strategies” (p. 12). Furthermore, the students also reported being confused by what the teacher had written on their papers. This information is important because teachers should be aware of the fact that while they are spending many hours commenting on student essays, they also risk not being understood completely by the students.

Students’ reactions to teacher feedback determine their attitude towards writing especially in the long run. There have been a number of studies in the literature which point at the importance of the relationship between teachers’ written feedback and students’ improvement of their skills in writing. Research conducted by Talmage and Eash (as cited in Semke, 1984) indicate that student achievement is closely related to student attitude. When students are criticized deeply by their instructors or the paper they get from their teachers is full of comments and symbols, they may feel demotivated, which, in turn, may affect their attitude towards writing. Consequently, as they state “anything which has a negative effect on attitude tends to retard learning” (p.195). Rinderer (as cited in Semke, 1984) also supports this argument and mentions the importance of providing students with positive feedback together with constructive criticism. As she says, “... supportive comments have a positive effect on students’ motivation toward writing improvement, while corrections tend to stifle motivation” (p.196).

As it is clear from all these study results, the feedback students receive from their instructors have a great deal of impact on their perceptions of their abilities, influence their attitudes about the activities they engage with and affect their willingness to engage in such activities in the future.

2.7 Writing Self-Efficacy Beliefs

The ways that students are affected by teacher feedback can also affect their perception of their abilities and their willingness to perform a task in the future. Likewise, students’ attitude towards writing has the potential to affect how they feel about their ability in this skill, namely their self-esteem or their self-efficacy beliefs.

Self-esteem is believed to be affected by receiving negative or unexpected feedback. Teachers, most of the time, do not mean to hurt students while giving feedback; however, as Boud (1995) puts it, “We judge too much and too powerfully, not realizing the extent to which students experience our power over them” (p. 43). Sometimes an instructor’s message can be misinterpreted by a student leading him to feel loss in his/her self-confidence. This is especially the case in students with low self-esteem as they are usually the ones who view all feedback as a judgment of their ability. Recently, Young (2000) has found out in his qualitative study that while students with low self-esteem were more likely to feel defeated and consider leaving the course, the ones with medium or high self-esteem tended to perceive feedback as an opportunity to act on and improve their writing (p. 415).

The function of schools in the education system is to increase students’ competence and confidence in related skills that they will need in their life after graduation. Writing is one of these skills and when students face difficulties in their writing courses, this may decrease their self-efficacy in writing. The only way to improve students’ capabilities in writing is to alter their self-efficacy beliefs. Bandura (1986) believes in the existence of a reciprocal relationship between belief and behavior. According to this belief, improving one’s writing ability requires improving this person’s self-efficacy beliefs as well. Such an attitude also has some long term benefits for students. As Bandura (1986) states, “Students who develop a strong sense of self-efficacy are well equipped to educate themselves when they have to rely on their own initiative” (p. 417). In other words, it is of crucial importance to equip students with a belief in themselves so as to make them responsible individuals who can take their own decisions.

At this point, it might be necessary to define what self-efficacy is. Although there is a general consensus about the concept, researchers and practitioners provide different definitions for the term.

According to Ormrod (2003), self-efficacy is “the belief that one can execute certain behaviors or reach certain goals” (p. 152). Walker (2003) defines it as “people’s specific judgments and beliefs about their abilities like reading a book, writing a poem, etc.” (p. 173). Jackson (2002) shares the same view and adds that “Self-efficacy refers to a set of beliefs regarding a person’s competence to formulate

and carry out a particular course of action. Self-efficacy is task-specific and is not conceptualized as a global personality characteristic” (p. 243).

Bandura (1986) defines self efficacy as “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p. 391). A student’s self-efficacy beliefs about his capabilities determine his behaviors. It is generally believed that students who do not have confidence in themselves are less likely to exert effort and more likely to give up quickly. In this respect, Bandura (1986, 1993) believes that self-efficacy beliefs and performance should be in line with each other, or self-efficacy beliefs should only slightly overestimate performance. Unaligned self-efficacy beliefs and writing performance will influence the quality of students’ work negatively, which will have impacts on their persistence and stress levels and engagement in the subject. This belief is also supported by research data which indicate a strong correlation between students’ beliefs in their abilities to perform a task and their actual performance (Schunk, 1983; Pajares & Valiante, 1997).

In short, self-efficacy is about “an individual’s judgments of his or her capabilities to perform given actions” (Schunk, 1991, p. 207). As mentioned previously, the concept is basically grounded on Bandura’s social cognitive theory. According to the principles of this theory, “both environmental conditions (e.g., the consequences of behavior and the presence of a role model) and personal variables (e.g., goals, expectations, and self-efficacy) influence learning and behavior” (Ormrod, 2003, p. 148). The implication of these principles for self-efficacy is that self-efficacy can be changed or increased with the effects of personal and environmental factors (Schunk, 2003). If students are acknowledged of their capabilities regarding certain skills, they will be sure of what they can do and will perform the tasks assigned to them better. It is important to note that existence of a self-efficacy belief is very vital because as Bandura (1993) said, “children with the same level of cognitive skill development differ in their intellectual performance depending on the strength of their perceived self-efficacy” (p. 136).

Bandura (1993) also lists the qualities of students with high self-efficacy as follows:

- they work hard

- persist
- feel less apprehensive when faced with writing problems
- approach difficult tasks as challenges instead of ignoring or avoiding them to save face
- set more challenging goals, believe that they will achieve their goals, take risks,
- engage in related activities, and are confident with the awareness of their potential

Students with low self-efficacy, on the other hand, avoid difficult tasks, have low aspirations, dwell on their personal deficiencies, give up quickly and in the end suffer a lot from stress and depression (Bandura, 1993). This feeling of helplessness leads them to label themselves as complete losers who can never learn or improve their skills.

In the area of writing, researchers have justified the fact that students' confidence in their writing skills is related both to writing competence and to academic motivation variables such as writing self-concept, writing apprehension, achievement goals, and the perceived value of writing, as well as their writing competence (McCarthy, Meier, & Rinderer, 1985; Pajares, Miller, & Johnson, 1999; Pajares & Valiante, 1997; Shell, Colvin, & Bruning, 1995; Shell, Murphy, & Bruning, 1989). According to Bandura's (1986) social-cognitive theory, students' beliefs about their academic capabilities, or self-efficacy beliefs, are good predictors of their academic achievement and of their subsequent career choices and decisions.

In the case of writing, it is possible to talk about an inverted relationship between writing self-efficacy beliefs and writing apprehension. What this means is that students with high self-efficacy beliefs about their writing have low apprehension with regard to writing, while students with low self-efficacy beliefs about their writing have higher apprehension with regard to writing.

Actually, this is not a surprising fact. Earlier in the history of ELT, this finding was also confirmed in a study conducted by Daiker (1989). Daiker found out in his study that negative responses given by teachers on students' writing may encourage high writing apprehension and may lead a student to lack of motivation

and consequently to a cycle of failure. His suggestion to this problem is to provide students with positive reinforcement to reduce this apprehension.

Assessing students' self-efficacy beliefs can provide instructors with important insights about students' academic motivation, behavior, and future choices. As Pajares et al. (2001) state “students who lack confidence in skills they possess are less likely to engage in tasks in which those skills are required, and they will more quickly give up in the face of difficulty” (p. 5). In such cases, both instructors and the school administration should work in cooperation to help students get rid of these inaccurate self-beliefs in themselves and should design their instruction accordingly to equip these students with the necessary skills to achieve academic success. If students are given practice and instruction in how to do schoolwork better, their performance can be developed.

In this respect, Zimmerman, Bonner, and Kovach (1996) warned teachers to be aware of their students' self-efficacy beliefs and urged them to pay attention to these beliefs so that they will become foundational to their counseling practices and instructional strategies carried out in classrooms and schools.

Following guidelines outlined by Bandura (1997), social-cognitive researchers have typically assessed writing self-efficacy by asking students to provide judgments of their capability to successfully perform various writing skills appropriate to their academic level. Students provide these judgments on a rating scale that ranges from 0 to 100 (Pajares, Miller & Johnson, 1999; Pajares & Valiante, 1997; Shell, Colvin & Bruning, 1995; Shell, Murphy & Bruning, 1989). Teachers and counselors can make use of the results of such assessments to evaluate the effectiveness of academic programs, to design and implement intervention strategies and to monitor student progress.

There have been a few studies conducted in the field of ELT investigating students' self-efficacy beliefs about their writing competence and their actual performance. In their study, Pajares, Miller and Johnson (1999) worked on elementary school girls and boys. These students were asked about their beliefs concerning their writing performance. It was found out that although elementary school girls judged themselves to be better writers than the boys in their class, their writing self efficacy ratings did not differ significantly from those of the boys.

More recently, however, researchers have explored the self-beliefs that underlie student motivation in writing. What they have obtained at the end of their studies is that students' beliefs about their own writing competence, or self-efficacy beliefs, are instrumental to their ultimate success as writers (Pajares, 2003). In general, results reveal that knowing a student's self-efficacy beliefs about his competence in writing enables instructors to make predictions about his writing outcomes and achievement in writing.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter presents the research method used in this study. The first section gives a description of the research design. In the second section, the participants of the study are introduced. The third section explains data collection instruments and procedures. Finally, the last section introduces the data analysis procedures.

3.1 Research Design

The present study is designed to investigate EFL students' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback and to investigate teachers' perceptions of written feedback and their expectations of students. The ultimate aim of the study is to detect the areas of mismatch between students' and teachers' view of written feedback and find ways to satisfy both parties by informing them about these areas. To this end, the following research questions are formulated:

1. What kinds of teacher feedback (direct vs. indirect, content vs. structural) do the EFL students at the Department of Modern Languages (DML) expect and desire and to what extent are these expectations and preferences being met by teacher feedback?
 - a. How important do the EFL students at the DML perceive different areas of teacher feedback?
 - b. What types of feedback are provided by teachers?
 - as perceived by the EFL students at the DML
 - as perceived by teachers
 - c. What areas of teacher's feedback do the EFL students at the DML attend to more?

- d. What kinds of discrepancies, if any, exist between the students' and teachers' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback?
2. What source do the EFL students at the DML turn to for getting help in correcting their errors in English?
3. What factors seem to influence the students' expectations and preferences for and handling of teacher feedback?
4. What is the relationship between the students' writing self-efficacy beliefs and their expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback?

In order to answer these questions, the data were collected through both quantitative and qualitative data collection tools, namely teacher interviews, student questionnaires and scales and student interviews.

3.2 Participants of the Study

The participants of the study were the instructors teaching in the DML and the students taking the ENG 102 course.

3.2.1 The Instructors Teaching at the DML

The research was carried out by a teacher who has been a member of the DML for some time. As mentioned above, she observed a frustration among teachers regarding written feedback given to student essays, which is a common practice in the institution teaching English for academic purposes (EAP). During house meetings, teachers usually raised their concerns about the issue and complained that students' writing does not improve despite their best efforts. They also stated that some students do not even respond to their feedback and as their instructors, teachers are concerned about how to help them see their weaknesses and find solutions to their problems. In order to address the issue in more detail, it was decided to interview a number of teachers offering the ENG 102 course to learn more about the sources of their concerns, their feedback practices and expectations of students. Since

it would be impossible to interview all the teachers teaching in the DML, a representative sample was chosen according to their experience in the department and the profession. It was assumed that such a sampling may give a clear picture of how perceptions may change over time and experience. The questions asked in the interviews tried to clarify what teachers understand from the word “feedback”, how they perceive it to be and to what extent they think students benefit from it.

At the time of the study, there were 62 instructors teaching in the DML. Although 23 of them were teaching the ENG 102 course that semester, all the instructors had taught the course previously. In other words, all the teachers knew the course and gave feedback to their students in previous semesters. Therefore, all 62 instructors were taken into consideration while sampling.

The DML instructors came from different backgrounds. Some are graduates of education faculties, some are graduates of English or American language and literature departments or translation departments. Most of them have Master of Arts degrees in their fields and a few of them have PhD degrees. They also participate in seminars, in-service training programs and professional training sessions held in different institutions or places all around the world. In this respect, it can be said that the instructors in the DML follow the trends in the field of English language teaching and try to apply these novelties in their teaching.

For the present study, among 62 instructors, 7 of them were interviewed. While sampling the instructors, their experience in the department and the profession was considered. Based on this consideration, the instructors were classified in 4 different groups: the ones with up to 5 years of experience, the ones with 5 to 10 years of experience, the ones with more than 15 years of experience and the ones with more than 20 years of experience. Depending on this grouping, some instructors were asked about their consent to take part in the study. Since there are more teachers representing the first two groups, two instructors were chosen from each and according to their numbers in their groups, only one instructor was chosen from the last two groups. All the instructors willingly accepted to have an interview with the researcher. The last teacher who was interviewed was the head of the department representing the administration with almost 15 years of experience.

3.2.2 ENG 102 Students

Students who are enrolled in the ENG 102 course come from a wide range of backgrounds and they have varying degrees of English proficiency. Since it is logistically impossible to group the students in different classes according to their proficiency levels, in each class, there are students with varying proficiency levels. The general picture in almost each class is that the students with a good command of English improve fast and get good grades. On the other hand, the ones with average or low proficiency in the language cannot be as successful as they expect and get lower grades. Since grades mean a lot for students, low achievers easily lose their enthusiasm and motivation. These students are usually the ones who need more feedback but at the same time the ones who benefit less from it. It is generally accepted by teachers that these students either do not understand what teachers would like to say or even if they do so, they do not know how to correct their mistakes and improve their work because of their deficiency in the language.

At the beginning of this study, it was aimed to reach all the students taking the ENG 102 course in the spring term of 2009-2010 academic year. However, due to some reasons, not all took part in the study. The first reason was the number of students. Since there were about 2100 students enrolled in the course, it was impossible to have all of them present on the day when the questionnaires and the scales were administered. Secondly, as stated in the limitations part of the first chapter, the students were asked to fill in their identity numbers on the optic forms, which made some of them refuse to fill in the forms. There were also some students who filled in the forms but not their numbers. Unfortunately, the forms of these students had to be excluded from the study. Finally, some instructors mentioned their heavy workload and tight schedule and preferred not to administer the forms. Since the department allows this kind of research on a voluntary basis, these instructors' decision was accepted politely. In the end, the actual number of students who participated in the study was 1491. These students were from five different faculties. 118 of them were from the Faculty of Architecture, 318 were from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 209 were from the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, 155 were from the Faculty of Education and 691 were from the Faculty of

Engineering. There were 36 departments in total (for the names of the departments please see Appendix A). All these students filled in both the questionnaire and the scale. Among these 1491 students, 10 of them were chosen to be interviewed. In order to have a representative number of students for each faculty, a detailed sampling was carried out. By looking at the number of students from each faculty, it was decided to have 1 student from the Faculty of Architecture, 2 students from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 2 students from the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences, 1 student from the Faculty of Education and 4 students from the Faculty of Engineering. These students were selected randomly. First their instructors were informed about the interview and the researcher asked for each student's consent for recording the whole interview.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments and Procedures

For the present study, both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods were used. The quantitative data came from the questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale administered to the students and the qualitative data came from the interviews held with some students and instructors.

3.3.1 The Questionnaire

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) indicate that since questionnaires are easily administered and analyzed type of instruments for collecting survey information and often numerical data, they are widely used as data collection tools in various types of studies. As the size of the sample gets larger, the questionnaire becomes more structured, closed-ended and numerical. Since the number of students taking the ENG 102 course is around 2100, it was decided to use a questionnaire to collect data from this large group.

The questionnaire used in the study was adapted from the one produced by Leki (1991). Her original copy included 4 parts and 27 items. This original version was piloted at the beginning of the 2009-2010 spring term with students who had taken the ENG 102 course in the previous semester. ENG 102 course is offered once

a year and the aim of the researcher was to reach all students taking the ENG 102 course; therefore, she did not want any of them to be excluded from the study. Because of this reason, it was decided to pilot the questionnaire with the students who have recently taken the course. At the beginning of 2009-2010 spring term, the researcher sent an e-mail to the teachers offering the ENG 211 course, which is the next course students take after ENG 102, and asked for their help for piloting. Among the teachers who wanted to administer the questionnaires in their classes, one of them was chosen deliberately as she was teaching students from 3 different faculties, namely Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences and Faculty of Engineering. In total, the questionnaire was administered to 61 students. According to the results, some items had to be excluded from the study and some had to be revised since they did not yield reliable results.

In the final version of the questionnaire (please see Appendix A for the questionnaire), there are three parts. Part I aimed to investigate students' perceptions about accuracy and included 6 items. In Part II, students were asked to describe what they actually do when a marked paper is returned to them. This part also consisted of 6 items. In Part III of the questionnaire, students were asked to select the best choice from among several and included 12 items. This part tried to investigate teachers' actual feedback practices and students' expectations and perceptions of this feedback.

This last version of the questionnaire was administered in the last two weeks of the 2009-2010 spring term. Until then, the students had had enough experience in receiving feedback and revising their work. Although it was aimed to have all students fill in the questionnaire, due to the reasons mentioned above, not all students participated in the study. Out of 1557 students who filled in the questionnaires, only 1491 of them were used for analysis since the remaining 66 questionnaires were excluded from the study.

3.3.2 The Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

The Writing Self-Efficacy Scale (WSES) (Pajares, Miller, & Johnson, 1999) is a survey with 9 items designed to measure students' confidence when judging their

composition, grammar, usage, and mechanical skills required to write an effective essay appropriate to their academic level. The items in the survey ask students how confident they are that they can perform specific writing skills such as correctly punctuating a one-page passage or organizing sentences into a paragraph so as to clearly express a theme on a scale from 0 (no chance) to 100 (completely certain) (see Shell et al., 1995, and Shell et al., 1989, for an eight-item self-efficacy scale using similar items).

Bandura (2006) has provided clear guidelines regarding how self-efficacy beliefs should be operationalized and measured. Because efficacy beliefs vary in level, strength, and generality, these dimensions are important in determining how instruments should be constructed. A self-efficacy scale should provide multiple items of varying difficulty that collectively assess the domain of essay writing. In addition, items should be prototypical of essay writing rather than minutely specific features of writing (e.g., confidence to form letters), and they should be worded in terms of *can*, a judgment of capability, rather than *will*, a statement of intention.

The Writing Self-Efficacy Scale (Pajares et al., 1999) has been much used in studies of writing self-efficacy. It was questioned from time to time whether it is better to use a Likert scale or a 0-100 response format. Pajares et al. (2001) found that a writing skills self-efficacy scale with a 0-100 response format was psychometrically stronger than one with a traditional Likert format. In analyses predicting middle school students' grade point average (GPA) in language arts and teacher ratings of their students' writing competence, the 0-100 scale predicted both outcomes, whereas the Likert-scale assessment did not. This is consistent with Bandura's (1997) caution that "including too few steps loses differentiating information because people who use the same response category would differ if intermediate steps were included" (p. 44). Because neither a Likert-type scale nor a 0-100 scale is more difficult or longer than the other, using a format that adds predictive utility is especially warranted.

Pajares and Valiante (1997) reported coefficient alpha reliability of .88 and above .68 correlations between items and scale scores on a sample of Grade 5 students; Pajares, Miller, & Johnson (1999) reported a coefficient alpha of .85 with

students in Grades 3,4, and 5; and Pajares et al.(1999, 2001) reported a coefficient alpha of .92 with middle school students.

Although two other versions of the scale with the same items (an eight-item version and a ten-item version) have been used in other studies, in the present study, the one produced by Pajares, Miller and Johnson (1999) was used as it yielded higher reliability in the studies it was used (please see Appendix B for the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale). The other reason was that this version of the scale was found to be more appropriate for the participants of the research. The 0-100 scale format was not changed, either.

The Writing Self-Efficacy Scale was also piloted with the same students who filled in the questionnaire at the same time. However, there did not appear a need to change or revise any item in the scale since the scale produced reliable results as a whole. The Writing Self-Efficacy Scale was administered together with the questionnaire in the last two weeks of the spring term of 2009-2010 academic year. As it is the case with the questionnaire, only 1491 of the scales were used in the study owing to the reasons mentioned above.

3.3.3 Interviews

As the literature review results reveal in Chapter 2, teachers usually see the action of giving feedback as an error hunt and disregard a more important aspect of essay writing: content and organization. Consequently, the students follow the same approach and try to produce an error-free essay not paying much attention to the construction of the essay. The items in the tools used for this particular study also reflected this trend. There were not many items concerning the feedback practices in the content or the organization part of the essays. This led the researcher to use another data collection tool to have enough data related to these parts and it was decided to have interviews both with students and teachers to be able to ask questions and get their views about these parts.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) maintain that interviews enable participants to discuss an issue from their own point of view and to indicate their attitudes, beliefs and opinions. Despite being subjective, interviews, compared to

questionnaires, allow for a deeper understanding and analysis of a case, have a higher response rate and help respondents be more involved. Since the present study aimed at revealing students' and teachers' perceptions of and attitudes towards written feedback, interviews would be used to uncover and describe participants' subjective perspective related to the issue.

The questions used in the interviews were produced by the researcher (please see Appendix C for the interview questions). Some of these questions were adapted from the open-ended questions in the original questionnaire used by Leki (1991). As the open-ended questions were excluded from the questionnaire, the researcher wanted to use these questions for the interviews. There were basically two reasons for this exclusion. The first reason was the length of the questionnaire. It is known that participants usually do not like open-ended questions and together with the other 24 items on the form, the whole questionnaire would be too long. In this way, it would be difficult to get sincere answers from the respondents. In addition, considering the fact that the scale was also administered together with the questionnaires, the whole process would take more time so it was assumed that there would be more teachers who would be reluctant to administer the forms. Secondly, it is usually the case that respondents fill in the items but they leave the open-ended questions part blank. By asking these questions in an interview, the researcher would not only miss any of the questions but she would also be able to get her interviewees reflect more on the questions, which would give her more data for the analysis. The teachers who participated in the study were only interviewed due to the same reasons. Since teachers in the DML are familiar with this kind of research a lot, they are mostly unwilling to fill in questionnaires or even if they do so, they want to add their remarks more by adding a few comments on the forms. Since the researcher is a member of the DML, she knows the profile of the instructors so she preferred to have interviews with a group of teachers rather than using a questionnaire.

With these in mind, the researcher produced four questions for the teacher interviews and five questions for the interviews with the students. There were overlapping questions in the interviews because the researcher wanted to get both the teachers' and the students' views about the same topic. Another reason was to get students' expectations of teacher feedback and teachers' actual practice of giving

written feedback in order to be able to answer the research questions. For this reason, the interview questions were prepared as *open-ended questions* allowing participants to describe their perceptions and opinions about written feedback.

Since conducting interviews, transcribing the recorded data and analyzing the responses are all important concerns in terms of time and energy spent, a limited number of respondents were selected for the interviews (10 students and 7 instructors). The interviews were held in English with the teachers and in Turkish with the students, except for one as he did not know Turkish. The reason for having the interviews in Turkish with the students was to get sincere answers for the interview questions. It is generally observed that students are not as proficient in speaking as they are in other skills; therefore, when it comes to speaking in English, students usually hesitate. As they cannot express themselves well in the language, they refrain from talking. To avoid this obstacle, it was decided to have the interviews with the students in Turkish. The only student who was interviewed in English was asked whether he would feel comfortable speaking in English and he himself wanted to have the interview in English. Although the interviews with the students were in Turkish, the extracts taken from the interviews were translated into English by the researcher for the non-Turkish readers of this dissertation and for submitting it to an English medium institution. The translations were edited by a native speaker of English who could also speak Turkish.

When the questions that would be used in the interviews were produced, they were given to two teachers, a native and a non-native speaker of English, for feedback purposes. According to their feedback, some were reworded or paraphrased in order to avoid ambiguity or bias. Besides, the questions that would be used in student interviews were translated into Turkish by the researcher and these were also reviewed by the same two teachers. Moreover, the interview process was also piloted before implementation so as to give the researcher/interviewer the chance to improve her interviewing skills in order not to manipulate or interrupt the interviewee. For this reason, the piloted interview was recorded so the researcher/interviewer was able to listen to the recording a few times to point out her weak points in the interview and to come up with remedies.

The interviews were also conducted in the last two weeks of the 2009-2010 spring term on different days. Bogdan and Bilken (1992) suggest starting interviews with a small talk especially when the interviewee is a stranger to the interviewer, and when there is a need to break the ice. Following this small talk, the interviewer is advised to inform the subject of the purpose of the interview and to assure him/her that the responses will be treated confidentially. Therefore, at the beginning of the interviews, the interviewer indicated clearly the purpose of the interview in relation to the aim of the study and that the interviewees would be anonymous in reporting the results of the analysis. While using extracts from the recordings, the names of the interviewees were kept anonymous. Since the interviews were to be recorded, before the interviews, all interviewees, both the students and the teachers, were given the informed consent form to sign and allow for their interviews to be recorded.

3.3.4 Ethics Committee Approval

The Ethics Committee approval for the research study was received in March, 2009. On the day when the data were collected, the students were provided with an informed consent form attached to the questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale and they were asked to sign the document (please see Appendix D for the informed consent form for the questionnaire and the scale). Similarly, the students chosen for the interview were asked if they volunteered for the interviews to be recorded and used for research purposes. Among the twelve students approached, two stated that they did not volunteer for recording. Since it was necessary to record the interviews for the study, two other students were chosen randomly and they accepted to have their interviews recorded and they also signed the informed consent form. (Please see Appendix E for the informed consent form for the interviews). The volunteers were told that their names would be kept anonymous so their names are changed in the study. In addition, the interviewees were told that they could have a copy of the audio-recordings if they asked for it.

3.4 Data Analysis Procedures

The first set of data was collected through the student questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale. The quantitative data collected from these tools were analysed by using descriptive statistics. The Likert scale data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed through presenting the means, percentages and frequencies obtained for each item through the SPSS program. In order to explore the discrepancy among different participant groups (depending on their faculties, departments and gender) an independent sample t-test was conducted on the Likert scale data collected through the questionnaire.

The qualitative data were obtained through the interviews. Both student and teacher interviews were recorded and these recordings were transcribed using a simplified version of Jeffersonian transcribing conventions (Please see Appendix F for the explanations to the transcription conventions used in the study). Then the data were evaluated by coding and clustering common themes that emerged in the analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The general categories were derived from the research questions and specific categories were derived through multiple readings of the transcribed data. When introducing the results of the data analysis, the patterns are presented with excerpts from the transcripts. For intra-rater reliability of the analysis of the qualitative data, the teacher-researcher repeated the coding with an interval of a month.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the results of the study. While the first section gives the results of the quantitative data, the second section discusses the results of the qualitative data.

4.1 Results of the Quantitative Data

4.1.1 Analysis of the Questionnaire

The data for the quantitative part were obtained through two tools: the questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale administered to the students. The data were analyzed using the SPSS program.

The first research question aimed at investigating the students' expectations of and preferences for teacher feedback and the teacher's actual practice of providing feedback. It included four sub-questions. The first one tried to find out how important the EFL students at the DML perceive different areas of teacher feedback. The second sub-question aimed at finding out what types of feedback are provided by teachers as perceived by students and teachers. The third sub-question investigated students' revision process and tried to find out what areas of teacher's feedback the EFL students at the DML attend to more. The last sub-question tried to find out what kinds of discrepancies exist between the students' and teachers' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback.

The data for these questions were obtained both through the questionnaire and interviews. In the questionnaire, the first six items provided the results for the first sub-question. The students' responses to these six items were ranked from 1 to 7, 1 being the least important. (In the questionnaire, 1 represented most important

and 7 represented least important but for the ease of interpretation of the results, the students' responses were coded in the reverse order.)

The results of these items in the Part I of the questionnaire indicate that there is an overall tendency among students to rate the importance given to grammatical forms highest, which shows that students care more about grammatical accuracy. Almost as important as grammatical accuracy was vocabulary choice. The mean scores for these options were calculated 5.91 and 5.89 respectively. This result is line with the findings of many studies in the literature. (Cohen, 1987; Leki 1991) also emphasized that students give more importance to grammatical accuracy and word choice. Students' responses also indicate that they want their piece of writing to be error-free (mean= 5.52) and they also think that teachers expect an essay with as few errors as possible. Among these six items, the item which displayed least importance was the one about punctuation. The mean score for this item was calculated to be 5.07. The mean scores and standard deviations for the first part are indicated in the table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1 Mean Scores Displaying the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Skills

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
1- How important is it to you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	1491	5.52	1.60
2- How important is it to your English teacher for you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	1483	5.79	1.34
3- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in grammatical forms (verbs, subject/verb agreement, article use, etc.) in your written work?	1487	5.91	1.29
4- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in spelling in your written work?	1485	5.40	1.55
5- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in vocabulary choice in your written work?	1489	5.89	1.20
6- How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in punctuation in your written work?	1487	5.07	1.62

Part II in the questionnaire was designed to answer the third sub-question in the first research question. In this part, the students rated what areas of teacher’s feedback they attend to more on 5-point scale, 1 representing *always* and 5 representing *never*. However, while calculating the mean scores, 5 was coded for “always” and 1 was coded for “never” to ease the inference of the results. The results of this part displayed that what the students consider to be of utmost importance was the comments of their teacher’s on the ideas they expressed. The mean score for the item about the teacher’s comments on the students’ ideas (item 12) was found to be 4.48, the highest among the six items. The students also rated the comments on the organization of their paper and the marks indicating errors in grammar almost equally. The mean scores for these two items were 4.41 and 4.42 respectively. Among the six items, the one with the lowest rating was the items about punctuation. As in the previous part, the EFL students at the DML pointed out that they attend to the marks indicating errors in punctuation the least when compared to the other six items. The mean score for the item on errors in punctuation was 3.82. The mean scores and standard deviation about the second part are shown in the table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2 Mean Scores Displaying the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Points in Written Teacher Feedback

	N	Mean	SD
7-When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in grammar?	1488	4.41	0.77
8- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in spelling?	1485	4.09	0.92
9- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice?	1488	4.36	0.80
10- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in punctuation?	1489	3.82	1.03
11- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the organization of your paper?	1488	4.40	0.83
12- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the ideas you expressed?	1486	4.48	0.74

Table 4.3 below also gives below the frequency results about the same part.

Table 4.3 The Percentages Displaying the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Points in Written Teacher Feedback

	Never		Not very often		Sometimes		Usually		Always	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
7-When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in grammar?	4	0.3	40	2.7	113	7.6	517	34.7	814	54.7
8- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in spelling?	11	0.7	80	5.4	260	17.5	546	36.8	588	39.6
9- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice?	0	0.0	48	3.2	158	10.6	498	33.5	784	52.7
10- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in punctuation?	26	1.7	163	10.9	307	20.6	556	37.3	437	29.3
11- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the organization of your paper?	7	0.5	57	3.8	126	8.5	444	29.8	854	57.4
12- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the ideas you expressed?	5	0.3	30	2.0	103	6.9	453	30.5	895	60.2

As indicated in the table, the results revealed that while 60.2% of the students said that they “always” attend to their teacher’s comments on their ideas they expressed, almost 2% of these students said they “never” look carefully at the marks indicating errors in punctuation. This finding also shows that students give more importance to their teacher’s comments on their ideas they expressed.

The third part of the questionnaire included questions about students’ expectations of and preferences for teacher feedback and teacher’s actual practice of giving feedback. Namely, items 13 & 14 were designed to answer the fourth sub-question in the first research question, which was about the students’ perspective. Table 4.4 below show the frequency rates for these two items in the questionnaire.

Table 4.4 The Percentages Displaying the Students’ Preferences for Written Teacher Feedback

		n	%
13- If there are many errors in a composition, what do you want your English teacher to do?	mark all errors, major and minor	784	56.0
	mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones	266	19.0
	mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them	110	7.9
	mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are	45	3.2
	mark all repeated errors whether major or minor	114	8.1
	mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas	69	4.9
	mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express	12	0.9
14- How do you want your teacher to indicate an error in your written work?	The teacher crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct word or structure.	791	56.4
	The teacher shows where the error is and gives a clue about how to correct it.	486	34.7
	The teacher only shows where the error is.	102	7.3
	The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the ideas expressed.	19	1.4
	The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the organization of the paper.	4	0.3

According to the results, 56% of the students want all their errors, major and minor, to be corrected by their teacher. This finding is consistent with the results of many studies in the literature (Cohen 1987; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Leki, 1991; Lee, 2008). What students do not like is being given feedback only on the ideas they express not paying attention to language-related problems.

Item 14 was designed to get students' preferences for teacher feedback. When asked how they want their teacher to indicate an error in their written work, 56.4% of the students wanted their teacher to cross out the incorrect form and write in the correct word or structure instead. Again in line with the results of item 13, students do not want their teachers to ignore their errors in English only paying attention to the content or organization of a paper. Out of 1491 students, only 23 of them showed their preference for the opposite. It is assumed that these students are proficient language learners who have a good command of English.

The next two items in the questionnaire, namely items 15 and 16, aim to answer the second sub-question in the first research question. In item 15, students were asked about their teacher's preferences for correcting students' errors. 53.8% of the students stated that their teacher marks all errors, major and minor. Almost 25% of them said that their teacher marks the errors s/he considers major but not the minor ones. Only 8% of the students stated that their teacher only responds to the ideas ignoring the errors. The results of this item show that teachers have differing preferences for giving feedback to students' work.

Item 16 was about teachers' actual practice of giving feedback and investigated students' perception of how their teachers' mark errors. Slightly more than 50% of the students responded that their teacher shows where the error is and gives a hint about how to correct it. 30.3% of the students said that their teacher rewrites the sentence, phrase or word correctly. Though in minority (15.1%), it seems that some teachers prefer to show where the error is and asks the students to correct it or only says there are errors and expects the students to find and correct them (1.1%). Only 8 students out of 1491 stated that their teachers ignore the errors in English. According to these results, it can be concluded that teachers have different ways of giving feedback to students' writing. Table 4.5 below gives the results of items 15 and 16.

Table 4.5 The Percentages Displaying the Teacher's Written Feedback Practices

		n	%
15- What does your English teacher usually do now?	mark all errors, major and minor	749	53.8
	mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones	347	24.9
	mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them	141	10.1
	mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are	48	3.4
	mark all repeated errors whether major or minor	57	4.1
	mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas	43	3.1
	mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express	8	0.6
16- When your English teacher marks errors, how does he or she usually do it?	rewrites the sentence, phrase or word correctly	422	30.3
	shows where the error is and gives a hint about how to correct it	738	53.0
	only shows where the error is	210	15.1
	only says there are errors and you must find them	15	1.1
	ignores the errors in English	8	0.6

Items 17-21 in the questionnaire were testing almost the same competencies with the items 7-12 in the questionnaire. While in the former part, students rated areas of their teacher's feedback they attend to more, in the latter part, they stated how they handle the feedback provided by their teacher. Table 4.6 below shows the number of students marking each item and their percentages.

Table 4.6 The Percentages Displaying the Students' Reactions to Written Teacher Feedback

		n	%
17-How carefully do you look at the marks your teacher makes on your written work?	read every one carefully	907	65.4
	look at some marks more carefully than at others	311	22.4
	mainly pay attention to teacher's comments on the ideas you expressed	169	12.2
18- If you only look carefully at some of the marks your English teacher makes on your written work, which ones do you consider most important to look at carefully?	marks indicating errors in grammar	740	53.7
	marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice	578	42.0
	marks indicating errors in punctuation	35	2.5
	marks indicating errors in spelling	24	1.7
19- Of the marks that your English teacher makes on your compositions which ones do you remember best?	comments on your ideas	772	55.4
	comments on the organization of the paper	323	23.2
	marks indicating errors in English	298	21.4
20- If you make an error in English, what helps you the most to understand what you did wrong?	having another friend explain the problem	192	13.8
	having your teacher explain the problem	1061	76.1
	looking in a grammar handbook	141	10.1
21- If you make an error in English, what helps you the least to understand what you did wrong?	having another friend explain the problem	453	32.6
	having your teacher explain the problem	139	10.0
	looking in a grammar handbook	796	57.3

According to the results of item 17, it seems that most of the students (65.4%) responded that they read every mark the teacher makes on his/her work carefully, which shows that students care about their teacher's comments on their papers. In addition, some students (22.4%) accepted looking more carefully at some marks than others. These might be mostly the students who have a high opinion of different components of a paper such as content, organization or language. 12.2% of the students, on the other hand, responded that they mainly pay attention to teacher's comments on their ideas. Item 18 investigated which errors students considered most important to look at carefully. More than half of the students (53.7%) rated grammar to be more important than punctuation or spelling (2.5% and 1.7% respectively). This finding is not expected since students rated grammar to be of great importance to them in the first part of the questionnaire as well. However, when asked about which of the marks their teacher makes on their compositions they remember best (item 18), most of the students (55.4%) said that they remember comments on their ideas best. In this part, students rated marks indicating errors in English as remembering the least (21.4%). This might be due to the reason that teachers mostly write long

comments concerning content and organization of a paper; however, their preference for language mistakes is to use an error code, which is both difficult to remember and change/improve for the students in the long run. This is a result of the interviews held with teachers as part of the study. A detailed analysis of the interview data would be provided in the next section.

Item 20 and 21 ask students what helps them the most or the least to understand what they did wrong. In item 20, 76.1% of the students preferred their teacher to explain the problem. In item 21, they rated looking in a grammar book as providing the least help to them. This is because students consider their teacher as the authority figure in charge of giving grades to them as shown in some other studies conducted in the field (Long, 1992; McGee, 1999; Zacharias, 2007). In item 21, 13.8% of the students marked having a friend explain the problem as helpful, which shows that some students resort to their friends for help.

Items 22 and 23 were complementary of the previous two items, basically designed to answer the second research question. Students were asked to mark their source of reference when they need help in correcting their errors in English for item 22, almost half of the students (49.2%) rated their teacher as the best source. 33.3% of them mentioned their teacher as their first source. Grammar books, on the other hand, were used by a minority of the students (17.5%). These results are consistent with the results of the previous two items. In item 23, students were asked whose advice mentioned in item 22 they remember best and a great majority of the students (80.6%) marked their teacher's advice as the one that is remembered best. This finding is also consistent with the results of item 20, where students rated their teachers to help them best.

The present study does not aim to investigate how the students revise a paper. Therefore, there were not specific items about students' revision practices. However, item 24 investigated what helps the students most to learn from their errors and helps them avoid making that error again. Since the responses the students gave for this item might reveal their attitudes towards revising and getting feedback from their teachers, the results of the analysis are given in the Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7 The Percentages Displaying the Sources Preferred by the Students for Help

		n	%
22- If you make an error you don't know how to correct, where do you usually go for help?	to your teacher	686	49.2
	to another friend	465	33.3
	to a grammar handbook	244	17.5
23- If you turn to one of the sources in #22 for help in correcting your error, whose advice do you usually remember best?	the teacher's advice	1119	80.6
	the friend's advice	172	12.4
	the book's advice	98	7.1
24- What helps you most to learn from the errors marked on your paper and helps you avoid making that error again?	rewriting the whole paper	171	12.2
	rewriting on another piece of paper just the sentence in which an error appeared	420	30.0
	rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong	458	32.7
	just reading through the paper carefully without rewriting anything	309	22.1
	nothing because you know you'll probably just forget and make the same errors again no matter what you do	41	2.9

Although in the process approach to writing, students are expected to rewrite the whole paper after getting feedback from their teachers, they did not rate this practice as being very helpful. Only 12.2% of the students rated it as helpful. The most commonly marked options were rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong (32.7%) or rewriting on another piece of paper just the sentence in which an error appeared (30.0%). There were about 41 students (2.9%) who seemed quite pessimistic about revising or getting feedback thinking that nothing will help as it is quite probable that they will make the same mistakes again. Such students mostly have low motivation as they are not proficient language learners. Unfortunately, these are most probably the students who have low self-efficacy beliefs about their writing.

In order to answer the third research question, students' demographic information they give at the beginning of the questionnaire was used. In this part, the variables were students' gender, department or faculty. However, analyzing the data according to the students' departments would yield pages of results, so the "department" variable was ignored using the students' faculties instead.

While analyzing the data, the items in the first two parts were compared according to the students' gender using an independent samples t-test. The results are given in the Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8 Results of the Independent Samples t–tests for the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Skills

	Sex	N	Mean	SD	t	Sd	p
1- How important is it to you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	Male	799	5.41	1.65	-2.767	1.476	0.006*
	Female	679	5.64	1.53			
2- How important is it to your English teacher for you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	Male	793	5.72	1.38	-2.048	1.468	0.041*
	Female	677	5.86	1.29			
3- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in grammatical forms (verbs, subject/verb agreement, article use, etc.) in your written work?	Male	797	5.83	1.33	-2.700	1.472	0.007*
	Female	677	6.01	1.25			
4- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in spelling in your written work?	Male	797	5.38	1.55	-0.308	1.470	0.758
	Female	675	5.41	1.54			
5- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in vocabulary choice in your written work?	Male	798	5.83	1.25	-2.134	1.474	0.033*
	Female	678	5.96	1.14			
6- How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in punctuation in your written work?	Male	795	5.04	1.62	-1.046	1.472	0.296
	Female	679	5.13	1.63			
7-When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in grammar?	Male	796	4.34	0.81	-3.692	1.473	0.000*
	Female	679	4.49	0.70			
8- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in spelling?	Male	795	4.04	0.94	-2.322	1.470	0.020*
	Female	677	4.15	0.89			
9- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice?	Male	796	4.30	0.83	-3.038	1.473	0.002*
	Female	679	4.42	0.76			
10- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in punctuation?	Male	797	3.76	1.06	-2.467	1.474	0.014*
	Female	679	3.89	1.00			
11- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the organization of your paper?	Male	796	4.35	0.87	-2.421	1.473	0.016*
	Female	679	4.45	0.79			
12- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the ideas you expressed?	Male	794	4.43	0.77	-2.733	1.471	0.006*
	Female	679	4.54	0.71			

*p<.05

As it is seen in the table, except for the 4th and 6th items, there has been significant differences between male and female students' responses at the

significance level of .05 ($p < .05$). The reason for the lack of a significant difference in items 4 and 6 is that these items are about spelling and punctuation respectively, which almost all the students rated as the least important points for them. In general, there is a tendency among males to care more about teacher feedback when compared to females.

Students' preferences for feedback also changes according to their gender. The data regarding this part were calculated using the Pearson Chi-Square Test. The analysis revealed that male and female students' preferences for teacher feedback is significantly different at the .05 level. Table 4.9 below gives a detailed analysis of the data.

Table 4.9 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Students' Preferences for Written Teacher Feedback

		Sex						Pearson Chi-Square Tests	
		Male		Female		Total		Chi-square	p
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
13- If there are many errors in a composition, what do you want your English teacher to do?	mark all errors, major and minor	375	49.1	409	64.2	784	56.0	35.611	.000*
	mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones	177	23.2	89	14.0	266	19.0		
	mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them	68	8.9	42	6.6	110	7.9		
	mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are	28	3.7	17	2.7	45	3.2		
	mark all repeated errors whether major or minor	64	8.4	50	7.8	114	8.1		
	mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas	43	5.6	26	4.1	69	4.9		
	mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express	8	1.0	4	0.6	12	0.9		
14- How do you want your teacher to indicate an error in your written work?	The teacher crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct word or structure.	404	52.9	387	60.7	791	56.4	10.773	.029*
	The teacher shows where the error is and gives a clue about how to correct it.	289	37.8	197	30.9	486	34.7		
	The teacher only shows where the error is.	60	7.9	42	6.6	102	7.3		
	The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the ideas expressed.	10	1.3	9	1.4	19	1.4		
	The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the organization of the paper.	1	0.1	3	0.5	4	0.3		

* $p < .05$

As mentioned previously, according to the results of the study, both males and females expect all their errors, major and minor, to be marked by their teacher. However, when they are analyzed separately, it is found out that more female students (64.2%) showed a preference for this option compared to the male students (49.1%). In item 14, students expressed how they want their teacher to indicate an error in their written work. In this item, again, there has been a significant difference between males and females. While 52.9% of males expected their teacher to cross out what is incorrect and to provide them with the correct form, the result was found to be 60.7% for females.

Items 15 and 16 in the questionnaire investigated the students' perception of their teacher's actual feedback practices. While there has not been a significant difference between male and female students' responses for item 15, item 16 shows a high significance in their responses at the .05 level. Table 4.10 below provides a more detailed analysis of the data.

Table 4.10 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Teacher's Written Feedback Practices

		Sex						Pearson Chi-Square Tests	
		Male		Female		Total		Chi-square	p
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
15- What does your English teacher usually do now?	mark all errors, major and minor	386	50.9	363	57.3	749	53.8	10.109	0.120
	mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones	212	27.9	135	21.3	347	24.9		
	mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them	79	10.4	62	9.8	141	10.1		
	mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are	26	3.4	22	3.5	48	3.4		
	mark all repeated errors whether major or minor	32	4.2	25	3.	57	4.1		
	mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas	20	2.6	23	3.6	43	3.1		
	mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express	4	0.5	4	0.6	8	0.6		
16- When your English teacher marks errors, how does he or she usually do it?	rewrites the sentence, phrase or word correctly	214	28.2	208	32.8	422	30.3	10.694	.030*
	shows where the error is and gives a hint about how to correct it	431	56.8	307	48.4	738	53.0		
	only shows where the error is	101	13.3	109	17.2	210	15.1		
	only says there are errors and you must find them	9	1.2	6	0.9	15	1.1		
	ignores the errors in English	4	0.5	4	0.6	8	0.6		

*p<.05

Items 17 to 21 were designed to see how the students handle teacher feedback. While a significant difference was not found between males and females for items 17, 19 and 21, in items 18 and 20, the students' handling practices of their teacher's feedback differed significantly (p=0.005 and p=0.004 respectively). Although in item 18, the students showed a general tendency for considering marks on grammar most important, females cared for grammar more than males. In item 20, the students expressed what helps them the most to understand what they did wrong.

The general tendency was for the teacher to explain the problem; however, females marked this option more than males.

Table 4.11 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Students' Reactions to Written Teacher Feedback

		Sex						Pearson Chi-Square Tests	
		Male		Female		Total		Chi-square	p
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
17- How carefully do you look at the marks your teacher makes on your written work?	read every one carefully	493	65.3	414	65.5	907	65.4	0.064	0.969
	look at some marks more carefully than at others	171	22.6	140	22.2	311	22.4		
	mainly pay attention to teacher's comments on the ideas you expressed	91	12.1	78	12.3	169	12.2		
18- If you only look carefully at some of the marks your English teacher makes on your written work, which ones do you consider most important to look at carefully?	marks indicating errors in grammar	388	51.8	352	56.1	740	53.7	12.726	.005*
	marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice	319	42.6	259	41.2	578	42.0		
	marks indicating errors in punctuation	29	3.9	6	1.0	35	2.5		
	marks indicating errors in spelling	13	1.7	11	1.8	24	1.7		
19- Of the marks that your English teacher makes on your compositions which ones do you remember best?	comments on your ideas	434	57.3	338	53.1	772	55.4	4.116	0.128
	comments on the organization of the paper	176	23.2	147	23.1	323	23.2		
	marks indicating errors in English	147	19.4	151	23.7	298	21.4		
20- If you make an error in English, what helps you the most to understand what you did wrong?	having another friend explain the problem	122	16.1	70	11.0	192	13.8	10.846	.004*
	having your teacher explain the problem	552	72.7	509	80.2	1061	76.1		
	looking in a grammar handbook	85	11.2	56	8.8	141	10.1		
21- If you make an error in English, what helps you the least to understand what you did wrong?	having another friend explain the problem	240	31.6	213	33.9	453	32.6	1.951	0.377
	having your teacher explain the problem	83	10.9	56	8.9	139	10.0		
	looking in a grammar handbook	436	57.4	360	57.2	796	57.3		

* $p < .05$

In the questionnaire, items 22 and 23 investigated the sources the students prefer for getting help. As explained in the previous parts, there is a general tendency (49.2%) for the teacher. However, there has been a significant difference between the male and female students' responses. In item 22, female students expressed a preference for their teacher to help them more than males. Similarly, in item 23, a majority of the students (80.6%) mentioned that they remember their teacher's advice more. When male and female students' responses are compared, it can easily be seen that females accepted remembering their teacher's advice more than males.

Table 4.12 below gives the analysis of data for this part.

Table 4.12 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Sources Preferred by the Students for Help

		Sex						Pearson Chi-Square Tests	
		Male		Female		Total		Chi-square	p
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
22- If you make an error you don't know how to correct, where do you usually go for help?	to your teacher	352	46.3	334	52.7	686	49.2	8.631	.013*
	to another friend	279	36.7	186	29.3	465	33.3		
	to a grammar handbook	130	17.1	114	18.0	244	17.5		
23- If you turn to one of the sources in #22 for help in correcting your error, whose advice do you usually remember best?	the teacher's advice	587	77.6	532	84.0	1119	80.6	9.036	.011*
	the friend's advice	107	14.2	65	10.3	172	12.4		
	the book's advice	62	8.2	36	5.7	98	7.1		

*p<.05

The last item in the questionnaire tried to investigate what helps the students most to learn from their errors marked on their paper. The statistical difference in this part was found to be 0.001, which indicates a high significance between males and females. In this item, while 34.9% of the females stated benefiting from rewriting on another piece of paper just the sentence with the error, the male percentage was found to be 26. Table 4.13 below shows the results of item 24.

Table 4.13 Results of the Pearson Chi-Square Tests for the Best Method to Learn From Errors

		Sex						Pearson Chi-Square Tests	
		Male		Female		Total		Chi-square	p
		n	%	n	%	n	%		
24- What helps you most to learn from the errors marked on your paper and helps you avoid making that error again?	rewriting the whole paper	90	11.8	81	12.7	171	12.2	18.870	.001*
	rewriting on another piece of paper just the sentence in which an error appeared	198	26.0	222	34.9	420	30.0		
	rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong	255	33.5	203	31.9	458	32.7		
	just reading through the paper carefully without rewriting anything	193	25.3	116	18.2	309	22.1		
	nothing because you know you'll probably just forget and make the same errors again no matter what you do	26	3.4	15	2.4	41	2.9		

*p<.05

The other factor that might influence the students' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback is their faculties or departments. The participants of the study were from 5 different faculties and from 36 different departments. While analyzing the data, students' departments were excluded from the study because such an analysis would yield an enormous amount of results. On the other hand, comparing the students on the basis of their faculties would provide more concrete results. Therefore, during the analysis, students' faculties were taken into consideration as the other factor that might influence their responses.

In the first part of the questionnaire, the students were rating how important they consider to be each item such as grammatical forms, spelling, vocabulary choice, and so on. For the analysis of the data about this part, one-sided variance analysis (ANOVA) was used. The results are displayed on the Table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14 Results of the ANOVA for the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Skills

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F	p
1-How important is it to you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	Faculty of Architecture	118	5.37	1.63	1.247	0.289
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	318	5.61	1.45		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	5.67	1.63		
	Faculty of Education	155	5.44	1.63		
	Faculty of Engineering	691	5.47	1.65		
2-How important is it to your English teacher for you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	Faculty of Architecture	117	5.79	1.24	1.691	0.149
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	317	5.92	1.17		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	5.70	1.47		
	Faculty of Education	155	5.90	1.36		
	Faculty of Engineering	685	5.72	1.38		
3- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in grammatical forms (verbs, subject/verb agreement, article use, etc.) in your written work?	Faculty of Architecture	118	5.89	1.20	1.135	0.338
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	317	5.96	1.22		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	5.93	1.40		
	Faculty of Education	155	6.07	1.18		
	Faculty of Engineering	688	5.85	1.33		
4- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in spelling in your written work?	Faculty of Architecture	118	5.47	1.41	1.372	0.241
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	317	5.51	1.53		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	5.44	1.60		
	Faculty of Education	154	5.49	1.51		
	Faculty of Engineering	687	5.30	1.57		
5- How important is it to for your English teacher to point out your errors in vocabulary choice in your written work?	Faculty of Architecture	117	6.02	1.22	0.562	0.690
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	318	5.86	1.20		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	5.95	1.18		
	Faculty of Education	155	5.85	1.20		
	Faculty of Engineering	690	5.88	1.20		
6- How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in punctuation in your written work?	Faculty of Architecture	118	4.91	1.76	1.425	0.223
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	318	5.15	1.59		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	5.03	1.68		
	Faculty of Education	154	5.31	1.56		
	Faculty of Engineering	688	5.03	1.61		

*p<.05

As can be seen in the table, there is no significant difference among the students' responses regarding the first six items based on their faculties. It can be

concluded from these results that all students participating in the study responded to these items in almost the same ways.

Regarding the items in Part II of the questionnaire, the analysis yield different results. While there is no significant difference in items 8, 9, 10 and 12, items 7 and 11 provide significant differences among the students' responses according to their faculties. In item 7, the students marked how carefully they look at the marks indicating errors in grammar. For this item, there has been a significant difference among the responses of the students at the 0.048 level ($p < .05$). When the mean scores of these faculties are analyzed, it can be seen that the students from the Faculty of Education have the highest mean score, 4.55. In item 11, the difference among the faculties is found to be significant at the 0.005 level ($p < .05$). This time, the highest mean scores belonged to the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences (4.49) and again to the Faculty of Education (4.46).

Table 4.15 Results of the ANOVA for the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Points in Written Teacher Feedback

		N	Mean	SD	F	p
7-When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in grammar?	Faculty of Architecture	118	4.34	0.73	2.405	0.048*
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	317	4.37	0.82		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	208	4.34	0.84		
	Faculty of Education	155	4.55	0.61		
	Faculty of Engineering	690	4.43	0.75		
8- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in spelling?	Faculty of Architecture	117	4.05	0.90	1.596	0.173
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	315	4.10	0.88		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	208	3.96	0.97		
	Faculty of Education	155	4.19	0.89		
	Faculty of Engineering	690	4.11	0.93		
9- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice?	Faculty of Architecture	118	4.33	0.84	1.253	0.287
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	318	4.27	0.88		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	4.38	0.76		
	Faculty of Education	155	4.36	0.72		
	Faculty of Engineering	688	4.39	0.78		
10- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in punctuation?	Faculty of Architecture	118	3.78	0.97	2.252	0.061
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	318	3.81	1.02		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	3.65	1.06		
	Faculty of Education	154	3.95	1.01		
	Faculty of Engineering	690	3.85	1.04		
11- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the organization of your paper?	Faculty of Architecture	118	4.17	0.99	3.766	0.005*
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	318	4.33	0.87		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	4.49	0.76		
	Faculty of Education	155	4.46	0.79		
	Faculty of Engineering	688	4.43	0.81		
12- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the ideas you expressed?	Faculty of Architecture	118	4.44	0.75	0.408	0.803
	Faculty of Arts and Sciences	318	4.46	0.76		
	Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	209	4.53	0.71		
	Faculty of Education	155	4.50	0.72		
	Faculty of Engineering	686	4.48	0.75		

*p<.05

The difference in item 7 might be explained due to a basic reason. Unfortunately, it is commonly accepted by the teachers at the DML that students in

the Faculty of Education have quite low proficiency levels when compared with the students from the other faculties these students are usually the graduates of teacher training high schools; therefore, they do not only have a satisfactory level of English but they also do not have a good knowledge of learning strategies. Owing to this reason, they make more errors in their writings and unfortunately they have to spend more time to revise their drafts. As their papers are mostly full of grammar mistakes which hinder their teacher's understanding of the content and organization of the paper, teachers teaching students from the Faculty of Education provide their students with more feedback on grammar. As a result, the students are to pay more attention to this feedback in order to make their piece of writing understandable at first sight. The students from the other four faculties, on the other hand, have a better command of English; therefore, they care about all components of their papers almost equally.

In item 11, which is about the organization of a paper, the lowest mean score belonged to the Faculty of Architecture (4.17) while the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences had the highest (4.49). Faculty of Education (4.46) and Faculty of Engineering (4.43) yielded almost similar results. Actually, this is an interesting finding because in the Faculty of Architecture, the students are expected to write papers or articles; therefore, they need to be careful about the organization in their papers. However, the lowest mean score belonged to this faculty. The Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences and the Faculty of Education also expect their students to produce long prose so the mean scores of these faculties are not surprising. However, the Faculty of Engineering also had a high mean score when compared with the Faculty of Architecture. In the Faculty of Engineering, the students are mostly busy with writing reports which does not require as much organization as writing a term paper. Report writing has its own mechanics and reports mostly follow the same structure. Therefore, it is usually observed that the students from this faculty complain a lot about writing essays and the feedback they get on the content and organization of this essay. However, according to the results of the questionnaire, it is seen that what the students actually say and what they perceive it to be in essay writing contradicts with each other.

Item 13 and 14 in the questionnaire investigated the students' preferences for teacher feedback. In order to see whether there is significant difference among the students' responses, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was run. Although there has not been a significant difference among the students' responses concerning item 14, the results of item 13 point at a significant difference. Table 4.16 below displays the results for items 13 and 14.

Table 4.16 Results of the ANOVA for the Students' Preferences According to Faculties for Written Teacher Feedback

		Faculty											p	
		Faculty of Arch.		Faculty of Arts and Sciences		Faculty of Economic and Admin. Sciences		Faculty of Education		Faculty of Eng		Total		
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n		%
13- If there are many errors in a composition, what do you want your English teacher to do?	mark all errors, major and minor	64	59.8	186	63.1	102	50.7	87	58.8	351	53.0	790	55.9	0.044*
	mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones	20	18.7	46	15.6	38	18.9	24	16.2	142	21.5	270	19.1	
	mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them	10	9.3	14	4.7	21	10.4	6	4.1	59	8.9	110	7.8	
	mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are	2	1.9	5	1.7	9	4.5	7	4.7	23	3.5	46	3.3	
	mark all repeated errors whether major or minor	7	6.5	31	10.5	15	7.5	15	10.1	47	7.1	115	8.1	
	mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas	4	3.7	9	3.1	14	7.0	6	4.1	36	5.4	69	4.9	
	mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express	0	0.0	4	1.4	2	1.0	3	2.0	4	0.6	13	0.9	

Table 4.16 (continued)

14- How do you want your teacher to indicate an error in your written work?	The teacher crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct word or structure.	72	67.3	175	58.9	124	62.0	71	48.0	355	53.5	797	56.3	0.075
	The teacher shows where the error is and gives a clue about how to correct it.	29	27.1	96	32.3	56	28.0	63	42.6	247	37.3	491	34.7	
	The teacher only shows where the error is.	6	5.6	20	6.7	14	7.0	12	8.1	51	7.7	103	7.3	
	The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the ideas expressed.	0	0.0	4	1.3	6	3.0	2	1.4	7	1.1	19	1.3	
	The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the organization of the paper.	0	0.0	2	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.5	5	0.4	

* $p < .05$

It is clearly shown in the table that the students' responses in item 13 differed significantly according to their faculties at the 0.044 level. Though it is not a high significance, the result may be due to varying expectations of the faculties from their students. It was mentioned previously that there is a general tendency among the students to expect all their errors, major and minor, to be marked. However, when analyzed in detail, it is seen that the students from the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences and the Faculty of Engineering have the lowest mean scores regarding this item (50.7% and 53.0% respectively). On the other hand, Faculty of Arts and Sciences (63.1%), Faculty of Education (58.8%) and Faculty of

Architecture (59.8%) have higher mean scores. The reason for this difference might be due to the fact that in the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences and the Faculty of Engineering, students are mostly engaged with different genres of writing such as report writing. Therefore, they do not consider much about content and organization in a paper. It is generally observed in classes as well that the students from these faculties complain a lot for being forced to write academic essays with documentation and proper organization. However, in especially the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Faculty of Education, students are expected to write their assignments in the form of academic papers. Thinking about the backwash effect of learning, these students want to improve all their skills in writing. For these students, it is important to produce an error-free and well-organized paper out of which they can benefit from to get good grades in their other courses, too.

In the next 7 items, namely items 15 to 21, the teachers' way of giving feedback and the students' way of handling this feedback were investigated. In items 15 and 16, the students were asked to state their teacher's feedback practices and the results were obtained by running the ANOVA again. In both of these items, there has been a significant difference among the responses. Table 4.17 below gives the results of these two items.

Table 4.17 Results of the ANOVA for the Teacher's Written Feedback Practices According to Faculties

		Faculty												p
		Faculty of Architecture		Faculty of Arts and Sciences		Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences		Faculty of Education		Faculty of Engineering		Total		
		n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
15- What does your English teacher usually do now?	mark all errors, major and minor	64	60.4	166	56.3	101	50.5	76	52.4	346	52.4	753	53.6	0.000*
	mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones	21	19.8	58	19.7	46	23.0	35	24.1	191	28.9	351	25.0	
	mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them	6	5.7	31	10.5	18	9.0	12	8.3	75	11.4	142	10.1	
	mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are	5	4.7	9	3.1	14	7.0	5	3.4	16	2.4	49	3.5	
	mark all repeated errors whether major or minor	6	5.7	16	5.4	6	3.0	7	4.8	24	3.6	59	4.2	
	mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas	4	3.8	12	4.1	14	7.0	8	5.5	6	0.9	44	3.1	
	mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express	0	0.0	3	1.0	1	0.5	2	1.4	2	0.3	8	0.6	

Table 4.17 (continued)

16- When your English teacher marks errors, how does he or she usually do it?	rewrites the sentence, phrase or word correctly	46	43.4	93	31.4	78	39.6	43	29.1	167	25.3	427	30.4	0.000*
	shows where the error is and gives a hint about how to correct it	41	38.7	135	45.6	92	46.7	76	51.4	401	60.8	745	53.0	
	only shows where the error is	19	17.9	59	19.9	25	12.7	25	16.9	83	12.6	211	15.0	
	only says there are errors and you must find them	0	0.0	6	2.0	1	0.	3	2.0	5	0.8	15	1.1	
	ignores the errors in English	0	0.0	3	1.0	1	0.5	1	0.7	3	0.5	8	0.6	

* $p < .05$

In the previous parts, it was seen that the students from the Faculty of Engineering and the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences had the lowest mean scores regarding their preference about their teacher's marking all errors, major and minor. On the other hand, the students from the Faculty of Architecture and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences had the highest mean scores. Similarly, in this part, the highest mean scores belong to the Faculty of Architecture and the Faculty of Arts and Sciences respectively. On the contrary, the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences got the lowest mean score (50.5%). The Faculty of Education and the Faculty of Engineering followed the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences with the same mean score (52.4%). Some conclusions can be drawn out of this table. First of all, it can be said that in most cases, the students' preferences and their teacher's feedback practices are in line with

each other. Secondly, it can also be concluded that in some cases like the Faculty of Education, the students' expectations and the teachers' feedback practices might differ. Actually, this conclusion is drawn out of the students' perceptions so one can question whether this is the teacher's actual practice or not. The data obtained from the interviews would shed more light on this issue. The analysis of the interview data would be provided in the next part.

Item 16 is another item which yields differing results. In this item, as in item 15, there has been a significant difference among the students' responses. Since the item was testing the teachers' way of giving feedback, it can easily be concluded that the teachers have different ways of providing feedback. Their choice might be determined based on the students' faculties or it might be due to their philosophy of teaching and learning. Whatever the case is, the truth does not change: Teachers have varying practices in giving feedback. Apart from the Faculty of Architecture, the students from the rest four faculties marked that their teachers show where the error is and gives a hint about how to correct it though the difference between the mean scores of these four faculties is significant. According to the students, teachers teaching the students from the Faculty of Architecture, on the other hand, mostly rewrite the sentence, phrase or word correctly. Showing the error and giving a clue about it was the second most commonly used technique among the teachers, though.

Items 17 to 21 investigated the students' way of handling their teacher's feedback. Except for the last item, in all the other items, a significant difference was found among the students' responses. Table 4.18 below gives the results of this part.

Table 4.18 Results of the ANOVA for the Students' Reactions to Written Teacher Feedback

	Faculty of Architecture		Faculty of Arts and Sciences		Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences		Faculty of Education		Faculty of Engineering		Total		p	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
17- How carefully do you look at the marks your teacher makes on your written work?	read every one carefully	61	57.5	193	66,1	123	62,1	107	73,8	432	65,7	916	65,5	0,015*
	look at some marks more carefully than at others	33	31.1	60	20,5	51	25,8	16	11,0	154	23,4	314	22,4	
	mainly pay attention to teacher's comments on the ideas you expressed	12	11.3	39	13,4	24	12,1	22	15,2	72	10,9	169	12,1	
18- If you only look carefully at some of the marks your English teacher makes on your written work, which ones do you consider most important to look at carefully?	marks indicating errors in grammar	52	49.1	156	53.1	103	53.1	107	72.8	331	51.0	749	53.9	0.015*
	marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice	49	46.2	125	42.5	84	43.3	35	23.8	289	44.5	582	41.9	
	marks indicating errors in punctuation	3	2.8	8	2.7	4	2.1	3	2.0	17	2.6	35	2.5	
	marks indicating errors in spelling	2	1.9	5	1.7	3	1.5	2	1.4	12	1.8	24	1.7	

Table 4.18 (continued)

19- Of the marks that your English teacher makes on your compositions which ones do you remember best?	comments on your ideas	56	52.3	167	57.0	109	54.8	70	47.9	379	57.3	781	55.5	0.031*
	comments on the organization of the paper	18	16.8	59	20.1	55	27.6	44	30.1	151	22.8	327	23.3	
	marks indicating errors in English	33	30.8	67	22.9	35	17.6	32	21.9	131	19.8	298	21.2	
20- If you make an error in English, what helps you the most to understand what you did wrong?	having another friend explain the problem	10	9.3	42	14.2	22	11.2	14	9.5	105	15.9	193	13.7	0.044*
	having your teacher explain the problem	83	77.6	220	74.6	162	82.2	124	83.8	481	72.9	1070	76.0	
	looking in a grammar handbook	14	13.1	33	11.2	13	6.6	10	6.8	74	11.2	144	10.2	
21- If you make an error in English, what helps you the least to understand what you did wrong?	having another friend explain the problem	32	30.8	102	34.7	69	34.7	47	32.2	211	32.1	461	32.9	0.0436
	having your teacher explain the problem	12	11.5	29	9.9	27	13.6	17	11.6	54	8.2	139	9.9	
	looking in a grammar handbook	60	57.7	163	55.4	103	51.8	82	56.2	392	59.7	800	57.1	

*p < .05

In item 17, the students from the Faculty of Education got the highest mean score (73.8%) for the option “read every one carefully”. As mentioned previously, the students in the Faculty of Education have very low proficiency levels. Therefore, teachers have to provide the students with a lot of feedback and the students are to pay attention to each and every of these marks in order to improve their paper. However, interestingly, though the students from the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences and the Faculty of Engineering had the lowest mean scores in the item about their preferences for teacher feedback, in this item, they have quite high mean scores about the first option. Although their mean scores are not as high as the Faculty of Education, it can still be said that the students from these two faculties also value teacher feedback and they pay attention to it reading every mark carefully.

In item 18, the students rated the mark they consider most important to look at carefully. The general tendency is for the marks indicating errors in grammar and the errors in vocabulary choice respectively. However, there has again been a significant difference among the faculties. The Faculty of Education got the highest mean score (72.8%) for the marks indicating errors in grammar. This result can be expected considering the low proficiency levels of the students in the faculty. As they make a lot of errors in language structures, teachers provide a lot of marks indicating these errors, which the students have to correct in order to make meaning clear in their papers. The lowest mean score (49.1%) belongs to the Faculty of Architecture. The reason might be that they rated marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice almost equally (46.2%). The difference was found to be 0.015 at the .05 significance level.

In item 19, the students rated the marks which their teachers make on their compositions they remember best. The highest mean scores for this option “comments on ideas” belong to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences (57.0%) and the Faculty of Engineering (57.3%). While the mean score of the Faculty of Education (47.9%) is the lowest.

In items 20 and 21, the students marked what helps them the most or the least to understand what they did wrong. In item 20, the general tendency is for the teacher to explain the problem. However, the students from the Faculty of Education and

from the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences got almost the same highest mean scores (83.8% and 82.2% respectively). It is easy to understand the reason for the students from the Faculty of Education as they need the guidance of their teacher throughout the course with their low proficiency level. However, the result of the Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences is interesting because they had the lowest mean scores about the importance they give to different components in essay writing. Still, though, almost all the students regard their teacher as the authority figure in charge of grades; therefore, they value teacher feedback and want to get the help again from their teachers. The significance was found to be 0.044 for this item, not a very high one, though.

For item 21, most of the students (57.1%) marked the grammar book as the least helpful source to them. When their results were compared based on their faculties, there has not been a significant difference (0.0436%). It can be concluded that the majority of the students do not refer to a grammar book or even if they do so, it does not help them much to correct their mistakes.

For the last three items in the questionnaire, namely items 22, 23 and 24, a significant difference was not observed among different faculties as shown in Table 4.19.

Table 4.19 Results of the ANOVA for the Sources Preferred by the Students for Help

	Faculty of Architecture		Faculty of Arts and Sciences		Faculty of Economic and Admin. Sciences		Faculty of Engineering		Total				p	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
22- If you make an error you don't know how to correct, where do you usually go for help?	to your teacher	50	46.7	139	47.1	105	53.0	78	53.1	322	48.7	694	49.3	0.410
	to another friend	36	33.6	96	32.5	56	28.3	44	29.9	237	35.9	469	33.3	
	to a grammar handbook	21	19.6	60	20.3	37	18.7	25	17.0	102	15.4	245	17.	
23- If you turn to one of the sources in #22 for help in correcting your error, whose advice do you usually remember best?	the teacher's advice	80	76.2	235	80.2	166	83.8	125	85.6	523	79.2	1129	80.5	0.526
	the friend's advice	17	16.2	35	11.9	18	9.1	14	9.6	89	13.5	173	12.3	
	the book's advice	8	7.6	23	7.8	14	7.1	7	4.8	48	7.3	100	7.1	

Table 4.19 (continued)

24- What helps you most to learn from the errors marked on your paper and helps you avoid making that error again?	nothing because you know you'll probably just forget and make the same errors again no matter what you do	just reading through the paper carefully without rewriting anything	rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong	rewriting on another piece of paper just the sentence in which an error appeared	rewriting the whole paper
	2	22	33	37	13
	1.9	20.6	30.8	34.6	12.1
	12	59	94	89	41
	4.1	20.0	31.9	30.2	13.9
	8	54	60	58	20
	4.0	27.0	30.0	29.0	10.0
	3	17	49	53	25
	2.0	11.6	33.3	36.1	17.0
	17	158	227	188	73
	2.6	23.8	34.2	28.4	11.0
	42	310	463	425	172
	3.0	22.0	32.8	30.1	12.2
	0.096				

*p < .05

4.1.2 Analysis of the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

The items in the first two parts of the questionnaire (items 1-12) were correlated with the students' scores they got from the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale using the Spearman Brown correlation coefficient. Table 4.20 below gives the results of the analysis regarding the first twelve items in the questionnaire.

Table 4.20 Correlations Between the Students' Scale Scores and the Perceived Importance Attached to Specific Skills

		Scale Score
1- How important is it to you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	r_s	.226(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1491
2- How important is it to your English teacher for you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?	r_s	.178(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1483
3- How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in grammatical forms (verbs, subject/verb agreement, article use, etc.) in your written work?	r_s	.127(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1487
4- How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in spelling in your written work?	r_s	.142(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1485
5- How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in vocabulary choice in your written work?	r_s	.117(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1489
6- How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in punctuation in your written work?	r_s	.128(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1487
7- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in grammar?	r_s	.234(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1488
8- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in spelling?	r_s	.222(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1485
9- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice?	r_s	.212(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1488
10- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in punctuation?	r_s	.201(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1489
11- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the organization of your paper?	r_s	.182(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1488
12- When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the ideas you expressed?	r_s	.148(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0,000
	N	1486

**p<.001

It can be observed from this table that the correlation coefficients are positive for each item. What this means is that while the students' scores they got from the scale increase, their perception related to each item in the questionnaire increases, too. In other words, all this information reveals that as the students' self-efficacy beliefs regarding writing increase, their perception related to each item in the questionnaire increases as well. The correlation coefficients obtained out of this analysis is low but significant ($p < .05$).

When the results of the analysis are critically evaluated, it can be said that the correlation coefficients are low in general. The highest correlation coefficient belongs to the correlation between the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale score and the questionnaire items 7 and 1. For item 7, which is about the students' approach to the feedback on grammar, the correlation coefficient was calculated to be .234. Similarly, in item 1, which has the second highest correlation coefficient (.226), the students want their papers to have as few errors as possible. These results are actually in line with the results of the questionnaire where the students also rated the feedback on grammar to be perceived as important. Though the interview results yielded almost similar results, the students also mentioned to be guided almost equally about the content and organization of a paper.

An interesting outcome of this analysis, however, can be observed in the lowest correlation coefficients. Although the highest correlation coefficients belong to the items about grammar and having few errors, the lowest correlation coefficients are for those items which are about the teachers' indicating errors in vocabulary choice in the first place (1.17 for item 5 in the questionnaire) and grammar forms in the second (1.27 for item 3 in the questionnaire). In the general analysis part (see Table 4.1), items 3 and 5 got the highest mean scores (5.91 and 5.89 respectively), which means the students perceive grammatical accuracy and vocabulary choice to be important.

4.2 Analysis of the Qualitative Data

In order to triangulate the data collection tools, together with the questionnaire and the scale administered to the students, semi-structured interviews were held with a number of students and some teachers. All the interviews were first transcribed. Then all the qualitative data obtained through these transcriptions were coded and some themes were drawn out of the analysis.

4.2.1. Results of the Student Interviews

Among the 1491 students who filled in the questionnaire and the scale, 10 of them were interviewed by the researcher. During the interview, these students were asked 5 questions (please see Appendix C for the interview questions used for the students). These questions were mostly taken out of the original questionnaire used by Leki (1991). She used these questions as open-ended items; however, in order to get more sincere results and to complement the qualitative data, the researcher decided to ask these questions in the interviews. The questions basically aim at investigating the students' attitudes towards revision in general and teacher feedback.

The first interview question asked the students what they think of "revision". The common themes drawn out of the data are improvement, change and consideration of teacher feedback. Especially, "improvement" was a word used by all ten students during the interviews. In addition, some students clarified this term by adding what they improve during the revision process such as grammar, organization and content and mechanics. Having a positive attitude towards the word, the students mostly mention that revision is an improvement for the better. The students generally state that when they hear the word "revise" what they understand is to look at their paper again to correct these mistakes either in the form of language mistakes or content/organization-related mistakes. However, two of these ten students also mentioned that revision also means seeing their weaknesses in their drafts through their teacher's eyes and improving to better their paper.

'Revision' hocanın bana yanlışlarımı ve olabilecek daha iyi yolları göstermesi demek... İyiye doğru bir düzeltme demek.

Revision means a kind of correction for the better. It means the teacher's showing me both my mistakes and some ways for improvement (Student 4).

Biz nerede yanlış yapmışız onlara bakıyoruz. Neler eksikmiş. Onları tamamlamaya, düzeltmeye çalışıyoruz.

We look at where we made mistakes. We try to complete and improve what is missing (Student 2).

Biraz daha geliştiriyorum düşüncelerimi, cümleleri belki de. Örneklerimi artırmaya çalışıyorum.

I improve my thoughts and may be my sentences more as well. I try to increase the number of the examples (Student 3).

The students' responses they have given to this question reveal that the students generally have a positive attitude towards "revision". They do not see it merely as a process where they correct only their surface level mistakes but they see it as a chance to make their paper better. One student (S10) even defined revision as a mutual activity and said "ikimizin birlikte yaptığı bir faaliyet" (an activity that we carry out together).

The second interview question aimed to test the students' reaction upon receiving a heavily marked paper almost all of the students used some phrases which might be considered negative at first sight; however, as they proceeded further explaining the question, they all turned out to be positive. Regardless of their departments, many students accepted that a paper full of red marks demotivates them. However, it seems that the students have different ways of dealing with such a paper. While all the students agreed that though they are demotivated when they first see their paper, they also state that as they think correction of these mistakes will improve their writing, they see it as a chance and try to use this opportunity to make their piece of writing better some students' comments are provided below.

Kıpkırmızı bir kağıt görmek pek hoş olmuyor tabi ama belli başlı şeyleri en azından düzeltmek iyi oluyor. Özellikle bazıları sürekli tekrarlananlar [*hatalar*] olursa onları düzeltiyorum. Yoksa hepsine teker teker bakamıyorum.

It is, of course, not nice to see a paper full of red marks but it is good to correct some specific things at least. I especially correct commonly made mistakes. But I cannot deal with every feedback one by one (Student 2).

This student specifically mentions being selective in correcting her mistakes as she cannot deal with correcting all the errors in her paper. This student goes on further explaining the question and adds that "eğer oklar ya da işaretlemeler daha az

olursa, daha iyi oluyor tabii” (the fewer marks or arrows there are on a paper, the better it is). What can be concluded from this remark is that s/he also expects her teacher to be selective in correcting her mistakes.

Three of the students also stated being demotivated or even disappointed after seeing their paper with their teacher’s feedback on it but these students put the blame on themselves and feel sorry for committing so many mistakes.

Bunları ben nasıl yapamamışım, nasıl görememişim diye üzülüyorum. Düzelttiğiniz zaman essay cidden güzel birşeye benziyor.

I feel sorry for some simple mistakes that I made. When corrected, your paper really turns out to be something good (Student 3).

Önce bir çöküyorum. Ben bunu yapana kadar çok uğraştım ama birşey yapamamışım ki böyle bir kağıt geldi diyorum. Ama sonra bakınca “Aaa evet bu böyle olması gerekiyor. Böyle daha iyi olur, hem de daha kolay yazarım” diyorum. Aslında iyi oluyor yani.

First I feel degraded. I tried hard until I could write this paper but as I received such a marked paper, then it means I could not be successful that much. But when I look at again, I say to myself, “Yes, it should be this way” or “It’s better this way and it is going to be easy for me to write”. Actually, it is good (Student 4).

Kağıdı ilk gördüğümde “Ya böyle hata yapılır mı?” diye düşünüyorum. Gerek gramer gerek content için.

When I see my paper first, I say “I should not have made such a mistake” both for grammar and content (Student 7).

Çok işaretli olmuyor aslında benim kağıtlarım ama yine de çok yanlışım olduğunu düşünüp endişeye kapılıyorum. Bu kadar da hata yapılır mı diyorum.

I actually do not get heavily marked papers but still I worry thinking that I have made a lot of mistakes. I say, “I should not have made so many mistakes (Student 9).

Although most of the students accepted having negative feelings at first sight, these thoughts turned out to be positive as they see their papers improve.

Two of the students did not use any negative comments at all for this question. Especially one student seemed quite enthusiastic and said:

Actually, for me, I want my paper to be heavily marked and I feel positive about that (Student 1).¹

The other student pointed at the effect the revision process has on his/her grade as the motivating force.

Başta canım sıkılıyor. Acaba ben bu işi bilmiyorum mu diyorum ama sonra notumu görünce demek ki öğrenmişim diyorum.

First I feel worried. I question whether I know how to write a paper but later on when I see my grade, I feel that I have learnt it (Student 8).

Actually, the students' responses to this interview question justify their responses they have given to the items in the questionnaire. According to the questionnaire results, it was observed that there is a general tendency among the students to expect all their errors, major and minor, to be marked. This was proven by the comments the students made during the interviews. What was revealed more was the reason behind this expectation. As the students think that when they correct their mistakes, they will improve their paper and get a better grade. As the students see their teacher as the authority figure in charge of grades, whatever comes from him/her is valued by them. This finding is consistent with the results of many studies in the literature (Long, 1992; McGee, 1999; Zacharias, 2007).

The third interview question builds on the previous question and asks the students how they feel about the comments their teachers write on their papers. With the second interview question, the students have mostly been engaged with marks indicating surface level mistakes. By this question, it was aimed to get the students' ideas regarding their teacher's comments on their content and/or organization.

¹ S1 is a foreign student and the interview was conducted in English with him. Therefore, his own wording was kept as it is.

All ten students think that their teacher's comments on their written work are beneficial and help them a lot while improving their work. Some commonly used phrases are "helps me see my mistakes" and "shows me what I cannot see myself" or "shows me my weaknesses". In this sense, it seems that the students mostly benefit from teacher feedback. One student even says, "Hoca bir çizik atsa bile yararlı olur" (even a tick of a teacher is beneficial) emphasizing how valuable they consider teacher feedback.

Another point the students generally agree on is that they expect both positive and negative feedback. Although the students have a high opinion of teacher feedback, they do not always want to see negative comments. They state that they sometimes want to be praised or appreciated for having done something right.

Hocam iyiyi de kötüyü de söylüyor. O yüzden daha yararlı oluyor. Sadece hataları işaretlese çok moral bozucu oluyor. Mesela "thanks", "this is good" gibi ya da tick'ler [√] görünce güzel oluyor.

My teacher writes both good and bad comments. That's why it is more beneficial this way. If she only marks the mistakes, it turns out to be demotivating. It is good to see some comments like "thanks" or "this is good" or even a simple tick [√]. (Student 2).

Orada "good" yazması güzel birşey. İnsanı iyi hissettiriyor.

It is nice to see "good" on the paper. It makes us feel good (Student 6).

In addition to this, one student accepted not agreeing with whatever the teacher says. In his view, in such a case, the teacher's opinion outweighs the student's as s/he is the "grade giver".

Genelde feedback yüzünden kötülediğim söylenemez. Yani sonuçta birkaç yoruma katılmadığım oluyor... Bazen benim görüşümle hocanın görüşü çarpışıyor ama onunki üstün geliyor daima. Sonuçta notu hoca veriyor.

I generally do not feel bad just because of teacher's feedback. Sometimes I do not agree with a few comments... Sometimes there might be a clash between my point of view and the teacher's point of view but the

teacher's one always outweighs mine. In the end, it is the teacher who assigns the grade (Student 3).

One student, on the other hand, had a more pessimistic view. S/he also values teacher feedback; however, s/he remembers going crazy at some point when she could not find how to correct her mistake.

Hoca bir cümlenin altını çizip defalarca 'rewrite' yazdı. Her düzeltmemde aynı cümlenin altında 'rewrite' yazıyordu. Sonunda "Hocam artık bulamıyorum" dedim. Yine de "kendin bul" dedi. Delirdiğimi sandım. Bence artık son aşamalarda yardım edilmeli.

Once my teacher underlined a sentence several times and wrote "rewrite". In each of my trial, I got a "rewrite". In the end, I said, "Teacher I can't make it". Again she said, "Find it yourself". I was nuts. I think in the last stages, the teachers should help the students (Student 7).

Apart from the comments the teachers write on the students' papers regarding content and organization, they also use some kind of an error code with some symbols indicating what type of a mistake the student has made. The fourth interview question tried to elicit the students' thoughts regarding this error code.

All students made positive remarks about the error code and stated enjoying working on it. Even a student from the Faculty of Engineering resembled the process to maths and said,

Bence kullanılan semboller matematik gibi... Orada bir yorum olmadığından direk hatan ne, ne yapman gerekiyor görüyorsun ve düzeltiyorsun.

I think the symbols used are like maths... Since there is not a long comment there, you see what your mistake is and correct it (Student 4).

The students also added that they do not want the teacher to correct their mistakes or write in the correct form. They found such a practice as spoonfeeding them and stated that they would not learn anything out of it. They rather preferred

being shown where the error is and a code or symbol to tell them what the source of the error is. Then it is the students' duty to search and find the solution to this problem.

Subject-verb agreement (SVA) gibi ya da wrong word (WW) gibi şeyler yazdığında hocamız, biz kendimiz gözden geçirince daha iyi oluyor. Hoca direk yazmış olsa, biz direk doğrularını yazar geçeriz, öğrenmeyiz. Böyle daha iyi oluyor.

When our teacher writes things like “subject-verb agreement (SVA) or wrong word (WW), it is better for us to revise them. If the teacher directly writes the correct form, we just copy them. We won't learn. It is better this way (Student 5).

Hocamız hatalarımızı düzeltmiyor. Burada gramer hatası var diyor biz bulup düzeltiyoruz. Normalde direk hocamız yazsa biz yazar geçeriz. Ama biz araştırıp öğrenince yararlı oluyor.

Our teacher does not correct our mistakes. She just indicates that there is a grammar mistake here and we find and correct it. If she normally writes the correct form, we just copy it down. But when we search and find the answer, it becomes more beneficial for us (Student 8).

In addition to finding the error code beneficial in terms of learning, more than half of the students also mentioned finding it time-saving.

It's fine. It saves our time. If she only says find the errors you have made, I can't find all of them first and it will last ages. This way, it is easier (Student 1).

En başta hocamız bunların ne anlama geldiğini söylemeden önce hiçbir şey anlamamıştık. Ondan sonra mantıklı çünkü çok yer kaplamıyor. Ayrıca daha kısa zaman alıyor.

When our teacher hasn't explained what they meant, we have not understood anything. But then they were logical as they did not take a lot of space. In addition, they are time-saving (Student 3).

Hocam hatamın olduđu yere bazı işaretler koyuyor. Artık bunların ne anlama geldiğini biliyoruz. Düzeltmesi kolay oluyor. Gidip hocaya da sormamıza gerek kalmıyor. Zaman kazandırıyor diyebilirim.

My teacher uses some symbols for my mistakes. Now we know what these symbols mean. It is easy to correct them. We do not even need to go and ask our teacher. So I can say that they save time (Student 9).

Although all of the students agreed on the beneficial value of the error code, some of the students also added that the teacher should help if the students cannot come up with the correct form themselves.

...Some points like, I have a grammar mistake but I don't know what it will be, how it will be correct. Then, I think I should go to her and ask her (Student 1).

Aslında bazı küçük hataları ben düzeltebilirim ama hoca bazen burda şu hata var bunu kullansan daha iyi olur dese daha yararlı olur benim için. Bazen nasıl düzelteceğimi bilemiyorum.

Actually, I can correct some of the simple mistakes but sometimes it might be more beneficial for me if the teacher says "It is better if you use 'this' instead of 'that'". I sometimes do not know how to correct a mistake (Student 2).

Bizim hocamız ikisini de kullanıyor zaten. Bazen çok bariz hatalar varsa kod kullanıyor. Mesela plural yapmamışsam pl yazıyor. Onu düzeltebilirim ama bazen de sanırım daha anlayamayacak birşey ise ya da kendisi yazsa daha kolay olacaksa yazıp geçiyorum.

Our teacher uses both of them. If there are simple mistakes, she uses the error code. For example, if I have not used the plural form, she writes 'pl'. I can correct such a mistake but she writes in the correct form when she feels that I cannot understand it or if she feels that it is easier to do so (Student 6).

The students' responses emphasize a very crucial point in teacher feedback: the consensus between the teacher and the students about the use of teacher

feedback. No matter what type of feedback the teacher provides the students with (either in the form of long comments or in the form of an error code), s/he should make his/her expectations clear from the beginning. It can be inferred from the students' responses that these students know the logic behind their teachers' feedback; therefore, they know what is expected of them. If that is the case, it becomes easier for the students to make the corrections.

In the fifth interview question, it was aimed to get the students' attitude towards the teacher. The question basically asked the students to state the role they assign to the teacher in improving one's writing ability. All the students interviewed appreciated the teacher's effort and assigned a big role to their teachers. Three students even said, "Without the teacher, I can't write".

One common remark the students made is that instructors teach them the way to write well. Some of the student responses related to this point are given below:

In ENG 102, the role of the teacher is to just explain us the way of writing, the correct way, the way that people usually write (Student 1).

Hocanın katkısı yadırganamaz. Benim süper bir writing'im yoktu. Hocam sayesinde gelişti ama iş öğrencide bitiyor. Hoca öğretiyor bizim de uygulamamız lazım.

The role of the teacher cannot be underestimated. I was not a super writer. I improved myself by the help of my teacher; however, it is all in our [the students'] hands. The teacher just teaches but we should apply what she has taught (Student 3).

Hocam olmadan da yazarım ama birşeye benzemez. Kurallara uygun olmaz bir kere.

I can write without the teacher but it will not be good quality. It would not be the proper way of course (Student 5).

Hocam yanlışlarımı görmemi sağlıyor. Yazdığımı okunur hale getiriyor.

My teacher helps me see my mistakes. She turns my piece of writing into something that deserves to be read (Student 6).

Bence özellikle içerik için hocanın okuması çok iyi oluyor. Ben düşünürken hatalı gelmiyor mesela ama hoca irrelevant deyince bir daha okuyorum ve evet böyle olmalı diyorum.

I think it is especially good for content that teachers are checking our papers. When I think about it, I see no problems but when the teacher says 'irrelevant', I read my paper once more and I say, 'Yes, it should be this way' (Student 7).

Hoca eksikleri görüyor. Tabi o anlıyor hatalarımızı. Ama iş hocada bitmiyor. Aldığımız geri bildirim faydalı essay'i geliştirmek için.

The teacher sees what is missing. She can understand our mistakes. But it does not end there. The feedback we receive is valuable for improving our essay (Student 9).

Aslında ENG 102'ye kadar bazı beceriler edinmiş olmamız gerekiyor ki yazabilelim. Ama yapısal olarak bir essay yapısı, mekanikleri olsun o konularda hatalarımız oluyor. Bu konuda bir yetersizliğimiz var. Essay yazarken ben o yönümün geliştiğini görüyorum. Hoca işin sistematüğini ve mekaniğini öğretiyor.

Actually, we should have gained some skills until we take ENG 102 so that we can write. However, we make some mistakes regarding the structure or mechanics of an essay. We have weaknesses in these areas. I feel that I improve myself in these areas when I am writing. The teacher teaches the conventions of writing an essay (Student 10).

It can be concluded from these responses that the students see their teachers as a guide showing them the path to proper ways of essay writing. It is also important to note two students' comments about their roles as students to improve their writing ability. These students not only value their teachers' feedback but they also mention that it is their responsibility to make good use of their teachers' feedback to improve their essays. These students consider their teachers as supporters who help them in the process of producing a good piece of writing. In short, it is accepted by all the students that the teachers' feedback is invaluable.

The last interview question asked the students to state how they think the teachers should approach the students' errors. This interview question yield striking results that need to be taken into consideration seriously by all teachers and especially by the teachers teaching at the DML. Some common themes that emerged from the students' responses are 'the presence of both positive and negative feedback', 'the qualities of good feedback', 'the inclusion of oral feedback or student/teacher conferences' and 'the teachers' being standard'.

The first theme, the presence of both positive and negative feedback, was also mentioned by the students in their responses they have given to the third interview question. As it is summarized in the relevant part, the students report being demotivated by only seeing the negative sides of their essays. What they expect to see more is positive remarks made by the teachers even such phrases as "good work" or "well-done", which will encourage them to work more on their writing to improve it. According to them, the presence of only negative comments just refrains them from revising their paper.

The second theme "the qualities of good feedback" clarifies the teachers about what they should be more careful about while giving feedback. The students mostly state that the teachers should be clear in their feedback. By just looking at what is written on their paper, they want to be able to understand what the teacher would like to say and ask them to do.

Hocalar yazdıklarında açık ve net olmalılar. Mesela sadece "rewrite" ne demek ben anlamıyorum. Neden ya da nasıl rewrite yapmalıyım.

The teachers' comments should be clear and specific. For example, just 'rewrite' does not mean anything to me. Why or how should I rewrite? (Student 7).

Hocalar bir de bizim gözümüzle bakmalı. Biz daha yeni başlıyoruz, hatalarımız çok tabi. Hocalar ona göre feedback vermeli. Her öğrencinin eksikliği farklı olabilir.

The teachers should see from our points of view as well. We have just started to write; therefore, we make a lot of mistakes. The teachers should take this into consideration. Each student's might have different weaknesses (Student 8).

Bence en çok feedback outline'a verilmeli. Herşey orada netleşiyor.

I think the most feedback should be given to the outlines. Everything becomes clear in an outline (Student 10).

In addition to these remarks, the students also emphasize the importance of getting face to face feedback from their teachers.

Hoca ile yüzyüze konuşabilmemiz gerek. Özellikle content ve organizasyon kısımlarını netleştirmek için.

We should be able to talk to the teacher face to face. Especially in order to clarify content and organization (Student 10).

Ben hoca olsam mesela sözlü feedback verirdim. Çünkü her zaman yazının ne ifade ettiğini anlamıyoruz. Bizim hocamız da bunu yapıyor. Ofis saatleri veriyor. Onlar olmasa biz sıkıntı çekiyoruz tabi. Ama yazılı feedback de veririm çünkü o da öğrencinin elinde kalıcı oluyor.

If I were the teacher, I would give oral feedback. Because we do not always understand what is meant in the written form. Our teacher applies this. She allocates some office hours. Without these office hours, we have problems. But I would also give written feedback as it is more durable (Student 9).

Aslında bir şeyi yapamadığımızda hocaya gidip sorabilmeliyiz. Sözler genelde yazıdan daha açıklayıcı oluyor.

In fact, we should be able to ask our teacher if we cannot do something. Speech is generally more explanatory than the written word (Student 3).

The last comment made by three students is that the teachers should be standard in the way they give feedback. These students complain about being confused due to teachers' varying practices of providing the students with feedback.

Aslında ben şu anki sistemden memnunum ama öğretmenler arasında bir consensus olsa. Hocadan hocaya değişiyor bazen. Standard olunmalı. Hepsi ortak şeylere karar verse iyi olur.

In fact, I am happy with the current system but there should be a consensus among the teachers. It changes from teacher to teacher. Therefore, there should be a standard. It is better if they all agree on the same things (Student 3).

Hocalar aynı şeylere bakıp puan verseler çünkü alınan puan hocaya göre değişiyor. Bundan da öğrenci adaletsiz bir şekilde etkileniyor.

If the teachers care about the same things, it would be better because the point one gets changes according to the teacher. This in turn affects the student negatively (Student 4).

Bir de her hoca farklı birşey söyleyebiliyor. Sen hocanın stiline alışana kadar da dönem bitiyor. Bütün hocalar arasında bir standard olsa bu sorun ortadan kalkar.

Each teacher may say a different thing. The terms finishes until one gets used to the way of the teacher. This problem can be overcome if there exists a standard among the teachers (Student 10).

One of the most important findings of this study is that contrary to the teachers' beliefs, the students are quite knowledgeable about the issue of revision. They mostly know what is expected of them; however, they complain that they are sometimes confused by the teacher's feedback as teachers have different ways of giving feedback. Therefore, what the students would like to see is a standard among the teachers. This is especially crucial if the students are to get a grade out of what they have produced. As mentioned by S4, if the students get various grades from their teachers owing to a lack in the standardization among teachers, this would be injustice for them and they would be affected by this negatively.

4.2.2 Results of the Teacher Interviews

The second group of qualitative data was obtained through the interviews held with 7 instructors teaching at the DML. During the interviews, the instructors

were asked 4 questions (see Appendix D for the interview questions). These questions were almost the same with the questions asked to the students. The reason behind this was to get both parties' ideas concerning the same issues. In this way, it would be possible to compare and contrast their views to be able to answer the research questions.

The first interview question asked to the teachers aimed to get their views about revision in general. When teachers were asked to define what revision means, they all used "improvement" in their responses. By improvement, they meant a kind of betterment in the students' papers in terms of content, organization, language and mechanics. Another common theme used by teachers was "change", change in order to make the paper more coherent and unified. In this respect, both the teachers and the students have a common understanding of what revision means. What was different in the teachers' responses was that the teachers also expect the students to "consider the teachers' feedback". This phrase was used by 5 of the teachers interviewed. While the students mostly thought of revision as a process to improve their papers, they did not include teacher feedback in their responses much. However, teachers think that while revising, the students should take their feedback into consideration. Some teacher comments are provided below:

I think revision is multi-faceted. There is no single thing you can revise but there is a number of things and you can revise based on the teacher's feedback and after sleeping on it, you can have a different version of what you need to include in the essays. So your idea plus the teacher's idea entails a change in the organization, content and the language (T2).

I expect them to respond to my feedback related to content and organization... I give feedback using the evaluation criteria here and I expect them to revise their drafts according to the feedback I put here (T3).

Revision means revisiting their work depending on the feedback I've given them. To revisit and actually to improve what they lack in their work (T6).

The second interview question asked the teachers the role of teachers in improving one's writing ability. The main themes were teachers as a "guide", "organizer" and "researcher". In this sense, especially for the first role "guide", there is a commonality with the students' responses. In other words, both the instructors

and the students view teachers as “guides” in the way of improving one’s writing ability. Almost all the teachers defined their roles as “guides” showing the students the way to better their papers. Especially two teachers added the phrase “teacher as a reader” to their comments and said:

The teacher as an objective person and as an outside reader can, I think, spot the weak points or shortcomings that you fail to see in your own writings so I think the teacher has a leading role in that pointing you towards an ideal, let’s say (T2).

I think the teacher can be a guide. Most of the time, I like to play the role of the guide and rather than correct things myself or teach something to the student, I like to ask them questions, Socratic questions, open-ended questions to make them think... Sometimes I also like to be the reader and ask questions about content but in playing the part of an interested reader, I ask questions like “did your grandmother really do that?” type of questions. I try to show my interest in the story or whatever it is (T7).

The students also stated that they value teacher feedback and they see their teachers as guides during the writing process. Some students even said that they would not be able to write without their teachers. One of the teachers also pointed at this issue and said:

Without the teacher, they [*students*] may sometimes fail to see what’s wrong or lacking in their paper because with peer feedback, things may go wrong. Sometimes the students focus on minor details rather than the big picture. So I think the teacher has an organizing role (T2).

In addition to this, while answering the second interview question, most of the teachers mentioned the importance of giving oral feedback, which was a comment made by the students during their interviews as well. Like the students, the teachers also think that it is better to integrate oral feedback or conferencing with the students in their feedback process to make their feedback more effective and meaningful for the students.

Of course, we have a huge workload and we have too many students and we have very less time and a tight schedule but I try to give them [the students] some written and if time allows also oral feedback and I try to explain them

what I expect from an essay. So I sometimes feel that I teach essay writing when I am giving feedback (T1).

When students have a paper in front of them and you explain this and that on the paper, they say “Hmmm, OK now I understand”. So I think face to face feedback works better but may not be possible all the time (T4).

I think, one to one, oral feedback works a lot (T3).

The third interview question was about the teachers’ approach to the students’ mistakes. Being “positive” was a phrase used by all the teachers in their approach to the students’ mistakes.

I think the attitude is very important. We need to be kind and we need to be motivating. That is the principle thing we have to keep in mind because nobody does these mistakes willingly and purposefully. They are committing these mistakes either because of lack of experience in writing or because of their lack of command of language so it is not a protest of the teacher. So we need to be very encouraging and positive in our feedback. And rather than crossing out something saying that it is wrong, we should better reword ourselves in a kinder way. I think kindness is the gist of it because if you act kindly, the student also reacts positively and gets the feedback in a positive way. Otherwise, the student only sees it as a criticism and gets into defense mechanism and either refuses to do the revision or gives something that is equally full of mistakes (T2).

Well, of course, there will be mistakes so rather than criticizing the students, we must be more constructive in our feedback (T6).

In addition to being positive, the teachers also mentioned that they should be using different techniques for different students according to their needs.

I have an error code, symbols like “sp” for spelling, “coll” for collocation kind of. I use these codes but sometimes when I feel that the student will not be able to understand it or if the student is the type of student who will not be able to find it out, then I offer them the correct forms as well. All these depend on the student (T1).

I think I myself went through a major change because in the past I was doing most of the work for the students. Then I realized that that is not the best way to help the students. Now what I do is I just underline things like grammar and vocabulary using some symbols but when it comes to content and

organization, I only ask questions. When answering the questions, they usually find the answers. The questions are more personal than the error code. I ask them according to the students' needs, I mean, to serve their needs (T4).

Unfortunately, we do not have much time, we have too many students. Therefore, the mainstream kind of problems can be addressed and this may change according to the students. While for some students, improving grammar or vocabulary has priority, for some others, improving content or organization is more important so what you give feedback may change (T6). In my 15 years of teaching writing, I tried different techniques. I started with using symbols, then I can't exactly remember when in my career I was interested in a technique called "reformulation"... I also tried giving oral feedback. I think my favorite these days, or let's say after these 15 years, I've come to a point where I think the best thing is to judge what I should do depending on the mistakes in the paper... Now I try to judge by individual student. Now my revised papers are never only symbols. You can see a combination of different techniques depending on the students' needs (T7).

The last interview question asked the teachers how they correct the students' mistakes and aimed at investigating the teachers' actual feedback practices. Some of the teachers' responses for this question overlapped with the responses they had given to the third research question. In other words, while explaining their approach to the mistakes in the students' papers, the teachers inevitably talked about how they give feedback to the students. Except for one teacher, all the other teachers accepted that they underline and use a kind of error code to spot the students' mistakes concerning language use. Apart from this, they also mention writing notes in the margins or at the end of the paper for content or organization-related issues. In addition, as mentioned previously, teachers are in favor of oral feedback and find it valuable to allocate some office hours for the students to come and get face to face feedback, which they think work more than any other technique.

One point that needs consideration is teachers' being selective in correcting their students' mistakes. Voicing their concerns about the students' making a lot of mistakes, the instructors emphasized the impossibility of dealing with all the mistakes in a paper. Therefore, the teachers resort to selective marking.

My main focus when reading a paper is organization and content. I look at the paper in general and try to find if there is good content, if there are examples, if the ideas are supported. This does not mean that grammar and vocabulary are less important but you know with so many students and so many

mistakes, it is impossible to correct all the mistakes so I choose the most problematic ones. But for content and organization, I sometimes write one paragraph feedback explaining what's lacking in content and organization (T1).

For content and organization, I write in the margins some notes for students but for grammar and vocabulary, I mostly correct their mistakes because I know they won't be able to do it on their own but of course, I do not correct each and every mistake. It's impossible (T2).

I underline and use symbols to identify what type of an error it is. But not for very simple mistakes. For such mistakes, I spend some time in the classroom and give some general feedback. Then I expect the students to correct these simple mistakes on their own (T6).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter draws some conclusions from the present study. In the first part, the findings of the study are discussed. Next, the implications of these findings are explained. Finally, the chapter ends by some recommendations for further research.

5.1 The Summary and Discussion of the Findings

5.1.1 Research Question 1

The first research question aimed at investigating the EFL students' at the DML expectations of and preferences for teacher feedback and to what extent these expectations and preferences being met by teacher feedback. The question had 4 sub-questions analyzing different aspects of the main question.

The first sub-question tested how important the EFL students at the DML perceive different areas of teacher feedback. In order to answer this question, in Part I of the questionnaire, 6 items were prepared. When the mean scores and standard deviations for these 6 items were calculated, it was seen that in general the students hold a high perception of the items asked in the questionnaire. According to the results, the highest mean score belonged to the item about grammatical accuracy. The mean score for this item was calculated to be 5.91. This item was followed by the 5th item in Part I of the questionnaire, namely the item about vocabulary choice. The mean score for this item was 5.89. The lowest mean score was calculated to be 5.07 for the 6th item in the questionnaire about punctuation.

It can be concluded from the results for the items 1-6 that the students in general perceive all the points stated in the items to be important. In other words, it

can be said that the students give a lot of importance to accuracy in grammatical forms, spelling, vocabulary choice and punctuation in their written work. They also would like to have as few errors in their essays as possible, a fact which they think is shared by teachers as well. This finding is actually consistent with the results of Can's study (2009), in which she investigated the expectations of doctoral students from their instructors. Her study results showed that while students in lower levels care about surface level errors or namely local errors, students in higher level institutions do care about content and organization of a paper more. All these findings point out that in lower levels, both the students and the teachers are happy with *the error hunt*. It is usually considered as a stage the students have to go through in order to improve their skills in the use of the language. As they increase their level, it then becomes easier for the teachers to deal with issues like content and organization.

The second sub-question in the first research question tried to analyze what types of feedback are provided by teachers. The first part of this sub-question investigated the students' perception regarding the issue. In the questionnaire, namely items 15 and 16 addressed the question. The responses to these items were analyzed based on frequency results. It seems that 53.8% of the students think that their teachers mark all errors, major and minor. 24.9% of the students, on the other hand, state that their teachers mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones. For the other options in item 15, different frequencies were also calculated. In item 16, 53% of the students marked that their teachers show where the error is and gives a hint about how to correct it. This hint is found to be the error code according to the interview data. These results show that teachers have differing ways of providing feedback.

10 of the students who filled in the questionnaire were also interviewed and during these interviews, the students were asked some questions about their teacher's way of giving feedback. Especially the third and fourth interview questions investigated the students' perceptions of the comments their teachers write on their papers and the error code or symbols they use to mark their errors. When the students' responses were analyzed, it was easy to see that the students have a high opinion of teacher feedback and they want to get more of it. The students did not

only find teacher feedback beneficial but they also stated that if constructive, such feedback motivates them. In this respect, both the questionnaire results and the interview data reveal that teachers have different ways of giving feedback to the students' written work. The only striking result coming out of the student interviews about these various feedback practices is that the students would like to be given the logic behind such practices in order to have a clear idea of what is expected from them.

When the teachers teaching at the DML were asked about how they correct the students' errors in their papers during the interviews held with them (interview question 4), their responses revealed that teachers have different ways of providing feedback. What is important to note at this part is that the teachers have their own reasons for following different routes. Then, it is crucial that the students be acknowledged of these reasons so that they will not be confused among such various practices. Once the students get an understanding of why their teachers choose this way or that way, they will fine tune themselves accordingly and will try to respond to the feedback in the best way possible.

The third sub-question in the first research question investigated what areas of teacher's feedback the EFL students at the DML attend to more. Mainly items 7 to 12 in the questionnaire aimed to answer this sub-question. When the mean scores of these items were analyzed, it can be seen that the students give more importance to their teachers' comments on their ideas they expressed (mean=4.48). Marks indicating errors in grammar, comments on the organization of the paper and marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice followed this option respectively. The lowest mean score (3.82) belonged to the item 10, which was about marks indicating punctuation. The second lowest mean score (4.09) was calculated for the item about marks indicating errors in spelling.

What these results show is that the students mostly value teacher feedback and they try to attend to it as much as possible. However, it is obvious that the students care about some points more than others. According to the results, it can be said that for the students, teachers' comments on their ideas and the organization of their paper and the marks indicating errors in language use are superior to the marks indicating errors in punctuation and spelling.

The fourth sub-question in the first research question tried to find out what kinds of discrepancies, if any, exist between the students' and the teachers' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback. Both quantitative and qualitative data results were used to answer the question. The quantitative data were obtained through the questionnaire items 13, 14 and items 17 to 21.

When the frequencies for items 13 and 14 were analyzed, it was found out that the majority of the students (56.0%) want their teachers to mark all errors, major and minor. When asked how they want their teacher to indicate an error in their written work, almost an equal number of the students (56.4%) stated that they want their instructors to cross out what is incorrect and write in the correct word or structure. The lowest frequencies (0.9% and 0.3%) represent the options about ignoring the errors paying only attention to the ideas expressed or the organization of the paper. These results are also consistent with many studies conducted in the literature (Cohen 1987; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Leki, 1991; Lee, 2008). What all these results show is that the students expect their instructors to mark all the errors. Although a great majority of the students in the questionnaire expressed their preference for their teachers to cross out what is incorrect and write in the correct form, during the interviews, the students mentioned that they do not want their teachers to provide them with the correct forms right in the beginning. Actually, the reason behind such a preference was that the students would like to learn from their mistakes. They prefer to go and search for the correct forms themselves. However, the same students also state that when they cannot come up with the correct forms, their teachers should help them or even should provide them with the correct versions. These students interviewed also represent 56.4% of the students who stated in the questionnaire to be provided with the correct forms of their mistakes. As explained above, the students care a lot about their teachers' comments on their ideas and the organization of their paper. Therefore, it seems that they would like to deal with these issues more. Mistakes in grammar and vocabulary choice are subordinate so they can be handled by the teacher if the students are helpless to find the correct forms.

Items 17 to 21 in the questionnaire investigated how the students handle teacher feedback. According to item 17, 65.4% of the students accepted reading

every one of their teachers' marks carefully. When asked about which of these marks they consider most important to look at carefully (item 18), the students mostly pointed at marks indicating errors in grammar (53.7%) and marks indicating vocabulary choice (42.0%). This finding is also consistent with the results of the items in Part I of the questionnaire, where the students also stated giving more importance to grammar and vocabulary choice rather than spelling and punctuation.

In item 19, the students marked which one of the marks their teachers make on their compositions they remember best. The highest percentage (55.4%) was calculated for the comments on their ideas. The lowest percentage (21.4%) was calculated for the marks indicating errors in English. The reason for these results was revealed in the qualitative data obtained through student interviews. While during the interviews, the students mentioned that they like the error code, they also accepted that it is hard to follow what the symbols refer to. Besides, they said that it is very likely that they will commit the same mistakes in the near or distant future.

Error code o an için işe yarıyor. Yani ne hata yaptığımı görüp, düzeltmeye çalışıyorum. Ama bir dahaki sefere yine aynı hataları yapıyorum.

Error code works at that time. I see my mistake and try to correct it but I make the same mistakes the next time (Student 4).

In items 20 and 21, the students marked their preferences for what helps them the most or the least to understand what they did wrong. According to the results, it is seen that a great majority of the students (76.1%) want to have their teacher explain the problem. The literature also supports this finding as the students perceive their teachers to be the authority responsible from giving grades (Long, 1992; McGee, 1999; Zacharias, 2007). The students in the present study also stated the same reason in the interviews.

Bazen hocanın görüşünü anlamadığımda hocama gidiyorum. Onun görüşü ile benimki çarpıştığı oluyor. Ama her zaman onunki üstün geliyor. Sonuçta notu hoca veriyor.

Sometimes when I cannot understand my teacher's comments, I go to see my teacher. There might be a clash between my point of view and the teacher's point of view but the teacher's one always outweighs mine. In the end, it is the teacher who assigns the grade (Student 3).

5.1.2 Research Question 2

The second research question tried to identify what source the EFL students at the DML turn to for getting help in correcting their errors in English. In order to answer this question, the results of the items 22 and 23 in the questionnaire were analyzed.

As mentioned previously, according to the results of items 20 and 21, it is found out that the students at the DML mostly prefer to have their teachers explain a problem when they make an error in English. Similarly, in item 22 and 23, most of the students (49.2%) again showed their teacher as the source they resort to when they need help. With 33.3%, having another friend explain the problem followed this option. However, when asked about whose advice they remember best (item 23), 80.6% of the students marked "their teacher's advice" in their responses. As the students value teacher feedback so much and as they would like to be helped by their teachers, during the interviews, they pointed at the importance of oral feedback and required from their teachers more tutorial type of conferencing. During the interviews, the students generally emphasized that their teachers should be approachable so that they can easily go to them and ask for help when they feel helpless in correcting the mistakes in their essays during their teacher's office hours.

5.1.3 Research Question 3

The third research question was investigating the factors that seem to influence the students' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback. In order to answer this question, in the questionnaire, 3 columns were

separated for the students where they marked their sex, faculty and departments. Among these three variables, the “department” variable was disregarded in the analysis as there are 36 departments totally and the analysis of these data would yield a huge amount of results. Therefore, during the analysis, the students’ gender or faculty were correlated with some specific items in the questionnaire either by using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or t-test analysis or Pearson Chi-square test analysis to obtain results indicating significance.

For the analysis regarding gender, the students’ gender was correlated with the first 12 items in the questionnaire using an independent samples t-test. In general, there is a tendency among males to care more about teacher feedback when compared to females. Among these 12 items, except for the 4th and 6th items, there has been significant differences between male and female students’ responses at the significance level of .05 ($p < .05$). Items 4 and 6 are about spelling and punctuation respectively, which almost all the students rated as the least important points for consideration for them.

Items 13 and 14 in the questionnaire were testing the students’ preferences for teacher feedback. For the analysis, the responses for these two items were correlated with the students’ gender using the Pearson Chi-Square Test. The analysis revealed that male and female students’ preferences for teacher feedback is significantly different at the .05 level. Although the study showed that both males and females expect all their errors, major and minor, to be marked by their teacher, by a detailed analysis of the items, it is found out that more female students (64.2%) showed a preference for this option compared to the male students (49.1%). In item 14, the students expressed how they want their teacher to indicate an error in their written work. In this item, again, there has been a significant difference between the males and the females. While 52.9% of the males expected their teacher to cross out what is incorrect and to provide them with the correct form, the result was found to be 60.7% for the females.

These results may indicate that while male students care more about teacher feedback, female students pay more attention to how their teachers spot their mistakes and want to be clarified about what is wrong in their writing.

Items 15 and 16 in the questionnaire investigated the students' perception of their teacher's actual feedback practices. While there has not been a significant difference between male and female students' responses for item 15, item 16 shows a high significance in their responses at the .05 level. As this part is about the teacher's way of giving feedback, the difference can be attributed to the fact that the students have different teachers; therefore, they have differing feedback practices.

Items 17 to 21 were designed to see how the students handle teacher feedback. While a significant difference was not found between males and females for items 17, 19 and 21, in items 18 and 20, the students' handling practices of their teacher's feedback differed significantly. Although in item 18, the students showed a general tendency for considering marks on grammar most important, females cared for grammar more than males. In item 20, the students expressed what helps them the most to understand what they did wrong. The general tendency was for the teacher to explain the problem; however, females rated this option more than males. These results show the importance of individual differences.

In the questionnaire, items 22 and 23 investigated the sources the students prefer for getting help. Although there is a general tendency (49.2%) for the teacher, there has been a significant difference between the male and female students' responses. In item 22, female students marked their teacher as the source to help them more than the males. Similarly, in item 23, though a majority of the students (80.6%) mentioned that they remember their teacher's advice more, the responses show that it was again females who accepted remembering their teacher's advice more than males.

The other factor that might influence the students' expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback is their faculties. In Part I of the questionnaire, items 1-6 were investigating how important the students considered each item such as grammatical forms, spelling, vocabulary choice, and so on. For the analysis of the data about this part, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used. The results display that there is no significant difference among the students' responses regarding the first six items based on their faculties. It can be concluded from these results that all the students participating in the study similar perceptions about these items.

Regarding the second part of the questionnaire, the analysis yielded different results. While there was no significant difference in items 8, 9, 10 and 12, items 7 and 11 provide significant differences among the students' responses according to their faculties. In item 7, the students marked how carefully they look at the marks indicating errors in grammar. For this item, the difference was found to be significant at the 0.048 level ($p < .05$). In item 11, on the other hand, the significance was calculated to be 0.005. These results show that the students' faculties they are being educated in are an important factor determining their perceptions of teacher feedback.

Items 13 and 14 in the questionnaire investigated the students' preferences for teacher feedback. Although there has not been a significant difference among the students' responses concerning item 14, the results of item 13 point at a significant difference at the 0.044 level. This result also shows that the students' faculties and these faculties' expectations of their students may affect the students' preferences for teacher feedback.

In items 15 and 16, the students were asked to state their teacher's feedback practices. In both of these items, there has been a significant difference among the responses. This result indicates the teachers' differing practices in providing feedback for their students.

Items 17 to 21 investigated the students' way of handling their teacher's feedback. Except for the last item, in all the other items, a significant difference was found among the students' responses. According to these results, it can be said that how the students prefer to handle teacher feedback differs and their faculties is a significant factor in their choice.

For the last three items in the questionnaire, namely items 22, 23 and 24, a significant difference was not observed among different faculties.

5.1.4 Research Question 4

The last research question aimed at investigating the relationship between the students' self-efficacy beliefs and their expectations of, preferences for and handling of teacher feedback. In order to answer this question, the items in the first two parts

of the questionnaire (items 1-12) were correlated with the students' scores they got from the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale using the Spearman Brown correlation coefficient. The results display that the correlation coefficients are positive for each item. What this means is that while the students' scores they got from the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale increase, their perception related to each item in the questionnaire increases, too. In other words, all this information reveals that as the students' self-efficacy beliefs regarding writing increase, their perception related to each item in the questionnaire increases as well. The correlation coefficients obtained out of this analysis is low but significant ($p < .05$).

5.1.5 Conclusion and Discussion

The aim of the present study was to investigate the teachers' and the students' perceptions of and attitudes towards teacher feedback. It was believed that such an analysis would guide the teaching practices of the teachers by equipping them with the knowledge of how particular attitudes might affect writing behavior. As Radecki and Swales (1988) says, "Gaining information about students' attitudes to writing and about the roles they assign to themselves and to their instructor in the review process would be of value in designing courses" (p. 356).

According to the results of the present study, some conclusions can be drawn regarding the teaching and learning process in the improvement of writing skill. The most interesting result of the study is that the students value their teachers' feedback. During informal conversations held with the students, it is generally observed that the students mostly complain about the teachers' feedback and question the value of it. However, the results of the present study show that it is generally accepted by both the teachers and the students that teachers play a key role in improving a student's writing ability. As the students attach such great importance to their teachers, they care about what is provided to them by the teachers as feedback on their written work. There are even students who think that it is impossible to produce a coherent and unified essay without a teacher. Some studies in the literature also emphasize the fact that the students value teacher feedback (Zacharias, 2007; Long, 1992). However, the students' responses they have given during the interviews in the

current study highlight some points that the teachers should be careful about while giving feedback to a student's work.

To begin with, the questionnaire results indicate that the students would like their teachers to mark all their errors, both major and minor. This finding is consistent with the results of many studies in the literature (Cohen 1987; Radecki & Swales, 1988; Leki, 1991; Lee, 2008). On the other hand, the interviews held with the teachers reveal that teachers do not follow this practice. On the contrary, the teachers at the DML mainly mention that they prefer selective marking stating their reasons for doing so. Some of their concerns include the abundance of errors in the students' work and the impossibility of correcting all these errors. In addition, they also state that they try to give feedback according to their students' needs. In this respect, the teachers stated caring about the students' weaknesses, their own expectations as teachers and the requirements of the students' faculties or their fields. It can be concluded then that there is a kind of mismatch between what the students expect and what the teachers provide. What needs to be done in such a case is that the teachers should inform the students about their expectations. From the first meeting with the students onwards, the students should be clarified about their teachers' feedback practices so that they will consider this information while they are revising their paper.

Secondly, the results of the study also reveal another crucial fact. Although the students would like to be shown all their errors, they also state that they would like to see both positive and negative comments together. Some of the students mentioned being demotivated after receiving a heavily marked paper. Actually, this is not something they do not want to see. What they react to is being only shown their errors without any good comments. According to the students, even phrases like "good work" or "well done" would be enough for them to feel better. Otherwise, their attitude towards writing is harmed and they do not want to revise their papers at all feeling that they will make a lot of mistakes again and their papers will never be perfect. In their studies, Ferris & Hedgecock (1998), Dessner (1991) and Lip (1995) obtained similar results highlighting the importance of positive comments. Therefore, teachers should try to include positive comments together with some points to consider on the students' papers.

Moreover, the students also emphasize that there are times when they feel helpless owing to not understanding the teacher's comment or they may even not know how to correct a mistake both related to language use and content or organization of the paper. What they would like to do in such times is to be able to see their teachers to get oral feedback. At this point, the teacher's being positive and approachable is important in order for the students to feel comfortable while asking his/her questions. Higgings et al. (2001) in their article point at the importance of oral feedback and say, “

Feedback may need to be more dialogical and ongoing. Discussion, clarification and negotiation between student and tutor can equip students with a better appreciation of what is expected of them, and develop their understandings of academic terms and appropriate practices before or as they *begin* to write. (p. 273)

Of all the students' comments, the most important one to consider is that the students expect their teachers to be somehow standard in their way of giving feedback. Though the students are mostly aware of the individual practices of each teacher, they state that their teacher's feedback affect their grades in the essays or in the exams. Therefore, setting a standard would have a backwash effect on the teaching process, which will produce better results for the students.

As the present study displays, the students' expectations of, preferences for and their handling of teacher feedback changes according to some factors such as the students' gender or faculty. The teachers should be aware of such differences and reflect this knowledge in their teaching practices.

5.2 Implications of the Study

In a writing class, the aim is to provide students with the best opportunity for improving their knowledge base and develop necessary skills; therefore, as Weaver (2006) says, “it is important that tutors become aware of their response styles and the possibility of students misinterpreting academic discourse, which will affect the usefulness of feedback” (p. 390). A teacher's feedback has a lot of influence in improving one's writing ability. Through their feedback, teachers might even lose a

student so as Lee (2008) emphasizes, teachers must “be aware of the impact of their feedback practices on student expectations and attitudes, which should be fed back to teachers to help them develop reflective and effective feedback practices” (p. 161).

The DML has been following the process approach to writing for quite a long time; however, there have been enormous changes in both the student and teacher profiles over the years. In addition, the number of students has increased drastically. Therefore, the teachers’ feedback practices, which have been carried out for years by the teachers’ inner feelings, have started to be questioned. In the end, there has appeared a need for a study which would analyze the students’ and the teachers’ perceptions of and attitudes towards written feedback.

The present study was conducted with these considerations in mind and the results have some implications both for the teachers teaching at the DML and for all writing teachers carrying out their duties in some other contexts. The findings of the study might also have implications for the teacher educators in many education faculties training prospective teachers about the idea of teacher feedback.

The first implication is that the process approach to writing works well and the students appreciate the process as a whole. Moreover, it is generally believed that the teachers play a crucial role in this process. Therefore, a change in the curricula for eliminating the process approach must be out of the question.

The second implication is that if the process approach is to be followed, then some actions should be taken to make the best use of it. As the students stated, there is a lack of a standard among the teachers regarding their feedback practices. Therefore, it is clear that some standardization sessions should be held where the teachers would be informed about the common practice. Especially, in institutions where there are more than a few teachers teaching the same writing course, it is really crucial to set a standard among the teachers’ actual written feedback practices and their grading system. Prior to such standardization, teachers may even go through a training program that teaches them what constitutes good feedback and how to make use of both positive and negative feedback.

By looking at the results of this study, a training model is suggested to help teachers better understand what is expected by students and how teachers should adjust their written feedback practices accordingly so as to help the students more.

First of all, in any institution where the process approach to writing is applied, teachers should be clear about the concept of *feedback* and *revision*. As the results of this study also indicate, teachers have different opinions regarding these two terms basically due to their various backgrounds which affect their philosophy of teaching and learning. However, it should always be of utmost importance for teachers to be fair to their students, which requires a kind of standard among teachers' teaching and grading practices. Therefore, in every institution, the starting point of the administrators should be to clarify the teachers about the concept of feedback and revision. By doing so, teachers would be made knowledgeable about what is expected of students. However, language institutions should create their own standards based on some findings. This could either be done by reviewing some study findings from the literature to have an idea about how such issues are dealt with in other contexts or by carrying out a similar needs analysis study to discover what the students in that specific context expect from their teachers and the teachers' written feedback. Goldstein (2006) also suggests carrying out needs analyses with the students to uncover student experiences with, preferences for and attitudes towards written commentary.

According to the results, some training sessions should be held for the teachers. In the first stage of these sessions, the teachers should be informed about the results of the studies conducted to make them aware of the students' expectations. Then they should be trained about different ways of giving feedback and how the students might benefit from each different practice. As Goldstein (2006) states "the teachers' commenting practices are affected by the institution they work in and the program within which the writing, commenting, and revision takes place" (p. 187). Therefore, once the teachers are made clear about the institution's and the program's expectations of the students, the next step should be to set a standard among the teachers concerning both their written feedback practices and their way of grading the students. In the present study, the interviews held with the teachers also showed that teachers have different styles of giving feedback. This variability in the teachers' responses justified the students' complaints that there is not a standard among the teachers. However, although standardization is necessary, it should also be kept in mind that expecting all teachers to be standard is unrealistic as people have

different values. Therefore, the training sessions should be carried out by some reservations. Rather than ordering the teachers to follow one way of giving feedback, the trainers could offer a number of different ways of giving feedback by emphasizing the positive sides and pitfalls of each practice. The teachers could then be advised to take these as guidelines while carrying out their duties. It should also be noted that teachers usually hate being told what to do as they consider themselves the authority in their classes so they should be given some autonomy as well. When the teachers are made clear about what their priorities are (i.e. content versus language) in a paper, they can have more effective commenting practices according to the needs of their students. The aim of these training sessions should be to make the teachers conscious of what they do and why and when they should provide written commentary on their students' writing. This awareness should lead to careful examinations of their commentary, both the form and the content of this commentary, to decide on what is working and what is not, so that if any changes are needed, they will be made (Goldstein, 2006). When teachers review their beliefs on the purpose of feedback, examining the language they use and messages they convey, their feedback will have a better chance of connecting with the student and addressing their main concerns (Weaver, 2006).

In the training sessions, the teachers should also be warned about another aspect that is often overlooked by teachers when responding to students' writing: positive feedback. Students need to know when they are doing something right. Teaching students to write involves pointing out the strengths as well as the weaknesses. Therefore, when responding, incidents of effective developments in an essay deserve some form of praise from the teacher. In fact, students report that they feel discouraged when they don't receive positive comments (Ferris, 1995).

The ultimate aim of the process approach is to empower students; in other words, to make students autonomous in their own learning. By helping the students through their feedback, teachers aim to show students what good writing constitutes so that in the future they can also write on their own. Lee's (2008) study showed that "teacher-dominated feedback practices are likely to produce passive and reliant learners" (p. 152). Therefore, in the training sessions, the teachers should also be guided about how to coach the students. It has been suggested that teachers should

systematically decrease the amount of feedback given during a writing course to help students develop as independent self-editors (Ferris, 1995). While in lower levels, students might be given feedback on all areas of writing such as language, content, organization and mechanics, as they progress further, the teachers might shift their focus and refrain from providing feedback on language attaching more importance to issues like content and organization. At this point, it is important to make the students understand why teachers follow certain routes in their feedback practices. As there are mismatches between what the students expect and what the teachers provide, teachers might sometimes feel themselves forced to alter their students' expectations of and attitudes toward feedback, mainly by asking them to play a much more active role in the learning-to-write process, for example, by engaging in self/peer evaluation, by participating in the development of assessment criteria for different writing tasks, or by telling teachers what they want from their feedback, such as feedback on specific error patterns.

In addition, it should also be noted that it can be difficult for teachers to provide feedback that will cater for all students' expectations. As Ferris et al. (1997) say, "There is no "one-size-fits-all" form of teacher commentary" (p. 180). Therefore, teachers should be sensitive to the needs, abilities, and personalities of their students in providing feedback. Individual students may have very different perceptions of what constitutes useful feedback. In order to help prevent miscommunication, Hyland (1998) suggests,

Teachers and students should talk together in detail about their aims and expectations with regard to feedback. Teachers need to allocate some time for face-to-face discussion with the individual student on feedback issues, to gain an awareness of the student's perspective and an understanding of what each individual student brings with them to the course in terms of past experiences and expectations. (p. 283)

The demand for oral feedback was also mentioned by the students in the interviews held during the present study. Although most of the students said that they like working on the error code their teachers make use of, they also stated not being able to figure out how to correct some of their mistakes. At this point, the students expected to be helped by their teachers. Lee (1997) believes that student conferences

can be used to enhance the effectiveness of coded feedback. In recent studies, Alexeeva (2012) and Atieya (2012) also point at the importance of oral feedback. Both the students and the teachers in their studies expressed that oral feedback is more beneficial and useful when compared with the written feedback. Therefore, teachers should be encouraged in the training sessions to offer oral feedback as much as possible despite their workload and tight schedules. According to Reid (1994), the main aim of these oral conferences should be

to show our students how to seek, in the possibility of revision, the dissonances of discovery—to show them through our comments why new choices would positively change their texts and thus show them the potential for development implicit in their own writing. (p. 156)

The next step in the training sessions should be creating a standard in grading, which is more important and at the same time more difficult to achieve. Setting a standard in grading means being fair to all the students in an institution. Grading must be taken seriously as it affects the students' performance. If the students do not trust the teachers in an institution feeling that there are unjust grading procedures, they will lose their enthusiasm, which will lower their motivation. The idea of failure will lead to lower self-efficacy beliefs and the students might, consequently, develop apprehension towards writing. In order to avoid all these, in the standardization sessions for grading, teachers should be marking a few papers to make sure what each paper deserves. This activity should be carried out until all teachers are made clear about the standards.

It is also advised to conduct some sessions like these in any institution at certain intervals as the profile of the students, their expectations and needs and the expectations of the institutions change over time.

The last implication of this study concerning the DML is that, in the near future, the DML administration may go through a change for teaching English for Specific Purposes. As the students' preferences or expectations are determined by their faculties, the instructors may be teaching specific faculties rather than a combination of these in order to serve the needs of the students in these faculties best. Actually, this is one of the issues discussed in the *Middle East Technical University Strategic Plan 2011-2016*.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Research

The present study investigated the students' and the teachers' perceptions of and attitudes towards feedback. It did not aim to analyze what goes on during the revision process. Therefore, a more detailed study can be conducted in the future to have a better understanding of how the students revise. Such a study may shed more light on the issue of how much of a teacher's feedback the students consider.

In addition, a study on how teachers give feedback might also be useful to see whether the teachers' perceptions of written feedback and their actual feedback practices match or not. In such a study, it might be better to have more interviews with the teachers to get more data about their attitudes towards feedback and the revision process in general.

One of the limitations of this study is the number of interviews held with the students. As it was the end of the semester, it was not possible to reach many students who would be willing to spare some time to have an interview with the researcher. However, it is a known fact that this limitation makes the generalizability of the results difficult. If this study is to be replicated in another context, it is also suggested to have more interviews with the students as the qualitative data obtained through student interviews revealed more details related to the students' perceptions and attitudes towards written feedback.

REFERENCES

- Alexeeva, N. (2012, March). *The effectiveness of audio feedback in online environments*. Paper presented at the IATEFL 2012 Glasgow Conference, Glasgow.
- Amores, M. J. (1997). A new perspective on peer editing. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 513-522.
- Arndt, V. (1992). Response to writing: Using feedback to inform the writing process. In M. Brock and L. Walters (Eds.), *Teaching composition around the Pacific Rim: Politics and pedagogy* (pp. 90-116). Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Adelaide: Multilingual Matters.
- Ashwell, T. (2000). Patterns of teacher response to student writing in a multiple-draft composition classroom: Is content feedback followed by form feedback the best method? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 9, 227-257.
- Atieya, M. (2012, March). *Feedback: Read it or hear it?* Paper presented at the IATEFL 2012 Glasgow Conference, Glasgow.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(2), 117-148.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.
- Bandura, A. (2006). Guidelines for creating self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares & T. Urdan (Eds.), *Adolescence and education: Vol. 5. Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307-337), Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Bangert-Drowns, R., Kulik, C., Kulik, C., & Morgan, M. (1991). The instructional effect of feedback in test-like events. *Review of Educational Research*, 61(2), 213-238.
- Beason, L. (1993). Feedback and revision in writing across the curriculum classes. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 27, 395-421.

- Belcher, D., & Liu, J. (2004). Conceptualising discourse/responding to text. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 3–6.
- Bogdan, R., and Biklen, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education*. USA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boud, D. (1995). Assessment and learning: contradictory or complementary? In P. Knight (Ed.), *Assessment and learning in higher education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Brookhart, S. M. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. USA: ASCD.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual minds, possible worlds*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., & Ronning, R. R. (1995). *Cognitive psychology and instruction* (2. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Butler, R. (1988). Enhancing and undermining intrinsic motivation; the effects of task-involving and ego-involving evaluation on interest and performance. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 58, 1–14.
- Campbell, C. (1998). *Teaching second language writing: Interacting with text*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Can, G. (2009). A Model for Doctoral Students' Perceptions and Attitudes Toward Written Feedback for Academic Writing. (PhD Dissertation, Utah State University, 2009).
- Chandler, J. (2000, March). *The efficacy of error correction for improvement in the accuracy of L2 student writing*. Paper presented at the AAAL Conference, Vancouver, BC.
- Chandler, J. (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.
- Chapin, R. & Terdal, M. (1990). Responding to our response: Student strategies for responding to teacher written comments (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 328098).
- Clayton, E. R. (2007). Self-efficacy, Locus of Control and Social Attitudes: Generation Media Responds to Teacher Commentary. (PhD Dissertation, The University of Arizona, 2007).

- Coffin, C., Curray, M. J., Goodman, S., Hewings, A., Lilis, T. M. & Swan, J. (2003). *Teaching Academic Writing: A Toolkit for Higher Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, A. (1987). Student processing of feedback on their compositions. In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 57-67). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Cohen, A., & Cavalcanti, M. (1990). Feedback on written compositions: Teacher and student verbal reports. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 155-177). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cohen, A. & Cavalcanti, M. (1993). Feedback on composition: A case study of a remedial sixth-grader. *Ilha do deserto* 29, 83-98.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Conrad, S., & Goldstein, L. (1999). ESL student revision after teacher written comments: Texts, contexts and individuals. *Journal of Second Language Learning*, 8, 147-180.
- Daiker, D. (1989). Learning to praise. In C. Anson (Ed.), *Writing and response* (pp. 103-113). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Dessner, L. (1991). *English as a second language college writers' revision responses to teacher-written comments*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Diab, R. L. (2005). Teachers' and students' beliefs about responding to ESL writing: A case study. *TESOL Canada Journal*, 23(1), 28-42.
- Duncan, N. (2007). 'Feed forward': improving students' use of tutors' comments. *Assessment and evaluation in higher education*, 32(3), 271-283.
- Enginarlar, H. (1993). Student response to teacher feedback in EFL writing. *System*, 21(2), 193-204.
- Fathman, A. & Whalley, E. (1990). Teacher response to student writing: Focus on form versus content. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 178-190). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. (1995). Student reactions to teacher response in multiple-draft composition classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 33-53.
- Ferris, D. (1997). The influence of teacher commentary on student revision. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2), 315-339.

- Ferris, D. R. (1999). The case for grammar correction in L2 writing classes: A response to Truscott (1996). *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 1 – 10.
- Ferris, D. R. (2002). *Treatment of error in second language student writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ferris, D. R. (2003). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D. (2006). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing*(pp. 81–104). Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Ferris, D. R., Chaney, S. J., Komura, K., Roberts, B. J., & McKee, S. (2000). Does error feedback help student writers? New evidence on the short- and long-term effects of written error correction. Manuscript submitted for publication
- Ferris, D., & Hedgcock, J. (1998). *Teaching ESL composition: Purpose, process and practice*. Mahwah, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferris, D., Pezone, S., Tade, C., & Tinti, S. (1997). Teacher written commentary on student writing: Descriptions and implications. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6, 155–182.
- Ferris, D. & Roberts, B. (2001). Error feedback in L2 writing classes: how explicit does it need to be?. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 161-184.
- Freedman, S. (1987). *Response to student writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Gagné, Robert M. (1985). *The conditions of learning and theory of instruction*. 4th edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., and Wager, W. W. (1992).*Principles of instructional design* (4th ed.). Fort Worth TX.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Gilbert, M. (1990).Responding to writers: What I value.*English Journal*.79(5), 49-51.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2004). Questions and answers about teacher written commentary and student revision: teachers and students working together. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 63-80.
- Goldstein, L. M. (2006). Feedback and revision in second language writing: contextual, teacher and student variables. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing*(pp. 185–205). Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

- Guenette, D. (2007). Is feedback pedagogically correct? Research design issues in studies of feedback on writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 16(1), 40–53.
- Hamp-Lyons, L. (2006). Feedback in portfolio-based writing courses. In K. Hyland & F. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in second language writing* (pp. 140–161). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hedgcock, J., & Lefkowitz, N. (1994). Feedback on feedback: Assessing learner receptivity to teacher response in L2 composing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 3, 141–163.
- Higgins, R., Hartley, P. & Skelton, A. (2001). Getting the message across: the problem of communicating assessment feedback. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 6(2), 269-274.
- Hillocks, G., Jr. (1986). *Research on written composition: New directions for teaching*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and the National Conference on Research in English.
- Hounsell, D. (1995) Marking and commenting on essays. In M. Forster, D. Hounsell & S. Thompson (Eds.), *Tutoring and demonstrating: a handbook*. Sheffield: Higher Education Staff Development Agency.
- Hounsell, D. (2003) Student feedback, learning and development. In M. Slowey & D. Watson (Eds.), *Higher education and the lifecourse*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Hyland, F. (1998). The impact of teacher written feedback on individual writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 7(3), 255–286.
- Hyland, F. (2000). ESL writers and feedback: Giving more autonomy to students. *Language Teaching Research* 4, 1, 33-54.
- Hyland, F., & Hyland, K. (2001). Sugaring the pill: Praise and criticism in written feedback. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 185–212.
- Hyland, K., & Hyland, F. (2006). Feedback on second language students' writing. *Language Teaching*, 39, 83–101.
- Jackson, J. W. (2002). Enhancing self-efficacy and learning performance. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 70 (3), 243-254.
- James, D. (2000). Making the graduate: perspectives on student experience of assessment in higher education. In A. Filer (Ed.), *Assessment: social practice and social product*. London and New York: Routledge Falmer.

- Jenkins, R. (1987). Responding to student writing: written dialogues on writing and revision. *The Writing Instructor*, 6, 82-86.
- Keh, C. L. (1990). Feedback in the writing process: a model and methods for implementation. *ELT Journal*, 44, 294-304.
- Kepner, C. (1991). An experiment in the relationship of types of written feedback to the development of second-languagewriting skills. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 305-313.
- Knoblauch, C. & Brannon, L. (1981). Teacher commentary on student writing: the state of the art. *Freshman English News*.10: 1 - 4.
- Ko, J., Schallert, D. L., & Walters, K. S. (2003). Rethinking scaffolding: Examining negotiation of meaning in an ESLstorytelling task. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 303-324.
- Komura, K. (1999). *Studentresponse to error correction in ESL classrooms*. MA thesis, Department of English, California State University, Sacramento.
- Krashen, S. D. (1984). *Writing: Research, theory and application*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Lalende, J. F. (1982). Reducing composition errors: An experiment.*Modern Language Journal*, 66, 140-149.
- Lamberg, W. (1980). Self-provided and peer-provided feedback. *College Composition and Communication*. 31(1), 63 - 69.
- Lee, I. (1997). ESL learners' performance in error correction in writing: Some implications for college-level teaching. *System*, 25, 465-477.
- Lee, I. (2008). Student reactions to teacher feedback in two Hong Kong secondary classrooms. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 144-164.
- Lee, G. &Schallert, D. L. (2008). Meeting in the margins: Effects of the teacher-student relationship on revision processes of EFL college students taking a composition course. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 165-182.
- Lehr, F. (1995). Revision in the writing process. ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English, and Communication, Bloomington, IN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 379 664).
- Leki, I. (1990). Coaching from the margins: Issues in written response. In B. Kroll (Ed.), *Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom* (pp. 57-68). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Leki, I. (1991). The preferences of ESL students for error correction in college-level writing classes. *Foreign Language Annals*, 24, 203-218.
- Leki, I. (2006). "You cannot ignore". L2 graduate students' response to discipline-based written feedback. In F. Hyland & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Feedback in Second Language Writing* (pp. 266-285). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leki, I. & Carson, J. G. (1994). Students' perceptions of EAP writing instruction and writing needs across the disciplines. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(1), 81-101.
- Lipp, E. (1995). Training ESL teachers to write effective feedback on composition drafts. *Journal of Intensive English Studies*, 9, 50-66.
- Long, S. S. (1992). Using the process-model for writing options for responding to student drafts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (74th, Cancun, Mexico, August 9-13, 1992). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 826)
- MacDonald, R. B. (1991). Developmental students' processing of teacher feedback in composition instruction. *Review of Research in Developmental Education*, 8(5), 1-5.
- MacLellan, E. (2001) Assessment for learning: the differing perceptions of tutors and students, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 26(4), 307-318.
- McCarthy, P., Meier, S., & Rinderer, R. (1985). Self-efficacy and writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 465-471.
- McGee, S. (1999). *A qualitative study of student response to teacher-written comments*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- McLeod, S. H. (1987). Some thoughts about feelings: the affective domain and the writing process. *College Composition*, 3(4), 426-435.
- Merriam-Webster. (Ed.) (2003). *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (11th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- METU School of Foreign Languages. (2004). *METU School of Foreign Languages Curriculum Policy Document*. Ankara: METU.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.)*. California: Sage Publications.
- Oppenheim, A. N. (1966). *Questionnaire design and attitude measurement*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

- Ormrod, J. E. (2003). *Study guide and reader to accompany educational psychology developing learners* (4th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Ortadoğu Teknik Üniversitesi. (2011). *Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi 2011-2016 Stratejik Planı (Taslak)*. Retrieved November 15, 2011, from www.metumail.edu.tr.
- Pajares, F. (2003). Self-efficacy beliefs, motivation, and achievement in writing: A review of the literature, *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19, 139-158.
- Pajares, F. (2007). Empirical properties of a scale to assess writing self-efficacy in school contexts. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 39, 239-249.
- Pajares, F., Hartley, J., Valiante, G. (2001). Response format in writing self-efficacy assessment: greater discrimination increases prediction. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling & Development*, 33(4), 214-221.
- Pajares, F., Miller, M. D., & Johnson, M. J. (1999). Gender differences in writing self-beliefs of elementary school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91, 50-61.
- Pajares, F., & Valiante, G. (1997). The predictive and mediational role of the writing self-efficacy beliefs of upper elementary students. *Journal of Educational Research*, 90, 353-360.
- Paulus, T. M. (1999). The effect of peer and teacher feedback on student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 265-289.
- Pratt, E. (1999). *A qualitative study of peer and teacher response in an ESL writing classroom in Puerto Rico*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Radecki, P., & Swales, J. (1988). ESL student reaction to written comments on their written work. *System*, 16, 355-365.
- Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge Falmer.
- Reid, J. (1993). Historical perspectives on writing and reading in the ESL classroom. In J. Carson & I. Leki (Eds.), *Reading in the second language classroom: Second language perspectives* (pp. 9-32). Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

- Reid, J. (1994). Responding to ESL students' texts: the myths of appropriation. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28(2), 273-292.
- Reid, J. (1998). Responding to ESL student language problems: Error analysis and revisions plans. In P. Byrd & J. M. Reid (Eds.), *Grammar in the composition classroom: Essays on teaching ESL for college-bound students* (pp. 118-137). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Rennie, C. E. (2000). *Error correction in ESL writing: Student views*. MA thesis, Department of English, California State University, Sacramento.
- Robb, T., Ross, S. & Shortreed, I. (1986). Salience of feedback on error and its effect on EFL writing quality. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 83-93.
- Roberts, B. J. (1999). *Can error logs raise more than consciousness? The effects of error logs and grammar feedback on ESL students' final drafts*. MA thesis, Department of English, California State University, Sacramento.
- Schwartz, F., & White, K. (2000). Making sense of it all. In K. W. White & B. H. Weight (Eds.), *The online teaching guide: A handbook of attitudes, strategies, and techniques for the virtual classroom* (pp. 167-182). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Schunk, D. H. (1983). Ability versus effort attributional feedback: Differential effects on self-efficacy and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(6), 848-856.
- Schunk, D. H. (1991). Self-efficacy and academic motivation. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 207-232.
- Schunk, D. H. (2003). Self-efficacy for reading and writing: Influence of modeling, goal setting, and self-evaluation. *Reading and Writing Quarterly*, 19, 159-172.
- Semke, H. D. (1984). Effects of the Red Pen. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(3), 195-202.
- Shell, D. F., Colvin, C., & Bruning, R. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, attributions, and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement: Grade-level and achievement-level differences. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87, 386-398.
- Shell, D. F., Murphy, C. C., & Bruning, R. H. (1989). Self-efficacy and outcome expectancy mechanisms in reading and writing achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 91-100.
- Sheppard, K. (1992). Two feedback types: Do they make a difference? *RELC Journal*, 23, 103-110.

- Sommers, N. (1982). Responding to student writing. In I. L. Clark, (Ed.), *Concepts in Composition: theory and practice in teaching of writing*. (pp. 232-240). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publisher.
- Straub, R. (1996). The concept of control in teacher response: Defining the varieties of "directive" and "facilitative" commentary. *College Composition and Communication*, 47(2), 223 - 251.
- Straub, R. (1997). Students' reactions to teacher comments: an exploratory study. *Research in the Teaching of English* 31, 91-119.
- Taras, M. (2003) To feedback or not to feedback in student self-assessment, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28(5), 549–565.
- Truscott, J. (1996). The case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes. *Language Learning*, 46(2), 327-369.
- Truscott, J. (1999). The case for “the case against grammar correction in L2 writing classes”: a response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8(2), 111-122.
- Vengadasamy, R. (2002). Responding to student writing: motivate, not criticise. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 2(1), 1-9.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Walker, B. J. (2003). The cultivation of student self-efficacy in reading and writing. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19 (2), 173-187.
- Weaver, M. R. (2006). Do students value feedback? Students' perceptions of tutors' written responses. *Assessment and evaluation in higher education*, 31(3), 379-394.
- Young, P. (2000) 'I might as well give up': self-esteem and mature students' feelings about feedback on assignments, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 24(3), 409–418.
- Zacharias, N. T. (2007). Teacher and student attitudes toward teacher feedback. *RECL Journal*, 38(1), 38-52. Retrieved March 5, 2010, from <http://rel.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/38/1/38>
- Zamel, V. (1982). Writing: The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 195–209.
- Zamel, V. (1985). Responding to student writing. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 79–101.
- Zinsner, W. (1988). *Writing to learn*. New York: Harper & Row.

Zimmerman, B. J., Bonner, S. & Kovach, R. (1996). *Developing self-regulated learners: beyond achievement to self-efficacy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Survey of EFL Students' Preferences for Teacher Feedback

This survey is being conducted in an effort to find out what types of markings on written work are most useful to students in helping them improve the correctness of their written English. Do not answer according to what you think you *should* do but according to what you **actually** do. Please be as honest as possible. All responses will remain confidential. Please respond to all questions. Thank you for your willingness to participate.

STUDENT ID NUMBER										SECTION		FACULTY			DEPARTMENT									SEX	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<input type="radio"/> Faculty of Architecture	<input type="radio"/> ADM	<input type="radio"/> BIO	<input type="radio"/> CHE	<input type="radio"/> Male									
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	<input type="radio"/> Faculty of Arts and Sciences	<input type="radio"/> ECON	<input type="radio"/> HIST	<input type="radio"/> GEOE												
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	<input type="radio"/> Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences	<input type="radio"/> BA	<input type="radio"/> PHIL	<input type="radio"/> MINE	<input type="radio"/> Female											
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	<input type="radio"/> Faculty of Education	<input type="radio"/> IR	<input type="radio"/> STAT	<input type="radio"/> PETE												
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	<input type="radio"/> Faculty of Engineering	<input type="radio"/> ARCH	<input type="radio"/> ECE	<input type="radio"/> EE												
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		<input type="radio"/> CRP	<input type="radio"/> EME	<input type="radio"/> IE												
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6		<input type="radio"/> ID	<input type="radio"/> ESE	<input type="radio"/> ME												
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7		<input type="radio"/> PHYS	<input type="radio"/> PHED	<input type="radio"/> METE												
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8		<input type="radio"/> SOC	<input type="radio"/> CHED	<input type="radio"/> CENG												
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9		<input type="radio"/> PSY	<input type="radio"/> CEIT	<input type="radio"/> AEE												
											<input type="radio"/> CHEM	<input type="radio"/> ENVE	<input type="radio"/> FDE												
											<input type="radio"/> MATH	<input type="radio"/> CE	<input type="radio"/> SUNY												

Part I

Directions:

Respond to the questions below by marking the number that comes closest to representing your opinion.

If you feel the item is very important, mark #1, like this:

EXAMPLE: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If you feel the item is not important at all, mark #7, like this:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If the importance of the item is somewhere between, indicate that by marking the number between #1 and #7 which best represents your opinion.

1. How important is it to you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. How important is it to your English teacher for you to have as few errors in English as possible in your written work?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in **grammatical forms** (verbs, subject/verb agreement, article use, etc.) in your written work?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in **spelling** in your written work?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in **vocabulary choice** in your written work?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. How important is it to you for your English teacher to point out your errors in **punctuation** in your written work?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Part II

Directions:

Respond to the questions below by marking the number that comes closest to being accurate.

Mark #1 if you do something all the time.

Mark #2 if you do it most of the time.

Mark #3 if you do it some of the time.

Mark #4 if you do it not very often.

Mark #5 if you never do it.

7. When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in **grammar**?

1 2 3 4 5

8. When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in **spelling**?

1 2 3 4 5

9. When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in **vocabulary choice**?

1 2 3 4 5

10. When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the marks indicating errors in **punctuation**?

1 2 3 4 5

11. When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the **organization of your paper**?

1 2 3 4 5

12. When your teacher returns a marked paper to you, do you look carefully at the comments on the **ideas you expressed**?

1 2 3 4 5

Tel: 0.312. 425 66 20
www.saimer.com
Saimer
İstanbul

+

- 1 -

LÜTFEN 2. SAYFADAN DEVAM EDİNİZ.

Part III

Directions:

Answer the following questions by marking **the best** or **most accurate** for you. Please mark only **ONE** response.

13. If there are many errors in a composition, what do you want your English teacher to do?
- mark all errors, major and minor
 - mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones
 - mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them
 - mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are
 - mark all repeated errors whether major or minor
 - mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas
 - mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express
14. How do you want your teacher to indicate an error in your written work?
- The teacher crosses out what is incorrect and writes in the correct word or structure.
e.g. Since I arrived in Knoxville, I ~~am~~^{have been} very lonely.
 - The teacher shows where the error is and gives a clue about how to correct it.
e.g. Since I arrived in Knoxville, I ~~am~~^{was} very lonely.
 - The teacher only shows where the error is.
e.g. Since I arrived in Knoxville, I am very lonely.
 - The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the ideas expressed.
 - The teacher ignores the errors in English and only pays attention to the organization of the paper.
15. What does your English teacher **usually do now**?
- mark all errors, major and minor
 - mark all errors the teacher considers major, but not the minor ones
 - mark most but not necessarily all of the major errors if there are many of them
 - mark only a few of the major errors no matter how many there are
 - mark all repeated errors whether major or minor
 - mark only errors that might interfere with communicating your ideas
 - mark no errors and respond only to the ideas you express
16. When your English teacher marks errors, **how does he or she usually do it**?
- rewrites the sentence, phrase or word correctly
e.g. Since I arrived in Knoxville, I ~~am~~^{have been} very lonely.
 - shows where the error is and gives a hint about how to correct it
e.g. Since I arrived in Knoxville, I ~~am~~^{was} very lonely.
 - only shows where the error is
e.g. Since I arrived in Knoxville, I am very lonely.
 - only says there are errors and you must find them
 - ignores the errors in English
17. How carefully do you look at the marks your teacher makes on your written work?
- read every one carefully
 - look at some marks more carefully than at others
 - mainly pay attention to teacher's comments on the ideas you expressed
18. If you only look carefully at some of the marks your English teacher makes on your written work, which ones do you consider **most important** to look at carefully?
- marks indicating errors in grammar
 - marks indicating errors in vocabulary choice
 - marks indicating errors in punctuation
 - marks indicating errors in spelling
19. Of the marks that your English teacher makes on your compositions which ones do you **remember best**?
- comments on your ideas
 - comments on the organization of the paper
 - marks indicating errors in English
20. If you make an error in English, what helps you **the most** to understand what you did wrong?
- having another friend explain the problem
 - having your teacher explain the problem
 - looking in a grammar handbook
21. If you make an error in English, what helps you **the least** to understand what you did wrong?
- having another friend explain the problem
 - having your teacher explain the problem
 - looking in a grammar handbook
22. If you make an error you don't know how to correct, where do you usually go for help?
- to your teacher
 - to another friend
 - to a grammar handbook
23. If you turn to one of the sources in #22 for help in correcting your error, whose advice do you usually **remember best**?
- the teacher's advice
 - the friend's advice
 - the book's advice
24. What helps you **most** to learn from the errors marked on your paper and helps you avoid making that error again?
- rewriting the whole paper
 - rewriting on another piece of paper just the sentence in which an error appeared
 - rewriting near the error only the part of the sentence that was wrong
 - just reading through the paper carefully without rewriting anything
 - nothing because you know you'll probably just forget and make the same errors again no matter what you do

APPENDIX B

THE WRITING SELF EFFICACY SCALE

STUDENT ID NUMBER	SECTION	FACULTY	DEPARTMENT	Sex
<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/> Faculty of Architecture <input type="radio"/> Faculty of Arts and Sciences <input type="radio"/> Faculty of Economic and Administrative Sciences <input type="radio"/> Faculty of Education <input type="radio"/> Faculty of Engineering	<input type="radio"/> ADM <input type="radio"/> BIO <input type="radio"/> CHE <input type="radio"/> ECON <input type="radio"/> HIST <input type="radio"/> GEOE <input type="radio"/> BA <input type="radio"/> PHIL <input type="radio"/> MINE <input type="radio"/> IR <input type="radio"/> STAT <input type="radio"/> PETE <input type="radio"/> ARCH <input type="radio"/> ECE <input type="radio"/> EE <input type="radio"/> CRP <input type="radio"/> EME <input type="radio"/> IE <input type="radio"/> ID <input type="radio"/> ESE <input type="radio"/> ME <input type="radio"/> PHYS <input type="radio"/> PHED <input type="radio"/> METE <input type="radio"/> SOC <input type="radio"/> CHED <input type="radio"/> CENG <input type="radio"/> PSY <input type="radio"/> CEIT <input type="radio"/> AEE <input type="radio"/> CHEM <input type="radio"/> ENVE <input type="radio"/> FDE <input type="radio"/> MATH <input type="radio"/> CE <input type="radio"/> SUNY	<input type="radio"/> Male <input type="radio"/> Female

Direction:
On a scale from 0 (*no chance*) to 100 (*completely certain*), determine how sure you are that you can perform each of the *writing skills* below. Remember that you may use any number between 0 and 100. (e. g. 52)



<p>1. Correctly <i>spell</i> all words in a one-page story or composition.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>	<p>4. Write a <i>simple sentence</i> with good <i>grammar</i>.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>	<p>7. Write a paragraph with <i>details that support the topic sentence or main idea</i>.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>
<p>2. Correctly <i>punctuate</i> a one-page story or composition.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>	<p>5. Correctly use <i>singulars and plurals, verb tenses, prefixes and suffixes</i>.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>	<p>8. Organize sentences into a paragraph that <i>clearly expresses an idea</i>.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>
<p>3. Correctly use <i>parts of speech</i> such as <i>nouns, verbs, adjectives or adverbs</i>.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>	<p>6. Write a strong <i>paragraph</i> that has a good <i>topic sentence or main idea</i>.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>	<p>9. Write a <i>well-organized and well sequenced paper</i> that has a good <i>introduction, body and conclusion</i>.</p> <div style="text-align: right; border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> <input type="text"/> </div>

1905-56 www.setmar.com
 Tel: 0.312. 425 09 20

APPENDIX C

Interview Questions for the Students

1. What does *revision* mean to you?
2. What do you think about receiving a heavily marked paper?
3. What do you think about your teacher's use of marking symbols in your essays?
4. What is the role of the teacher in improving one's writing ability?
5. How do you think a teacher should correct the mistakes in your essays?

Öğrenci Mülakatları için Sorular

1. Size "revision" (revise etme) ne ifade ediyor?
2. Öğretmeninizden geri aldığınız kağıdınız çok işaretlenmiş olduğunda ne hissediyorsunuz?
3. Öğretmeninizin kompozisyonunuz üzerinde düzeltme amaçlı kullandığı işaretleme sembolleri hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?
4. Sizce bir öğrencinin yazma becerisini geliştirmede öğretmenin rolü nedir?
5. Sizce bir öğretmen kağıdınızdaki hataları nasıl düzeltmelidir?

Interview Questions for the Instructors

1. What does *revision* mean to you?
2. What is the role of the teacher in improving one's writing ability?
3. How do you think a teacher should approach the mistakes in student essays?
4. How do you correct the mistakes in your students' essays?

APPENDIX D

Informed Consent Form for the Questionnaire and the Writing Self-Efficacy Scale

Gönüllü Katılım Formu 1

Bu çalışma, ENG 102 dersi kapsamında öğrenci kompozisyonlarına öğretmenler tarafından verilen yazılı geri bildirim öğrencilerin yazma becerilerinin gelişimi üzerindeki etkilerini ve öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinin verdiği geri bildirim ile ilgili tercihlerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Gökçe Vanlı tarafından yürütülen çalışma kapsamında ENG 102 dersini almakta olan öğrencilere bir anket ve bir ölçek uygulanacaktır. Çalışmaya katılım tamamıyla gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler sadece bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Anket ve ölçek, genel olarak kişisel rahatsızlık verecek soruları içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz cevaplama işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda anket ve ölçeği uygulayan kişiye, anketi ve ölçeği tamamlamadığınızı söylemek yeterli olacaktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için ve değerli katkılarınızdan dolayı çok teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Modern Diller Bölümü okutmanlarından Gökçe Vanlı (Oda: S 137; Tel: 210 39 24; E-posta: vgokce@metu.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. (Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz.)

İsim Soyad

Tarih

İmza

----/----/---

APPENDIX E

Informed Consent Form for the Interview

Gönüllü Katılım Formu 2

Bu çalışma, ENG 102 dersi kapsamında öğrenci kompozisyonlarına öğretmenler tarafından verilen yazılı geri bildirimlerin öğrencilerin yazma becerilerinin gelişimi üzerindeki etkilerini ve öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinin verdiği geri bildirim ile ilgili tercihlerini ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlamaktadır. Gökçe Vanlı tarafından yürütülen çalışma kapsamında öğretmenlerin verdiği geri bildirimlerin öğrenciler tarafından nasıl değerlendirildiğini irdelemek için daha derin veri toplamaya yönelik olarak ENG 102 dersini almakta olan öğrencilerin bir kısmı mülakatlar yapılacak ve bu mülakatlar sesli kayıt altına alınacaktır. Kayıtlar tamamıyla gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırmacı tarafından değerlendirilecektir; elde edilecek bilgiler sadece bilimsel yayımlarda kullanılacaktır.

Bu mülakatlar kişisel rahatsızlık verecek soruları içermemektedir. Ancak, katılım sırasında sorulardan ya da herhangi başka bir nedenden ötürü kendinizi rahatsız hissederseniz kayıt işini yarıda bırakıp çıkmakta serbestsiniz. Böyle bir durumda öğretmenimize, kayıt işlemini istemediğinizi söylemek yeterli olacaktır. Bütün kayıtlar kullanımınıza açıktır. Bu çalışmaya katıldığınız için ve değerli katkılarınızdan dolayı çok teşekkür ederiz. Çalışma hakkında daha fazla bilgi almak için Modern Diller Bölümü okutmanlarından Gökçe Vanlı (Oda: S 137; Tel: 210 39 24; E-posta: vgokce@metu.edu.tr) ile iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu çalışmaya tamamen gönüllü olarak katılıyorum ve istediğim zaman yarıda kesip çıkabileceğimi biliyorum. Verdiğim bilgilerin bilimsel amaçlı yayımlarda kullanılmasını kabul ediyorum. (Formu doldurup imzaladıktan sonra uygulayıcıya geri veriniz.)

İsim Soyad

Tarih

İmza

----/----/----

APPENDIX F

Explanations to the Transcription Conventions Used in the Study

Symbol	Example	Explanation
(0.6)	that (0.5) is odd	Length of silence measured in tenths of a second.
(.)	right (.) okay	Micro-pause, less than two tenths of a second.
:::	I::: I don't know	Colons indicate sound-stretching of the immediately prior sound. The number of rows indicates the length of prolonged sound.
<u> </u>	I know that	Underlining indicates speaker's emphasis or stress.
=	you know=I fine	Equal sign indicates that there is no hearable gap between the words.
()	What a () thing	Empty parentheses indicate inability to hear what was said.
(word)	What are you (doing)	Word in parentheses indicates the best possible hearing.
(())	I don't know ((coughs))	Words in double parentheses contain author's descriptions.

Simplified Jeffersonian transcribing conventions

Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. London: Sage Publications (pp. 59-60).

Note:

(()) when translation of a part is not possible with false beginnings etc. the meaning is given.

APPENDIX G

Curriculum Vitae

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Surname, Name: Gökçe Vanlı
Nationality: Turkish
Date and Place of Birth: February 05, 1979, Bursa
Marital Status: Married
Phone: +90 312 210 39 04
e-mail: vgokce@metu.edu.tr

EDUCATION

Degree	Institution	Year of Graduation
PhD	METU, Ankara, Turkey English Language Teaching	2006-2013
MA	METU, Ankara, Turkey English Language Teaching Thesis: "Developing Reading Skills in English Through Strategy Training at Upper Intermediate Level in Bilkent School of English Language"	2002-2005
BA	METU, Ankara, Turkey English Language Teaching	1996-2001
High School	Bursa Anatolian Commercial High School	1992-1996

WORK EXPERIENCE

Year	Place	Position
2005-present	Department of Modern Languages, METU	English instructor Assistant Chairperson for 3 years and test writer for 2 years
2011-present	Department of Foreign Language Education, METU	Part-time teaching position:

2001-2005 Bilkent University English instructor
School of English Language

FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Advanced English, Beginner German

CERTIFICATES

September 2006 In-service Program Certificate
METU, Ankara, Turkey

May 2003 Post-COTE Course Certificate
Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

September 2002 Certificate of Overseas Teachers of English,
Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

ACADEMIC INTERESTS

Curriculum development, materials design and testing

INSTITUTIONAL ACADEMIC WORK

Evaluation of assessment practices in ENG 211	DML, METU	February, 2008
Needs analysis for a training program to be conducted at the DML	DML, METU	June, 2008

SELECTED CONFERENCE PAPERS AND WORKSHOPS

October 2009 *In-class assessment of speaking through debates,*
IATEFL Testing, Evaluation and Assessment SIG
Conference, Famagusta, Cyprus (together with Hale
Kızılcık)

September 2006 *The effect of strategy training on learners' reading*
performance, EUROSLA 2006, Antalya, Turkey
(together with Prof. Gölge Seferoğlu)

May 2006

Creating learner autonomy in the foreign language classroom, 9th METU International ELT Convention, Ankara, Turkey (together with Pinar Yurtseven)

PUBLICATIONS

Vanlı, G. & Kızılcık, H. In-class assessment of speaking through debates. IATEFL TEA SIG Conference Cyprus 23-24 October, 2009

REFERENCE:

	Institution	Department	Phone
Prof. Gölge Seferoğlu	METU	FLE	0312 210 40 74

APPENDIX H

Turkish Summary

İkinci dilde ya da yabancı dilde yazma becerisi yazma becerisinin kendi doğası sebebiyle bütün anadil konuşmacısı olmayanlar için büyük bir zorluk oluşturur. Öğrenciler sadece ikinci dilde yazma becerisinin kurallarını öğrenmeye çalışmamakta aynı zamanda dilbilgisi ve kelime gibi dil problemleri ile başa çıkmaya çalışmaktadırlar.

Geçen yıllar içerisinde, yazma becerisini öğretme konusunda bir değişiklik olmuştur. Geçmişte, yazma öğretimi yazma becerisini kontrollü mekanik bir aktivite olarak benimseyen sonuç temelli bir yaklaşım izlerdi. Fakat, geçen yıllarda, yazma becerisi hem öğrenci hem de öğretmen açısından çaba ve özen isteyen karmaşık ve yinelemeli bir aktivite olarak görülmeye başlanmıştır. Bu yüzden öğretmenler öğrencilerini daha iyi yazarlar haline getirmek için öğrencilerinin yazılarına müdahale etmelerini sağlayan ve onları geribildirimleri ile yönlendirebildikleri süreç temelli bir yaklaşım izlemeye başlamışlardır. Öğretmenler tarafından öğrencilerin yazılarına verilen geribildirim öğretimin ayrılmaz bir parçası olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Bu bağlamda, Gagné (1985) bir kişinin öğrenmesinde geribildirim önemini belirtmiş ve geribildirimi öğrenmenin etkinliğini artırmada dışsal bir öğrenme koşulu olarak tanımlamıştır.

Geribildirim öğrenciler için önemli olmasına rağmen, öğretmenler çoğu zaman geribildirim verirken rahat hissetmemektedirler. Goldstein (2004) yazma öğretmenlerinin endişelerini şöyle belirtmiştir: İkinci dilde yazmayı öğrenen öğrencilerin öğretmenleri genelde içerik ve etkili yazma konularında öğrencilere yazılarını gerek kısa gerekse uzun dönemde geliştirmelerini sağlayacak en etkili geribildirim tekniğini kullanma konusunda endişeler bildirmektedirler (p. 185). Öğretmenler öğrencilerine yardım edecek en iyi geribildirimi sağladıklarını düşündüklerinde bile bu geribildirim öğrenciler için çok şey ifade etmeyebilir.

Geribildirimden en iyi sonucu almak için hem öğretmenleri hem de öğrencileri göz önünde bulundurmak gerekir. Geribildirim öğrenciler için çok şey ifade etmektedir ancak öğrencilerin bu geribildirimini en iyi şekilde kullanabilmesi için geribildirim tam zamanında verilmesi ve öğrencilerin yazılarına verilen öneriler ve belirli tanımlarla örtüşmesi gerekir (Brookhart, 2008). Yine Brookhart'ın (2008) dediği gibi iyi geribildirim öğrenciyi öğrenmenin hangi aşamasında olduğu konusunda bilgilendirmeli ve bundan sonra ne yapması gerektiğini söylemelidir. Öğrenciler neyi neden yapmaları gerektiğini bildiklerinde kendi öğrenmelerini kontrol edebildiklerini düşünürler ki bu da onların motivasyonunu artırır. Fakat, öğretmenlerin bütün iyi niyetlerine rağmen, bazı geribildirimlerin öğrenciler üzerinde negatif etkisi olmaktadır ve bu öğrencilerin kendileri ve başarıları hakkındaki inançlarına zarar verici olabilmektedir.

Bu nedenle, geribildirim bir öğrencinin öz yeterliliği ile ilgilidir. Schunk (1991) öz yeterliliği bir bireyin kendisine verilen görevleri yerine getirmedeki yetkinliği hakkındaki değerlendirmeleri olarak tanımlamaktadır. Ormrod (2003) öz yeterliğin amaca yönelik doğasını vurgulayarak kavramın bireyin bazı temel davranışları göstermesi ve amaçlarına ulaşması olduğunu söylemiştir.

Öğrencilerin akademik hayatında öz yeterlik değerlendirmeleri önemli bir rol oynar. Zimmerman, Bonner ve Kovach (1996) öğretmenlere öğrencilerinin öz yeterlik değerlendirmeleri hakkında bilgi sahibi olmalarını vurgulamakta ve bu farkındalığın öğretim tekniklerini ve danışmanlık uygulamalarını yönlendirmesi gerektiğini belirtmektedir. Öğrencilerin öz yeterlik değerlendirmelerini bilmek onların akademik başarı ve motivasyonu hakkında bilgi sahibi olunmasını sağlar. Pajares (2007) öğrencilerin özgüvenini ve yeterliliklerini artırmada okullara düşen görevi şu şekilde açıklamıştır: Akademik zorluklar öğrencilerin yazma becerileri hakkındaki öz yeterliklerini sarstığında, onların öz yeterlik düşüncelerini değiştirmeden bu beceriyi geliştirmek çok zor olacaktır. Bandura (Pajares'te de yazıldığı gibi, 2007) inanç ve davranışın karşılıklı olarak birbirini etkilediğini iddia etmektedir. Öz yeterlik inançları ve yazma yeterliliği birbirine bağlı olarak çalışır. Birinin geliştirilmesi diğerinin de geliştirilmesini gerektirir. Öğrenciler güçlü bir öz yeterlik duygusuna sahip olduklarında kendilerini eğitmek için inisiyatiflerini kullanmaları gerektiğinde daha iyi donanımlı olacaklardır.

Bu sonuç öğretmenlerin öğrencilerin yazma becerisini geliştirmede çok önemli bir rol oynadığı fikrini doğrulamaktadır. Öğretmenler bu süreçte rehber rolünü oynarken aynı zamanda öğrencilerin yazmadan nefret etmesine de neden olabilirler. Bunun olmaması için, öğretmenler öğrencilerinin daha çok kendilerine güvenmelerini sağlamalı ve bunu da öğrencilerin öz yeterlik düşüncelerini geliştirerek yapmalıdırlar. Başka bir deyişle, yazma becerisini öğreten her öğretmenin amacı kendi öğrenmelerinin sorumluluğunu alabilecek, kendi kendini idare edebilecek öğrenciler yetiştirmektir. Bu yazma konusunda ancak zamanında verilmiş yapıcı geribildirimle sağlanır.

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi'nin (ODTÜ) eğitim dili İngilizce'dir ve Yabancı Diller Yüksek Okulu (YDYO) üniversite çapında İngilizce öğretimi yapmakla görevlidir. YDYO iki temel bölümden oluşmaktadır: Temel İngilizce Bölümü (TİB) ve Modern Diller Bölümü (MLD). TİB hazırlık bölümü öğrencilerine genel İngilizce öğretmekle yükümlü iken, MLD akademik İngilizce kullanımını öğretmektedir.

Öğrenciler ODTÜ'ye kayıt yaptırdıktan sonra dil seviyelerinin bölümlerindeki derslerle başa çıkabilecek kadar yeterli olup olmadığının belirlenmesi için ODTÜ İngilizce yeterlik sınavına girerler. Bu sınavda başarısız olan öğrenciler bir sene boyunca TİB'de eğitim görürler. Başarılı olanlar ise, bölümlerine gider ve MLD'den zorunlu İngilizce dersleri almaya başlarlar. MLD öğrencilerin akademik yaşamlarını en iyi şekilde devam ettirmelerini sağlayacak akademik İngilizce öğretimini planlamak ve uygulamakla görevlidir. Bölümlerindeki ilk yıllarında öğrenciler sırası ile İngilizce 101 ve İngilizce 102 derslerini almaktadırlar. Her iki ders de tematik olarak planlanmıştır ve derslerde dil becerilerinin bütünleştirildiği bir yaklaşım izlenmektedir. İngilizce 101 dersi TİB'de edinilen dil becerileri üzerine öğrencilerin akademik yaşamda ihtiyaç duyacakları okuma, yazma, dinleme ve konuşma becerilerinin geliştirilmesini amaçlamaktadır. İngilizce 102 dersi kapsamında ise aynı beceriler üzerine öğrencilerin araştırma ve edindikleri bilgileri sentezleme becerileri geliştirilmektedir. Akademik yazı tekniklerinin öğretildiği bu derste öğrenciler ayrıca yaptıkları alıntılar için doğru bir şekilde atıfta bulunmayı öğrenip bu becerilerini ders içerisinde yazılan birkaç kompozisyon içerisinde uygulamaktadırlar.

Bu çalışma öğrencilerin İngilizce 102 dersini aldıkları akademik yılın ikinci döneminde yapılmıştır. Bunun nedeni dönem sonu itibari ile öğrenciler sadece paragraf bazında yazılar üretmekle kalmayıp kompozisyon tarzında yazılar da yazmışlar ve bu yazıları için öğretmenlerinden yeteri miktarda geribildirim almışlardır. Bu bağlamda, öğrencilerin geribildirim hakkında yeterli tecrübe edindikten sonra kendileri ile yapılan mülakatlardan edinilen verilerden daha güvenilir sonuçlar elde edileceği düşünülmüştür.

Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinden aldıkları yazılı geri bildirim hakkındaki beklentilerini, tercihlerini ve bu geri bildirimleri kullanmalarını ve öğretmenlerin verdikleri yazılı geri bildirim hakkındaki tutumlarını ve öğrencilerden beklentilerini araştırmaktır. Bu amaçla araştırma soruları aşağıda yazıldığı gibi belirlenmiştir:

1. Modern Diller Bölümü'nde İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenen öğrenciler öğretmenlerinden ne çeşit geri bildirim (direk-indirek, içeriksel-yapısal) beklemek ve istemektedirler ve bu beklenti ve tercihleri öğretmenleri tarafından ne oranda karşılanmaktadır?
 - a. Modern Diller Bölümü'ndeki öğrenciler öğretmenlerin çeşitli alanlarda verdikleri geri bildirimleri ne kadar önemli görmektedirler?
 - b. Öğretmenler tarafından ne çeşit geri bildirim verilmektedir?
 - Modern Diller Bölümü'ndeki öğrenciler gözüyle
 - Modern Diller Bölümü'ndeki öğretmenler gözüyle
 - c. Modern Diller Bölümü'ndeki öğrenciler öğretmenlerinin verdiği geri bildirimlerin hangi kısımlarına/çeşitlerine daha çok önem vermektedirler?
 - d. Öğrenciler ve öğretmenlerin verilen geri bildirimler hakkındaki beklentileri, tercihleri ve bunlara yaklaşımları arasında, eğer varsa, ne çeşit farklılıklar vardır?
2. Modern Diller Bölümü'ndeki öğrenciler İngilizce'de yaptıkları hataları düzeltirken yardım almak için hangi kaynaklara başvuruyorlar?
3. Öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinden aldıkları geri bildirimler hakkındaki beklentilerini, tercihlerini ve bu geri bildirimleri kullanma şekillerini etkileyen faktörler nelerdir?

4. Öğrencilerin yazma becerileri bağlamındaki özyeterlilikleri hakkındaki görüşleri ve öğretmenlerinden aldıkları geri bildirimler hakkındaki beklentileri, tercihleri ve bu geri bildirimleri kullanma şekilleri arasında nasıl bir ilişki vardır?

Modern Diller Bölümü'nde (MLD) geribildirim rolünün araştırılmasının birçok nedeni vardır. Öncelikle, bölümün müfredat programında kesin olarak belirtilmiştir ki verilen derslerde yazma konusuna süreç temelli bir yaklaşım izlenmektedir. Fakat, program çok yüküldür ve öğretmenler müfredattaki aktiviteleri ve materyalleri bitirebilmek için zamana karşı yarışmak zorunda kalmaktadırlar. Buna ek olarak, sınıflardaki yüksek öğrenci sayıları gözönünde bulundurulduğunda, bütün öğrencilere etkili geribildirim vermek öğretmenler için çok bunaltıcı olmaktadır çünkü öğretmenlerin görevleri arasında geri bildirim vermek en zaman alıcı ve bilişsel olarak en zorlayıcıdır. Bu yüzden, her öğretmen değişik geribildirim verme teknikleri kullanmakta ve bu da öğrenciler için bazı yanlış anlama ve problemlere yol açmaktadır.

Bir diğer neden ise bölüm toplantılarında öğrencilere nasıl ve ne zaman geribildirim verilmeli konusunun en çok tartışılan konular arasında olmasıdır. MLD'de ders veren öğretmenler değişik eğitim öz geçmişlerine sahip olduklarından hepsinin "iyi geribildirim" konusunda değişik tutum ve anlayışları vardır. Bu nedenle geribildirim verme konusunda öğretmenler arasında bir standart olmadığı söylenebilir. Benzer bir şekilde, verilen derslerin yazma kısımları ile ilgili yapılan standardizasyon toplantılarında, öğretmenlerin verdikleri notlar da çok değişiklik göstermektedir ki bu da öğretmenlerin "iyi" yazı nedir konusundaki değişik algı ve beklentilerini göstermektedir. Bazı zamanlar öğretmenler bir standarda ulaşana kadar uzun ve hararetleli tartışmalar yaşanmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, MLD öğrencileri derslerini her dönem başka öğretmenlerden almaktadırlar. Bu yüzden çok çeşitli geribildirim şekilleri görmektedirler. Böyle bir durumda, kağıtları üzerinde yazılan geribildirimi ne kadar iyi anlayıp yorumladıkları tartışılabilir.

Ayrıca öğretmenlerin öğrencilerine verdiği geribildirim konusunda bazı endişeleri bulunmaktadır. Verdikleri geribildirim ile öğretmenler öğrencilerine çok fazla destek sağladıklarını düşünmektedirler. Bu da bölümün bir diğer amacı olan kendi kendine yetebilen öğrenciler yetiştirme fikri ile zıtlık içermektedir. Bir başka

deyişle, öğretmenler akademik İngilizce öğretilen derslerde öğrencileri ne derece bağımsız öğrenen bireyler olarak yetiştirdikleri konusunda endişelidirler. Fakat, öğretmenler sundukları geribildirim konusundaki endişelerinde yalnız değildirler. Öğrenciler de kağıtlarını geri aldıklarında üzerlerinde gördükleri geribildirimden şikayetçi olmaktadır. Öğrenciler öğretmenlerinin ofislerine gittiklerinde ya da kendi aralarında konuşurlarken “Öğretmenimin ne dediğini anlamadım” ya da “Hocam, siz benden daha çok yazmışsınız” gibi cümleler sıkça duyulmaktadır. Buradan öğrenmede geribildirim amacını açıklamak gerektiği çıkarımı yapılabilir.

MLD’de çalışan öğretmenler öğrencilerin yazma becerisi gelişiminde istenilen düzeyde olmadıklarını düşünürlerken öğrenciler de geribildirim alma konusunda bazı kavram yanılgısı içindedirler. Bu yüzden, öğrencilere en iyi geribildirimi sağlamak için, geribildirim konusunda öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin algılarının ne kadar benzediği ya da farklılaştığının araştırılması öğrenci ve öğretmenlerin birbirini daha iyi anlaması için gerekli görülmüştür. Böyle bir çalışmanın sonuçları her iki grup için de daha verimli yazma derslerine imkan sağlayacaktır.

Çalışmanın geçerliğini ve güvenilirliğini sağlamak için bir dizi farklı strateji kullanılmıştır. Bu çalışma için hem nicel hem de nitel veri toplama araçları kullanılmıştır. Nicel veri öğrencilere uygulanan bir anket ve Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği aracılığıyla, nitel veri ise bir kısım öğrenci ve öğretmen ile yapılan mülakatlar aracılığıyla toplanmıştır.

Bu çalışmada kullanılan anket Leki’den (1991) adapte edilmiştir. Leki’nin orijinal kopyası 4 kısım ve 27 soru içermektedir. Anketin bu orijinal kopyası 2009-2010 akademik yılı bahar döneminde İngilizce 102 dersini bir dönem önce alan öğrenciler üzerinde pilot bir çalışma yapılarak denenmiştir. Anket toplamda 61 öğrenci üzerinde denenmiştir. Sonuçlara göre güvenilir sonuçlar vermeyen bazı sorular anketten çıkarılmış ya da üzerlerinde değişiklik yapılmıştır.

Anketin oluşturulan son hali 3 kısımdan oluşmaktadır. Birinci kısım öğrencilerin doğruluk hakkındaki algılarını araştıran 6 sorudan oluşmaktadır. İkinci kısımda öğrencilerin kendilerine üzerinde düzeltme ve işaretlemeler olan bir kağıt verildiğinde ne yaptıklarını araştıran 6 soru bulunmaktadır. Anketin üçüncü kısmında ise öğrencilerin birçok alternatif arasından en iyi olanı seçmesini isteyen 12 soru

bulunmaktadır. Bu kısım öğretmenlerin uyguladıkları geribildirim yöntemlerini ve öğrencilerin bu geribildirim hakkındaki beklenti ve algılarını araştırmaktadır. Anket 2009-2010 bahar döneminin son iki haftasında uygulanmıştır. Bu zamana kadar öğrenciler geribildirim alma ve kağıtları üzerinde gerekli düzeltmeleri yapma konusunda yeteri kadar tecrübe edinmişlerdir. Uygulama başında İngilizce 102 dersini alan yaklaşık 2100 civarındaki öğrencilere ulaşmak hedeflenmişse de bu çeşitli nedenlerden dolayı gerçekleştirilememiştir. Öncelikle veri toplama dönemin en yoğun son iki haftasında yapıldığından bazı öğretmenler anket ve Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği'ni sınıflarında uygulamamayı tercih etmişlerdir. Bir ikinci neden ise bazı öğrencilerin uygulama esnasında sınıfta bulunmamalarıdır. Son olarak, anket ve Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği sonuçları arasında karşılaştırmalı bir çalışma yapılacağından her iki form üzerinde de öğrencilerin kimliklerini belirleyici bir faktör olması gerekli idi. Öğrencilerin isimleri çok daha belirleyici olacağından, öğrencilerden her iki anket üzerine de öğrenci kimlik numaralarını kodlamaları istendi. Bir kısım öğrenci bu nedenle kimlik numaralarını formlar üzerine kodlamamış olduklarından çalışmanın doğası gereği maalesef bu öğrencilerin formları analiz dışında tutulmuştur. Sonuç olarak net ulaşılan öğrenci sayısı 1491 olmuştur.

Çalışmada kullanılan bir diğer nicel veri toplama aracı yine aynı öğrencilere anket ile eş zamanlı olarak uygulanan Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği'dir. Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği (Pajares, Miller ve Johnson, 1999) öğrencilerin akademik seviyelerine uygun etkili kompozisyonlar yazabilmeleri için gerekli olan kompozisyon, dilbilgisi, kullanım ve mekanik becerilerini değerlendirdikleri 9 sorudan oluşan bir ölçektir. Ölçekte kullanılan sorular öğrencilerden yazma becerisi ile ilgili bazı temel becerilerini kullanma konusunda kendilerine ne kadar güvendiklerini belirtmelerini istemektedir. Bu becerilerden bazıları bir sayfalık bir metin üzerinde doğru noktalama işaretlerini kullanmak ya da bir konuyu düzgün ve net bir şekilde ifade edebilecek cümleleri bir paragraf haline getirmek gibi ifadeler içermektedir. Ölçekte öğrenciler bu ifadeler için kendilerine 0 ve 100 arasında bir not vererek değerlendirmektedirler. 0 kendilerine en az güvendikleri ve 100 en emin oldukları ifadeler için kullanılmalıdır.

Pilot çalışma için Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği de anketin yapıldığı aynı grup üzerinde uygulanmıştır. Fakat anketten farklı olarak Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği güvenilir sonuçlar verdiği için ölçek üzerinde herhangi bir değişiklik yapılmamıştır. Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği anket ile eş zamanlı olarak aynı öğrenciler üzerinde 2009-2010 akademik yılı bahar döneminin son iki haftasında uygulanmıştır. Ankette olduğu gibi uygulanan Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği'nden sadece 1491 tanesi çalışma için kullanılabilmiştir.

Anket ve Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği'nin uygulanmasından önce öğrencilere çalışmanın içeriğini açıklayan ve sonuçların nasıl ve nerede kullanılacağını bildiren gönüllü katılım formu verilmiş ve sonuçların yapılan çalışma kapsamında araştırmacı tarafından kullanılmasına izin veren bu formu imzalamaları istenmiştir.

Araştırma kapsamında nitel veri toplamak için anket ve Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği uygulanan öğrencilerden 10 tanesi ile ve de MLD'de görev yapan öğretmenlerden 7 tanesi ile mülakatlar yapılmıştır. Mülakatlar için kullanılan sorular araştırmacı tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Bu soruların bazıları Leki'nin (1991) hazırladığı anketin açık uçlu sorular kısmından adapte edilmiştir. Bu sorular araştırmacının uyguladığı anketten çıkarılmıştır. Bunun iki nedeni vardı. İlk neden anketin uzunluğu idi. Genellikle kabul edilir ki katılımcılar açık uçlu soruları sevmeyenler ve 24 soru içeren bir ankette bu kısmı tamamlamak çok zaman alacaktı. Bu nedenle de sorulara samimi cevaplar alabilmek zor olacaktı. Buna ek olarak, Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği'nin anket ile aynı zamanda uygulandığı dikkate alınırsa bütün süreç çok uzun olacak ve bu da daha çok öğretmenin veri toplama araçlarını uygulamamayı tercih etmesine neden olacaktı. Bir diğer neden ise katılımcıların genelde anketlerde çoktan seçmeli soruları cevaplaması fakat açık uçlu soruları boş bırakmasıdır. Bu soruları mülakatlar esnasında kullanarak araştırmacı tüm bu sorulara cevap almakla kalmamış aynı zamanda öğrencilerin görüşme esnasında sorulara daha açık cevaplar vermesini sağlayarak analiz için daha çok veri elde etmiştir. Çalışmaya katılan öğretmenler için de benzer bir nedenle mülakat yapılması tercih edilmiştir. MLD'de çalışan öğretmenler bu tür çalışmalara aşinadılar. Fakat öğretmenler genelde anket doldurmayı sevmemekte ya da bunu yapmak zorunda kalsalar bile formun çeşitli yerlerine kendilerini daha iyi ifade edebilmek için yorumlar yazmayı sevmektedirler. Bu çalışmayı yürüten araştırmacı da MLD'de

görev yaptığından öğretmen profilini çok iyi bilmektedir ve bu nedenle de öğretmenlere anket uygulamaktansa onlarla mülakat uygulamayı tercih etmiştir.

Bu amaçlarla, araştırmacı öğrencilere sormak için 4 ve de öğretmen mülakatlarında kullanmak için 5 soru oluşturmuştur. Her iki mülakatta da ortak olan bazı sorular bulunmaktadır. Bunun bir nedeni aynı konular hakkında hem öğrencilerin hem de öğretmenlerin görüşlerinin alınmak istenmesidir. Bir diğeri ise araştırma sorularının cevaplanabilmesi için bu sorular sayesinde öğrencilerin öğretmen geribildiriminden beklentileri ve öğretmenlerin yazılı geribildirim verme yöntemleri hakkında daha detaylı bilgi edinebilmektir. Bu nedenle mülakatlarda kullanılacak olan sorular katılımcıların yazılı geribildirim hakkındaki algı ve düşüncelerini daha iyi ifade edebilmelerine olanak sağlayacak şekilde açık uçlu olarak hazırlanmıştır.

10 öğrenci ve 7 öğretmen ile yapılan mülakatlarda öğrenciler için mülakat dili Türkçe, öğretmenler için ise İngilizce kullanılmıştır. Öğrencilerle yapılan mülakatlarda Türkçe tercih edilmesinin nedeni öğrencilerden daha net cevaplar alınmak istenmesidir. Öğrencilerin genelde diğer becerilerle kıyaslandığında konuşma konusunda çok başarılı olmadıkları bilinmektedir. Bu yüzden, İngilizce konuşmak dendiğinde öğrenciler genelde çekimser davranmaktadırlar. Hatta bu dilde kendilerini çok iyi ifade edemedikleri için konuşmaktan kaçınmaktadırlar. Mülakat dilinin bir engel teşkil etmemesi için öğrencilerle yapılan görüşmelerde Türkçe kullanılmıştır. Sadece 10 öğrenciden biri yabancı uyruklu olduğundan bu öğrenci ile yapılan mülakatta İngilizce kullanılmıştır. Mülakat öncesinde öğrenciye İngilizce kullanırken rahat olup olmayacağı sorulmuş ve öğrenci kendisi mülakatın İngilizce olarak yapılmasını istemiştir. Öğrenci mülakatlarında Türkçe kullanılmasına rağmen tez içersinde kullanılacak olan alıntılar araştırmacı tarafından İngilizce'ye çevrilmiştir. Yapılan çeviriler İngilizceyi ana dili olarak kullanan ve Türkçe de bilen bir kişi tarafından kontrol edilmiştir.

Mülakatlarda kullanılacak olan sorular için biri İngilizce'yi ana dili olarak kullanan ve biri de İngilizce'yi yabancı dil olarak öğrenmiş iki İngilizce öğretmeninden geribildirim alınmıştır. Alınan geribildirimler üzerine sorular yeniden gözden geçirilmiş ve bazıları üzerinde yanlış anlamaya ya da anlam karmaşasına neden olunmaması için düzeltmeler yapılmıştır. Buna ek olarak, öğrenci

mülakatlarında kullanılacak sorular da hazırlandıktan sonra Türkçe'ye çevrilmiş ve yine aynı iki öğretmen tarafından değerlendirilmiştir. Ayrıca araştırmacının mülakat becerilerini geliştirebilmesi için mülakat süreci de pilot bir çalışma yapılarak denenmiştir. Bu yüzden, pilot çalışma çerçevesinde yapılan mülakatlar için ses kaydı yapılmıştır ve zayıf olduğu noktaları belirleyip geliştirmek için araştırmacı tarafından birkaç kez dinlenmiştir.

Mülakatlar da aynı anket ve Yazma Öz-Yeterlik Ölçeği gibi 2009-2010 akademik yılı bahar döneminin son iki haftasında farklı günlerde yapılmıştır. Mülakatların başında araştırmacı katılımcılara mülakatın amacını açıklamış ve sonuçların açıklanması esnasında kimliklerinin gizli tutulacağını söylemiştir. Bu nedenle, çalışma içerisinde mülakatlardan alıntılar yapılırken katılımcıların kimliği gizli tutulmuş bunun yerine her katılımcıyı belirleyen numaralar kullanılmıştır. Mülakatlar kayıt altına alınacağından, görüşme başlamadan önce hem öğretmenlere hem de öğrencilere gönüllü katılım formları verilmiş ve imzalamaları istenmiştir. Bunu yaparak katılımcılar görüşmeler için ses kaydı yapılmasına izin vermişlerdir.

Çalışma süresince toplanan nicel verilerin istatistiki analizi yapılmış ve çalışmada sunulmuştur. Ses kaydı yapılan mülakatlar ise öncelikle yazılı metne çevrilmiş ve daha sonra bu metinlerin içerik analizi yapılmıştır. Yazılı metinler birçok kere okunduktan sonra araştırma soruları göz önünde bulundurularak ortaya çıkan temalar belirlenip kodlanmıştır ve kodların verilerde ne sıklıkta görüldüğü hesaplanmıştır. Daha sonra bulguların yorumu yapılmıştır (Miles ve Huberman, 1994). Yapılan yorumların güvenilirliğini sağlamak amacıyla mülakatlardan yorumlanan parçalar hem Türkçe hem de İngilizce çevirileri ile birlikte tez metni içerisinde verilmiştir.

Yapılan çalışmanın sonuçlarına göre yazma becerisinin geliştirilmesinde öğretme ve öğrenme süreçlerini ilgilendiren bazı çıkarımlar yapılmıştır. Çalışmanın en ilginç sonucu öğrencilerin öğretmenleri tarafından verilen yazılı geribildirimleri önemsedikleridir. Öğrencilerle yapılan günlük konuşmalar esnasında genelde öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinden gelen geribildirimlerden şikayetçi oldukları ve hatta bazı geribildirimleri sorguladıkları gözlenmiştir. Fakat, yapılan çalışmanın sonuçları hem öğretmenlerin hem de öğrencilerin bir öğrencinin yazma becerisini geliştirmede öğretmenlerin büyük bir rol oynadığını kabul ettikleri göstermektedir. Öğrenciler

öğretmenlerine bu derece büyük bir rol yükledikleri için onlardan gelen geribildirim ciddiye almaktadırlar. Hatta bir öğretmenin yardımı olmadan bütünlük içeren organize bir kompozisyon yazamayacaklarını belirten öğrenciler de bulunmaktadır. Fakat çalışma kapsamında yapılan mülakatlar sırasında bazı öğrencilerin yaptığı yorumlar öğretmenlerin öğrenci yazılarına geribildirim verirken dikkatli olmaları gereken bazı noktalar olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Öncelikle anket sonuçları öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinden önemli ya da önemsiz bütün hatalarını belirtmelerini istediklerini göstermektedir. Bu sonuç alanyazında yapılan bazı çalışma sonuçları ile de tutarlılık içerisindedir (Cohen, 1987; Radecki ve Swales, 1988; Leki, 1991; Lee, 2008). Bir diğer taraftan öğretmenler ile yapılan mülakatlarda öğretmenlerin bu uygulamadan kaçındıkları ortaya çıkmıştır. MLD'de ders veren öğretmenler bazı nedenler belirterek geribildirim verirken özellikle seçmeci davrandıklarını söylemektedirler. Bu nedenlerden bazıları öğrenci yazılarında bulunan hataların çokluğu, ve bu hataların hepsinin düzeltilmesinin imkansız olduğudur. Buna ek olarak, öğretmenler ayrıca öğrencilerinin ihtiyaçlarına göre geribildirim verdiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bu bağlamda, öğretmenler öğrencilerinin zayıf oldukları noktalara, öğretmen olarak öğrencilerden beklentilerine ve öğrencilerin buldukları fakülte ya da alanlarının gerekliliklerine önem verdiklerini söylemişlerdir. Dolayısıyla, öğrencilerin beklentileri ve öğretmenlerin sundukları geribildirim arasında bir uyumsuzluk olduğu sonucu çıkarılmıştır. Böyle bir durumda yapılması gereken öğretmenlerin öğrencilerini beklentileri hakkında bilgilendirmeleri gerektiğidir. Bu, öğrenciler ile yapılan ilk derste açıklanmalıdır ki öğrenciler yazılarında düzeltme yaparken nelere dikkat etmeleri gerektiğini bilmelidirler.

Çalışmanın sonuçları önemli bir gerçeği daha ortaya çıkarmıştır. Öğrenciler bütün hatalarının gösterilmesini istemelerine rağmen, aynı zamanda kağıtları üzerinde hem negatif hem de pozitif yorumlar görmek istediklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bazı öğrenciler öğretmenlerinden geri aldıkları kağıtlarının çok işaretlenmiş olduğunu gördüklerinde motivasyonlarını yitirdiklerini söylemişlerdir. Aslında öğrencilerin esas karşı oldukları nokta hiçbir iyi yorum bulunmadan sadece hatalarının işaretlenmiş olmasıdır. Böyle bir durumda öğrencilerin yazmaya karşı olan tutumları zarar görmektedir ve tekrar hata yapacaklarını düşünerek kağıtlarını

yeniden gözden geçirmeyi reddetmektedirler. Ferris ve Hedgecock (1998), Dessner (1991) and Lip'in (1995) çalışmaları sonucunda da pozitif yorumların önemli olduğu çıkarımı yapılmıştır. Bu yüzden, öğretmenler öğrenci kağıtları üzerine dikkat edilmesi gereken konular ve hatalar ile birlikte öğrencileri motive edecek pozitif yorumlar da yazmalıdırlar.

Öğrenciler bazen öğretmenlerinin verdiği geribildirim ya da yazdığı yorumu anlayamadıklarından ve de gerek içerik gerekse de organizasyon konusundaki hatalarını nasıl düzeltmeleri gerektiğini bilmediklerinden dolayı kendilerini çaresiz hissettiklerini vurgulamışlardır. Bu gibi durumlarda öğrenciler öğretmenlerinden sözlü yardım alabilmeyi istemektedirler. Bu durumda, öğretmenlerin iyimser ve yardımsever bir yaklaşım içinde olması gerekmektedir.

Yapılan öğrenci yorumları arasında en dikkat çekici olanlardan biri ise öğrencilerin öğretmenlerinin geribildirim konusunda standart olmalarını talep etmeleridir. Öğrenciler her öğretmenin değişik bir geribildirim verme tarzının olabileceğini kabul etmelerine rağmen, öğretmenlerinden aldıkları geribildirim iyi bir kompozisyon yazmalarında ve bu kompozisyondan alacakları notun belirlenmesinde önemli olduğunu belirtmektedirler. Bu yüzden öğretmenler arasında geribildirim verilmesi konusunda bazı temel standartların belirlenmesi öğrenciler için iyi sonuçlar doğuracaktır.

Çalışmanın sonucu ayrıca öğrencilerin yazılı geribildirim hakkındaki beklentileri, tercihleri ve bu geribildirimleri nasıl kullandıklarını belirleyen cinsiyet ve fakülte farklılığı gibi bazı faktörlerin olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır.

Yapılan çalışmanın sonuçları gerek MLD gerekse diğer kurumlarda yazma becerisinin geliştirilmesi için çalışan öğretmenler için bazı şeyler ifade etmektedir. Ayrıca çıkarılan sonuçlar birçok eğitim fakültesinde geleceğin öğretmenlerini geribildirim verme konusunda eğiten öğretmen eğitimcileri için de yararlı olacaktır.

İlk olarak, yazma becerisinin geliştirilmesinde uygulanan süreç temelli yaklaşım iyi bir şekilde işlemektedir. Özellikle de öğretmenlerin bu süreçte büyük bir rol oynadığı kabul edilmektedir. Bu nedenle süreç temelli yaklaşımdan vazgeçilmesi ve yine sonuç odaklı yaklaşımın izlenmesi fikri ortadan kaldırılmalıdır.

İkinci olarak, süreç temelli yaklaşımın izlenmesi esnasında geribildirimden en iyi sonucu alabilmek için bazı konulara dikkat edilmelidir. Öğrencilerin de belirttiği

gibi öğretmenlerin geribildirim verme teknikleri arasında bazı uyumsuzluklar vardır. Bu yüzden ortak bir yol bulmak adına öğretmenlerin bilgilendirileceği bazı standart olma toplantıları yapılmalıdır. Özellikle yazma derslerini öğreten birden fazla öğretmenin olduğu kurumlarda öğretmenler arasında geribildirim verme teknikleri ve notlandırma konularında bir standart oluşturulmalıdır. Böyle bir toplantı öncesinde, öğretmenler iyi geribildirim nedir ya da pozitif ve negatif geribildirim nasıl kullanılmalı konusunda fikir edinecekleri bir eğitim programına tabi tutulmalıdırlar.

Yapılan çalışmanın sonuçlarına bakılarak öğretmenlerin öğrencilere daha iyi yardım edebilmeleri için öğrenci beklentilerini daha iyi anlayabilmelerini ve kendi geribildirim verme yöntemlerini bu beklentileri karşılayacak hale getirmelerini sağlayacak bir eğitim modeli geliştirilmiştir.

İlk olarak, yazma becerisinin geliştirilmesinde süreç temelli yaklaşımın uygulandığı her kurumda, öğretmenler geribildirim konusunda net olmalıdırlar. Bu çalışmanın sonuçlarının da gösterdiği gibi öğretmenler arasında gerek değişik eğitim geçmişlerine sahip olmaları gerekse de eğitim ve öğretim hakkında değişik felsefeleri benimsemeleri nedeniyle görüş ayrılıkları bulunmaktadır. Fakat, amaç öğrencilere adil davranmak olduğundan bu hem öğretimde hem de notlandırmada ortak bir standart belirlemeyi gerektirmektedir. Bu konuda her kurum kendi standardını da belirleyebilir. Bu iki şekilde yapılabilir: 1) Değişik alan ve çevrelerde bu tür konuların nasıl ele alındığının belirlenmesi için bir alanyazın taraması yapıp çeşitli çalışma sonuçlarına bakılabilir. 2) Kurumda eğitim gören öğrenciler arasında öğretmenlerinden ve onların geribildirimlerinden neler beklediklerini öğrenmek amacı ile bir ihtiyaç analizi yapılabilir. Bu her ikisinin beraber yapılması daha da etkili olacaktır. Elde edilen sonuçlar öğretmenler için hazırlanacak olan eğitim programının içeriğini belirleyecektir. Eğitimin ilk aşamasında öğretmenler yapılan çalışma sonuçları hakkında bilgilendirilmelidirler. Daha sonra da uygulanabilecek farklı geribildirim yöntemleri ve dikkat edilmesi gereken konular hakkında eğitilmelidirler. Bu kurum içinde bir standart oluşturulmasını sağlayacaktır. Fakat şu da unutulmamalıdır ki standart olunması ne kadar gerekli ise de kişilerin farklı değerlere sahip olduğu düşünüldüğünde bu ulaşılması zor bir hedeftir. Bu yüzden, eğitim seansları bazı noktalar dikkate alınarak düzenlenmelidir. Öğretmenlerden bir çeşit geribildirim verme yöntemini takip etmelerini istemektense, birçok farklı

yöntem avantaj ve dezavantajları anlatılarak örneklenmeli ve öğretmenlerin bunları kendi uygulamalarında rehber almaları istenmelidir. Öğretmenlerin sınıflarında kendilerini otorite görmelerinden dolayı nasıl ders vermeleri gerektiği konusunda dikte edilmelerinden hoşlanmadıkları da bilinmektedir. Bu yüzden kendilerine bu konuda otonomi verilmelidir. Öğretmenler bir öğrenci kağıdı üzerinde önceliklerinin ne olması gerektiği konusunda hemfikir olduklarında öğrencilerinin ihtiyaçlarına daha kolay cevap verebileceklerdir. Dolayısıyla bu eğitim programının amacı öğretmenlere ne yapmaları gerektiğini anlatmak ve onları öğrenci kompozisyonlarına ne zaman ve ne şekilde geribildirim vermeleri gerektiği konusunda bilgilendirmek olmalıdır.

Bu eğitim programı süresince, öğretmenler aslında çok önemli olan fakat genelde gözardı edilen bir diğer nokta hakkında da uyarılmalıdırlar: pozitif geribildirim. Öğrencilerin hataları yanında neyi doğru yaptıklarını da bilmeye ihtiyaçları vardır. Yazma becerisinin geliştirilmesinde öğrencilere zayıf ve başarılı oldukları noktalar birlikte gösterilmelidir. Ferris'in (1995) çalışmasında da öğrenciler pozitif yorumlar almadıklarında motivasyonlarını kaybettiklerini belirtmişlerdir.

Süreç temelli yaklaşım izlenmesinin amacı öğrencileri kendi kendine yazabilen ve kendi öğretimini yönlendirebilen öğrenciler yetiştirmektir. Verdikleri geribildirim ile öğretmenler bu amaca hizmet etmektedirler. Lee'nin (2008) yaptığı çalışmanın da gösterdiği gibi verilen geribildirim çok fazla öğretmen odaklı olduğunda öğrenciler öğrenciler olurlar. Bu yüzden, öğretmenler bu eğitim programı esnasında öğrencilere nasıl yardım etmeleri gerektiği konusunda da bilgilendirilmelidirler. Bu bağlamda, öğretmenlerin sistematik olarak verdikleri geribildirimlerin miktarını azaltmaları gerektiği vurgulanmalıdır. Özellikle İngilizce yeterlik seviyesi düşük olan öğrencilere dilbilgisi, içerik, oraganizasyon ya da noktalama gibi her konuda geribildirim verilmeli iken bu öğrencilerin dil yeterlik seviyeleri yükseldikçe öğretmenler odak noktalarını değiştirip dilbilgisine çok fazla yüklenmeyip daha çok içerik ve organizasyon konularına yönelmelidirler. Tabi bunu yaparken öğrencilere öğretmenlerinin neden böyle bir yol izlediği konusunda bilgi verilmelidir.

Bunlara ek olarak, öğretmenlerin bütün öğrencilerin ihtiyaçlarına cevap verecek geribildirimi sağlamasının imkansız olduğu bilinmelidir. Bu yüzden,

öğretmenler geribildirim verirken öğrencilerinin ihtiyaçlarını, yeteneklerini ve kişiliklerini gözönünde bulundurmalıdır. Bireysel olarak öğrencilerin geribildirimden farklı beklentileri olabilir. Bu durumda Hyland'ın de (1998) önerdiği gibi öğretmen ve öğrenciler bir araya gelip amaç ve beklentilerini tartışmalıdırlar. Sözlü geribildirim talebi çalışma kapsamında mülakat yapılan öğrenciler tarafından da dile getirilmiştir. Çoğu öğrenci öğretmenlerinin kullanmış olduğu hata belirten kodlar üzerinde çalışmayı sevdiğini söylese de özellikle hatalarını nasıl düzeltmeleri gerektiğini bilmediklerinde sıkıntı çektiklerini belirtmişlerdir. Bu durumda, öğretmenlerinden yardım almayı talep etmektedirler. Lee (1997) de öğrencilerle yapılacak sözlü görüşmelerin hata belirtmede kullanılan kodların verimliliğini artırmaya yardımcı olacağını söylemiştir. Alexeeva (2012) ve Atieya (2012) da yaptıkları çalışmalarda benzer sonuçlar elde etmişlerdir. Onların çalışmalarında da gerek öğretmenler gerekse öğrenciler sözlü geribildirim yazılı geribildirime oranla daha etkili ve yararlı bulmuşlardır. Öğretmenler ile yapılan sözlü görüşmeler öğrencilerin nerede iyi olduklarını ve nerede hata yaptıklarını görmelerini sağlamakla beraber onlara yapılan değişiklik ya da eklemelerin yazılarını pozitif anlamda nasıl daha etkili bir hale getireceğini anlatmayı amaçlamalıdır. Bu yüzden, eğitim programı esnasında öğretmenler yüklü programlarına rağmen mümkün olduğu kadar sözlü geribildirim vermeleri gerektiği konusunda uyarılmalıdırlar.

Uygulanacak olan eğitim programının son safhasında öğretmenlerin notlandırma konusunda standart olmaları sağlanmalıdır ki bu da gerçekleştirilmesi zor bir amaçtır. Notlandırma öğrencilerin performanslarını belirleyici bir faktör olduğundan dikkatle ele alınmalıdır. Eğer öğrenciler bir kurumdaki öğretmenlere güvenmez iseler, heveslerini kaybederler ki bu da motivasyonlarının düşmesine neden olur. Başarısızlık fikri öz-yeterlik inançlarının düşmesine ve bu da sonuç olarak yazmaya karşı bir nefret uyanmasına neden olur. Bunların olmasını engellemek için standardizasyon çalışmaları kapsamında öğretmenler birkaç öğrenci kağıdı değerlendirerek herbir kağıdın alması gereken notu tartışmalıdırlar. Bu süreç öğretmeler arasında ortak bir sonuca varılana kadar devam etmelidir.

Ayrıca bu gibi eğitimlerin her kurumda zaman içerisinde değişen öğrenci profili, beklentileri ve ihtiyaçlarını ve de kurumun değişen beklentilerini karşılamak adına belirli aralıklarla tekrarlanması da önerilmektedir.

Çalışmadan MLD adına yapılabilecek bir sonuç da yakın bir gelecekte MLD yönetiminin özel amaçlar için İngilizce öğretmeyi seçme yolunda bir değişiklik içine girmesi beklenebileceği gerçeğidir. Çalışma sonuçlarının da gösterdiği üzere öğrencilerin tercih ve beklentileri konusunda öğrenim gördükleri fakülteler belirleyici bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu nedenle, ileride MLD'de görev yapan öğretmenler karışık gruplardaki öğrencilere ders vermektense fakülte bazında ders vermeye başlayabilirler. Bu da demektir ki her öğretmenin belirli bir fakülteden gelen öğrencileri olacaktır. Bu sayede öğretmenler öğrencilerinin bağlı oldukları fakültenin de beklentilerini gözönünde bulundurarak işlerini yerine getireceklerdir. Aslında bu fikir Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi 2011-2016 Stratejik Planı'nda da tartışılan konulardan biridir.

Bu çalışma öğretmen ve öğrencilerin geribildirim konusuna karşı tutumlarını ve algılarını incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Çalışma kapsamında öğrencilerin kağıtları üzerinde değişiklik yaptıkları süreç dikkate alınmamıştır. Bu nedenle, gelecekte öğrencilerin kağıtlarını düzeltme sürecinde neler yaptıklarının daha iyi anlaşılabilmesi için detaylı bir çalışma yapılabilir. Böyle bir çalışma, öğrencilerin öğretmenler tarafından verilen geribildirim ne kadarını dikkate aldıkları konusunda daha iyi bir fikir verebilir.

Buna ek olarak, öğretmenlerin geribildirim algıları ile gerçekte uyguladıkları teknikler arasında bir benzerlik olup olmadığının araştırılabilmesi için bir çalışma yapılabilir. Böyle bir çalışma kapsamında öğretmenlerin geribildirime karşı tutumlarını belirleyecek daha çok veri toplamak amacıyla daha çok öğretmen ile mülakatlar yapılmalıdır.

Bu çalışmanın diğer bir eksikliği ise öğrenciler ile yapılan mülakatların sayısının az olmasıdır. Veri toplama, dönemin en yoğun son iki haftasında yapıldığından, araştırmacı ile mülakat yapmaya zaman ayırabilecek birçok öğrenciye ulaşmak pek mümkün olamamıştır. Fakat, bunun da sonuçların genellenmesini zorlaştırdığı kabul edilmektedir. Bu çalışmanın başka bir ortamda yinelenmesi durumunda daha fazla öğrenci ile mülakat yapılması önerilir çünkü çalışma kapsamında yapılan mülakatlardan elde edilen veri öğrencilerin yazılı geribildirim hakkındaki algı ve tutumları konusunda daha detaylı bilgi edinilmesini sağlamıştır.

APPENDIX I

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Vanlı
Adı : Gökçe
Bölümü : Yabancı Diller Eğitimi

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce) : Student and instructor perception on feedback to student writing

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ:

.....